# Union Leadership: A Study of Union Stewards and Executives of Local Civil Service and Trade Unions

Copyright by Anthony E. Carroll 1995

August 31, 1995

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER of SCIENCE
Saint Mary's University
Halifax, Nova Scotia



Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0N4 Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0N4

Your hie Volte rélatence

Our lile Notre rélérance

THE AUTHOR HAS GRANTED AN IRREVOCABLE NON-EXCLUSIVE LICENCE ALLOWING THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA TO REPRODUCE, LOAN, DISTRIBUTE OR SELL COPIES OF HIS/HER THESIS BY ANY MEANS AND IN ANY FORM OR FORMAT, MAKING THIS THESIS AVAILABLE TO INTERESTED PERSONS.

L'AUTEUR A ACCORDE UNE LICENCE IRREVOCABLE ET NON EXCLUSIVE PERMETTANT A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA DE REPRODUIRE, PRETER, DISTRIBUER OU VENDRE DES COPIES DE SA THESE DE QUELQUE MANIERE ET SOUS QUELQUE FORME QUE CE SOIT POUR METTRE DES EXEMPLAIRES DE CETTE THESE A LA DISPOSITION DES PERSONNE INTERESSEES.

THE AUTHOR RETAINS OWNERSHIP OF THE COPYRIGHT IN HIS/HER THESIS. NEITHER THE THESIS NOR SUBSTANTIAL EXTRACTS FROM IT MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED WITHOUT HIS/HER PERMISSION.

L'AUTEUR CONSERVE LA PROPRIETE DU DROIT D'AUTEUR QUI PROTEGE SA THESE. NI LA THESE NI DES EXTRAITS SUBSTANTIELS DE CELLE-CI NE DOIVENT ETRE IMPRIMES OU AUTREMENT REPRODUITS SANS SON AUTORISATION.

ISBN 0-612-05316-4



Name			
Dissertation Abstracts Internat	ional is arranged by broad, general su	ubject categories. Please select the o	ne subject which most
nearly describes the content of	f your dissertation. Enter the correspon	iding four-digit code in the spaces p	provided.
,	•		
	SUBJECT TERM		SUBJECT CODE
	SONTEM (MIGH		
Subject Categories			
•			
THE HUMANITIES	AND SOCIAL SCIENCES		
COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS	Psychology0525	PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND	Ancient
Architecture	Reading	THEOLOGY	Ancient
Art History	Religious	Philosophy0422	Modern
Cinama 0900 Danca 0378	) Sciences	Religion	African
Fine Arts	Social Sciences0534	General	Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332 Canadian0334
Information Science	Special 0529	Clergy	European
Library Science	Teacher Training0530	Philosophy of 0322	Latin American
Mass Communications 0708 Music	lechnology	Clergy 0319 History of 0320 Philosophy of 0322 Theology 0469	European         0335           Lotin American         0336           Middle Eastern         0333           United States         0337           History of Science         0585
Speech Communication	Vocational	SOCIAL SCIENCES	History of Science
Spirech Communication	LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND	American Studies 0323	LOW
EDUCATION	HMCHISTICS	Anthropology Archaeology	Political Science General
General	Immuna	Cultural	International Law and
Administration 0514	0470	Physical	Relations
Adult and Continuing	Ancient	Connect 0310	Recreption
Art	Modern0291	Accounting0272	Social Work
Business	Literature General0401	Banking	General
Community College	Classical	Marketing0338	Criminology and Penalogy 0627
Curriculum and Instruction	Comparative	Accounting 0272  Banking 0770  Management 0454  Marketing 0338  Canadian Studies 0385	Social Work
Early Childhood 0518 Elementary 0524 Finance 0277 Guidence and Counseling 0519	Medieval	rennamics	Individual and Family
Finance	African0316	General	Industrial and Labor
Houle Unit	American	Commerce-Business	Sludies
Higher 0745 History of 0520	Asian 0305  Canadian (English) 0352  Canadian (French) 0355  English 0593  Germanic 0311	History 0509	Public and Social Wellare 0630 Social Structure and
Home Economics	Canadian (French)0355	Labor'	Development
Industrial	Germanic 0311	Theory	Theory and Methods 0344
Language and Literature	Latin American	Folklare 0358 Geography 0366 Gerontology 0351	Development 0700 Theory and Methods 0344 Transportation 0799 Urban and Regional Planning 0999 Women's Studies 0453
Music U522	0212	History	Women's Studies0453
Philosophy of	Slavic and Fast European 0314	General0578	
Physical			
THE SCIENCES AN	D ENGINEERING		
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES	Geodesy 0370	Speech Pathology 0460	Engineering
Agriculture	Geology	Speech Pathology	Engineering General0537
General	Geophysics	Home Economics0386	Aerospace
Animal Culture and	Mineralogy	PHYSICAL SCIENCES	Automotive
Nutrition	Paleobotany0345	Pure Sciences	Biomedical
Animal Pathology	Paleontology 0418	Chemistry General	Civil
Technology 0359 Forestry and Wildlife 0478 Plant Culture 0479	Paleozoology	Agricultural 0749	Electronics and Electrical 0544 Heat and Thermodynamics 0348
Plant Culture	Palynology 0427 Physical Geography 0368 Physical Oceanography 0415	Analytical	Hydraulic
Plant Pathology	rnysical Oceanography	Biochemistry	Industrial
Plant Physiology	HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL	Nuclear0738	Marine
Range Management 0777 Wood Technology	SCIENCES	Organic	Mechanical
Biology General	Environmental Sciences 0768	Physical	Metallurgy0743
Anatomy0287	CI OF44	Polymer	Mining
Biostatistics	Audiology 0300	Mathematics	Packaging0549
Bokity		Physics Physics	Petroleum
Ecology		General	System Science 0790 Geolechnology 0428 Operations Research 0796
Entomology	Harnit I M. maranant 0740	Acoustics	Operations Research 0796
Genetics 0369 Lennology 0793	Human Development 0758	Astrophysics	Plastics Technology
v icrobiology V410	Madiaina and Curnery 0564	Almospheric Science 0608 Alomic	Textile Technology0994
Molacular 0307 Neuroscience 0317	Mental Health	Electronics and Electricity 0607 Elementary Particles and	PSYCHOLOGY
Oceanography 0416		High Energy Controls and Migh Energy 0798	General0621
Physiology	Obstation and Concentent 0390	High Energy 0798	Behavioral
Regulation 0821 Velerinary Science 0778	Occupational Health and	Molecular	Dovelonmental 0620
Zoology	Ophthalmology0381	Optics	Experimental
Biophysics 0786		Radiation	Personality
Medical0760	Pharmacy	Solid State	Experimental   0023
EARTH SCIENCES	Pharmacy 0572 Physical Therapy 0382 Public Health 0573	Applied Sciences	rsychometrics
Biogeochemistry 0425	Padiology 0574	Applied Mechanics	Social0451
Geochemistry	Recreation0575	Computer Science 0984	<b>(A)</b>

## Union Leadership: A Study of Union Stewards and Executives of Local Civil Service and Trade Unions

#### Copyright by Anthony E. Carroll 1995

August 31, 1995

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER of SCIENCE Saint Mary's University

Halifax, Nova Scotia

Approved:

Faculty Advisor

Approved:

Thesis Committee Member

Approved:

hesis Committee Member

Date:

#### Acknowledgements

I would Like to express my gratitude to Dr. Victor Catano whose assistance and guidance throughout the last two years has given me an excellent example of what being a professor entails. A special thank you is extended to Dr. Kevin Kelloway, who was always there (on Email) with his academic excellence and knowledge when I needed help the most. To the members of my thesis committee, I am thankful for for your constructive comments and academic support. I express sincere appreciation to my best friend, Wanda, and family, which continues to grow, for bringing me back to reality, when I would lose perspective on my pursuits. I would also like to thank the three other I/O students with whom I was accepted into the program. Without our togetherness, graduate school would have been extremely more difficult than it was. Most of all, I extend my deepest gratitude to Norm Hebert and the stewards of civil service and trade unions. This study could never have been completed without their assistance. I hope they find the results helpful.

#### Table of Contents

Title	Pag <b>e</b>
Title Page	i
Acknowledgments	i i
Table of Contents	i.i.i
Abstract	v
List of Figures and Tables	vili
Introduction	1
Summary of Previous Research on Union Leadership	4
Summary of Previous Research on Variables of Interest on Union Leadership	10
Summary of Hypothesis	32
Method	35
Participants	35
Questionnaire Measures	36
Results	
Correlational Results	48
Descriptive Results	52
MANOVA Results	55
Factor Analysis	66
Descriptive Results on "Types" of Leaders	68
MANCOVA Results	72
Post Hac Analyses Results	78

Discussion	85
Limitations of Current Study	101
Directions for Future Research	102
References	104
Appendix A	113
Appendix B	115

#### Abstract

## Union Leadership: A Study of Union Stewards and Executives of Local Civil Service and Trade Unions

Anthony E. Carroll

August 31, 1995

This study examined differences between union stewards and union executive members of trade and civil service unions as part of an investigation into union leadership. Multivariate questionnaires were received from 248 union leaders in eastern Canada (response rate = 38.5%). A 2 (union type) X 2 (union position) between-subjects MANOVA examined differences on 14 dependent variables. Union executives were more charismatic, reported more willingness to work for the union, and had more conflict with family than did stewards. Trade union leaders reported higher perceived instrumentality of participation in union activities and were more willing to engage in unconventional behaviour than civil service union leaders. Compared to archival data on rank-and-file members, union stewards were higher in union commitment.

Chi-square analyses revealed that trade union leaders had a higher willingness to strike, less formal education, and less time served as stewards than civil service leaders. Civil service union leaders were also more likely to have mothers who belonged to a union, held a union office, and striked as a member of a union. Union executives had a higher willingness to strike and spent more hours per week and a greater percentage of their time each week on union duties. Executives and stewards also differed in having mothers who belonged to a union and mothers who striked as union members.

In an exploratory analysis, union leaders were classified, based on their reported reasons for becoming a leader, as victim, reluctant, social/ambitious, or voice union leaders. A MANCOVA examined the differences between the types of union leaders while controlling for union position effects. The various types of union leaders differed in industrial relations stress, pro-union attitudes, transformational leadership, Marxist work beliefs, perceived instrumentality of participation, and job satisfaction. Post hoc analyses revealed that victim union leaders had higher industrial relations stress, higher transformational leadership assessments, higher Marxist work

beliefs, and lower job satisfaction than other union leaders. Reluctant leaders reported lower levels industrial relations stress, union attitudes, transformational leadership assessments, and Marxist work beliefs yet higher levels of job satisfaction than other leaders. Voice leaders had a higher perceived instrumentality and union loyalty whereas social/ambitious had higher pro-union attitudes than other leaders. Limitations of this study and implications for future research are discussed.

#### List of Tables and Figures

Table	es	Page
1.	Summary of demographic variables for the sample.	37
2.	Demographic characteristics of trade union and civil service unions.	39
3.	Demographic characteristics of stewards and executives.	40
4.	Zero-order correlations and internal reliability between variables of interest.	49
5.	Descriptive variables of trade union and civil service unions.	53
6.	Descriptive variables of stewards and executives.	56
7.	Within well correlations with standard deviations on diagonal.	59
8.	Tests of type of union, union position, and their interaction on dependent variables.	63
9.	Factor loadings, communalities, percents of variance for principal factors extraction and varimax rotation on union activity items.	67
10.	Demographic characteristics of victim, reluctant, social/ambitious, and voice leaders.	69
11.	Descriptive characteristics of victim, reluctant, social/ambitious, and voice leaders.	70
12.	Within cell correlations with standard deviations on diagonal.	73
13.	Results of MANCOVA on different types of leaders (while controlling for union position effects).	76
14.	Post hoc comparisons of different types of union leaders.	80

### Union Leadership: A Study of Union Stewards and Union Executives of Local Civil Service and Trade Unions

Recently there has been a resurgence of research on unionrelated issues. This work has focused primarily on union commitment and the development of a union commitment scale (Conlin & Gallagher, 1987; Friedman & Harvey, 1986; Fukami & Larson, 1984; Fullagar, 1986; Gordon, Philpot, Burt, Thompson, & Spiller, 1980; Kelloway, Catano, & Southwell, 1992; Thacker, Fields, & Barclay, 1990; Thacker, Fields, & Tetrick, 1989), and, secondarily, on participation by members in union activities (Kelloway & Barling, 1993a; Klandermans, 1986; McShane, 1986) and the relationship between union participation and union commitment (Gordon et al., 1980; Kelloway et al., 1992; Thacker et al., 1989; Thacker et al., 1990; ). Even though union leadership may, perhaps, be the highest form of union participation, it has generated little research. For instance, very little is known about the people who become union leaders and their reasons for doing so. This is even more the case with respect to shop stewards. Stewards play a pivotal leadership role in any union. They serve as a link between rank-and-file members and higher levels in the union organization.

Union stewards come from the membership of the union; later, many assume roles as members of the union executive. Union executives are elected from the union steward body and assume responsibilities in addition to their roles as union stewards. The first objective of the present study was to describe the characteristics and roles of union leaders, particularly their activities, attitudes, beliefs, and job satisfaction and to determine how those variables change at different levels of leadership.

The union in the present study consists of approximately 13,000 members in eastern Canada, representing a wide spectrum of employees including clerical workers, medical service professionals, education instructors, trade workers, and technicians. The vast majority of the membership is constituted of white collar workers. Approximately 9,000 members are organized under a Civil Service Act which requires all disputes to be resolved through arbitration. The remaining 4,000 members are organized under a Trade Union Act which provides them with the fundamental right to strike. The division of membership, which were the result of two different pieces of legislation, presented an opportunity to examine how leadership differed between the two groups. Therefore, for it's second objective, this study examined differences between the civil

service union leaders and trade union leaders; specifically, it asked whether Trade Union and Civil Service Union leaders differed in attitudes, beliefs, and demographic characteristics. Did having the "right" to strike make a leader more involved in the union, more committed to the union, and more likely to engage in unconventional and militant behaviour?

The present study also offered an opportunity to examine differences between stewards and executives. The union in the present study consists of 49 union locals (19 Civil Service and 30 Trade Union) with each local having approximately a 5 - 7 person executive. Stewards and executives of each local are elected biannually. The union also has an Executive Board which represents the locals at a General Executive Committee. The Executive Board is elected at each Biannual Convention. The stewards and executives surveyed in the present study are leaders of the union locals. Previous research on union leadership has focused mainly on union executives and has largely ignored union stewards (MacDonald, 1959; Mills; 1971; Van Tine; 1973). While much is known about the differences between union executives and union members, little is known about union stewards. Examining differences between stewards and executives on variables related to union leadership

(e.g., union involvement, union commitment, industrial relations stress, etc.), may enhance our understanding of the "process" of union leadership and the different roles played by different types of union leaders. Is union commitment higher in union executives than union stewards? Do union stewards experience more stress due to being closer to the employees' concerns or do executives experience more stress due to having extra duties in the union?

#### Union Leadership

Union leadership activities are the highest form of union participation (Barling, Fullagar, & Kelloway, 1992). Much of the early research on union leadership was conducted during the 1950s considered to be the "Golden Decade" of research on union-related issues (Barling, 1988). This research focused on dual allegiance to the organization and union (Dean, 1954) and on union and management's views towards each other (Stagner, Chalmers, & Derber, 1958). Results of these early studies suggested a positive relationship between union-management relations and the existence of dual loyalty (Dean, 1954). It appeared that similar scales could be used to measure both union members' and management's attitudes towards each other (Stagner et al., 1958). Both the studies by Dean (1954) and Stagner et al. (1958) included items asking union

members and/or management to rate the performance of the union leaders of their respective organizations, implying that union leaders influenced employees' loyalty to union and management.

Other studies conducted during the 1950s found that family background and work experiences influenced employees' prounion attitudes (Mills, 1971; Seidman, London, & Karsh, 1950).

While early research made a contribution to our understanding of union leadership, it was nonetheless methodologically flawed.

Much of this research focused mainly on union executives, thus largely ignoring union stewards (MacDonald, 1959; Mills, 1971; Van Tine, 1973). In addition, many of the conclusions of these early studies were little more than impressions drawn from interviews and surveys, without the benefit of statistical analyses (Dean, 1954; Seidman, et al., 1950; Stagner, et al., 1958; Strauss & Sayles, 1953).

Recent research on union leadership has focused on leadership styles (Catano, 1993; Fullagar, Gallagher, Clark, & Gordon, 1993; Fullagar, McCoy, & Schull, 1992). This research has been influenced by Bass (1985) who identified three general leadership styles.

Leaders who use <u>Transactional Leadership</u>, rely upon an equitable exchange in which they provide rewards in exchange for compliance.

This style may be more applicable to organizational leaders than to union leaders. Organizational leaders have formal organizational power and can offer numerous rewards (i.e., promotions, lightened job duties, etc.) in exchange for compliance. Union leaders, on the other hand, are unlikely to have this type of formal power. Leaders who use Transformational Leadership, attempt to have members identify with the values and mission of the organization. Transformational leadership comprises three characteristics: charisma, individual consideration, and intellectual stimulation (Bass, 1985). Charisma is the leader's ability to instill a sense of pride in the organization and to transmit the mission of the organization to members. <u>Individual Consideration</u> is the leader's stimulation of learning experiences, the provision of a climate conducive of socialization, and the treatment of each new member as an individual. Intellectual Stimulation is the leader's use of creative problem solving, encouraging of others to use intelligence to solve problems, and to look at old problems in new ways (Bass, 1985). Fullagar et al. (1992) found charisma and individual consideration to be more influential than intellectual stimulation in union setting. Transformational leadership on the part of union stewards may influence members' satisfaction with the union (Kelloway & Barling, 1993), members' loyalty (Fullagar et al., 1992).

and members' union commitment and participation (Fullagar et al., 1993).

Charisma is a personal attribute of the leader. Followers believe in the extraordinary powers of a leader with charisma who demonstrates those powers often and to the benefit of the followers (Catano, 1993). In addition, these leaders often exhibit dominance. self-confidence, the need to exert influence, and strong conviction in the moral rightness of their beliefs (Bass, 1985; Catano; 1993; House, 1977). If charismatic leaders are perceived favourably. followers will adopt their values, expectations, and attitudes. are also likely to express ideological goals and to be effective in situations that their followers find stressful. Moreover, people with charisma often display superior debating skills, technical expertise, and an ability to persuade or influence others to justify their positions. Charismatic union leaders may influence union members' behaviour (Catano, 1993) and satisfaction with the union (Kelloway & Barling, 1993).

Although current research on union leadership styles has provided insight into union leadership (Catano, 1993; Fullagar *et al.*, 1992; Takamiya, 1978) much remains unknown. Earlier research on

union leadership is primarily based on the assumption that all union leaders are the same. A "union leader" has been operationalized as anyone with a leadership role within the union, ignoring the differences attributable to different leadership roles. Recently, Barling et al. (1992) noted the need for research that explored differences between specific union leadership positions. Much of this newer research has focused on the role of the union steward (Fullagar et al., 1993; Tetrick & Martin, 1993). Stewards' leadership style has been found to influence union members' commitment to the union and union participation (Fullagar et al., 1993). As well, stewards differ from members in their view on such issues as union influence and fairness of union dues (Tetrick & Martin, 1993).

Early leadership studies focused on union executives whereas more current research has investigated union stewards ignoring potential differences between stewards and executives.

Investigating each type of leader separately assumes stewards and executives are different. Union stewards are elected from the rank-and-file membership and are involved mostly in first level grievances. They are the first level of contact with the union and play a role analogous to that of first-line supervision in an organization. In contrast, union executives are elected to perform a

broad range of duties, including managing and administration; they also are involved in policy making and decision-making more so than stewards. Unlon executives may have been stewards at one time or continue to hold steward duties while serving as an executive member. Little is known why some stewards go on to become executives, how executives differ from stewards, and how leadership varies over the different positions. The present study seeks to answer these questions.

,

Past research on union leadership has also assumed that there are no differences across unions. For example, Marchington (1983), in exploring differences between different "types" of union stewards, collapsed data collected from stewards from white and blue collar unions in different organizations. Current research by Kelloway and Barling (1993) also suggests that there are no differences between stewards from different unions by pooling data from union members of different unions. Despite similar results having been obtained in studies of stewards from a retail union (Tetrick & Martin, 1993), a letter carriers union (Fullagar *et al.*, 1993) and an electricians union (Fullagar *et al.*, 1992), this research is limited and has not investigated differences of union leaders of unions with different bargaining rights. In the present study, trade

union leaders operate under a collective agreement which affords them the right to strike. The civil service union leaders are prohibited from striking by law. Both types of stewards operate under the same union organizational structure. The right to strike may require leaders with different characteristics than in cases where this right does not exist. Trade union leaders may be more militant or aggressive than their civil service counterparts; on the other hand, the right to strike may bring with it stress. Trade and civil service union leaders (and stewards and executives) may vary on these and many other variables.

#### Union Leadership Variables

Barling, Fullagar, and Kelloway (1992) extensively review variables which are of importance to union research. The following section briefly discusses a number of these variables which may have importance to union leadership and in which union leaders may be expected to vary. In particular, differences are noted between trade and civil service union leaders and between executives and stewards.

#### Industrial Relations Stress

Union leaders are exposed to numerous stressors as part of their union work (Barling, Fullagar, & Kelloway, 1992). Bluen & Barling (1988) identified role ambiguity, role conflict, role overload, and the role of the union leader as four major stressors affecting union leaders. Role ambiguity exists when union leaders are unclear about what is required to successfully perform their duties and often results from a lack of clear performance guidelines (Bluen & Barling, 1988) and training (Nicholson, 1976). Union leaders are often elected to their leadership positions without knowing what is required for successful performance.

Union leaders often experience stress from three types of role conflict (Barling, Fullagar, & Kelloway, 1992). First, many union-related duties are performed in addition to job responsibilities. Often, time spent on union duties conflicts with time that could be spent on family responsibilities. Union leaders often experience a conflict (Bluen & Barling, 1988; Nicholson, 1976) from having to deal with conflicting expectations of union members, other union leaders, and representatives of management. Finally, union leaders often have to take actions with which they personally disagree, resulting in person-role conflict (Bluen & Barling, 1988).

Quantitative and qualitative role overload (Bluen & Barling, 1988) also acts as a major stress source for union leaders.

Quantitative role overload results from the number and breadth of duties that union leaders must perform. Qualitative role overload results from the lack of skills or knowledge that union leaders need to perform their union duties. Nicholson (1976) reported that 75% of the union leaders in his study reported role overload; however, training decreased the amount of strain experienced by these union leaders.

Finally, union leaders may experience stress simply because they hold a leadership role (Bluen & Barling, 1988). Union leaders are often involved in conflicts between groups. These include not only conflict with management, but also among union members. In handling a grievance, a union leader may not only have to deal with management but with the conflicting rights of two or more members they represent.

Union officials report higher levels of role overload than union members (Shirom & Mayer, 1993) and experience emotional exhaustion due to role overload (Nandram & Klandermans, 1993).

They often experience role ambiguity and role conflict from their

representative duties (Martin & Berthiaume, 1993). Without a doubt, union leaders experience stress from their involvement in industrial relations (Bluen & Edelstein, 1993; Burke, 1993; Fried & Tiegs, 1993; Heaney, Israel, Schurman, Baker, House, & Hugentoblem, 1993; Kelloway, Barling, & Shah, 1993; Nandram & Klandermans, 1993).

Notwithstanding this current research on industrial stress, little is known on how stress varies with different levels of union leadership or how it differs across unions. Union executives and union stewards have different roles within the union and, therefore, may experience different levels of stress. Union stewards are elected or appointed from the rank-and-file membership and represent union members in grievances. Union executives, on the other hand, often have other duties in addition to representing members' grievances. Union executives represent the stewards and members at union conferences, represent the union executive to the steward body, and consult with upper management on policies affecting the workplace. Union executives, therefore, should experience more role conflict than stewards due to performing a broader range, and an increased number of duties. Union executives should report higher levels of industrial relations stress than union stewards. Since these extra duties are often at the expense of

family, union executives should also report more role conflict between union duties and home responsibilities than union stewards.

Trade and civil service union leaders may experience different levels of stress. For example, a civil service union leader may confront actions taken by management through grievance. If the grievance is lost, the civil service union leader has little recourse but to accept the decision. However, members may still oppose the actions and pressure the leader to "do something". The civil service union leader may become unclear about their role and experience role overload from the continuance of the old issues never being resolved and new disputes continually arising. Trade union leaders, with the right to strike, can force issues to be resolved by the threat of strike action. This is similar to Hirschman's (1970) Exit-Voice-Loyalty Model which indicates that union members are less likely to leave an organization due to having an extra voice (union) to hear them. In a similar vein, a union may increase employee morale and lower turnover by providing a voice for dissatisfied employees. Therefore, trade union leaders have an extra option. Therefore, civil service union leaders may experience more industrial relations stress than trade union leaders, and may report higher levels of role conflict.

#### Union Attitudes

When investigating union leadership, it is important to recognize the influence of union attitudes. General union attitudes, the attitudes employees hold toward unions, have been shown to correlate with administrative participation in unions (McShane. 1986). If employees have high pro-union attitudes they are likely to participate in union activities. In addition, Brett (1980) indicated in her model on unionization that even if employees have similar attitudes of union instrumentality, job dissatisfaction, and collective action, they are still unlikely to vote in favour of union certification if they have negative attitudes towards unions. General union attitudes predict how employees vote in union representation election (Brett, 1980). In addition to influencing voting behaviors of employees, union attitudes predict the willingness to join a union (Barling, Kelloway, & Bremermann, 1991) and union loyalty (Fullagar, McCoy, & Schull, 1992). Does this extend to union leadership? Or more precisely, do union executives have higher pro-union attitudes than union stewards? If union attitudes influence how employees vote in a certification election and the willingness to join a union, it seems likely that union members who have higher pro-union attitudes would be willing to become more involved in union activities and spend more time performing unionrelated duties than those members with less pro-union attitudes.

Bearing this in mind, it is predicted that union executives will report stronger union attitudes than union stewards.

Union attitudes towards specific unions have garnered much empirical analysis. Brett (1980) defines union instrumentality as the belief that unionization yields positive rather than negative results. However, various unions can be perceived as having greater or lesser influence in the workplace depending on their bargaining rights. Union instrumentality is associated with a vote in favor of the union (Barling, Laliberte, Fullagar, & Kelloway, 1990; Kochan, 1979; Premack & Hunter, 1988). Trade union leaders can ultimately force discussion of issues by the threat of going on strike whereas civil service union leaders do not have the right to strike and can not make use of this threat. Therefore, trade union leaders should rerceive a higher union instrumentality than civil service unionists and, consequently, have stronger pro-union attitudes.

#### Participation and Involvement in the Union

Much of the research on union participation has focused on its antecedents. Nicholson et al. (1981) found that union members' need for affiliation and involvement predicted their participation in union

activities. Since leadership is an ultimate form of participation (Barling et al., 1992), union leaders should have a higher need for involvement than union members and executive members should have a higher need for involvement than stewards. Therefore, need for involvement may predict whether union members become stewards or executives.

Need for involvement may also differ between civil service and trade union leaders. Previous research has shown that white collar union members' need for involvement moderates the relationship between demographic, work-related, and employment climate variables on one hand and their union attitudes and subsequent participation on the other (Nicholson, 1981). Trade union leaders may have a higher need for involvement than civil service leaders due having the right to strike. Brett (1980) indicated that perceived instrumentality of unions influenced unionization decisions; the influence of union instrumentality may extend to the involvement of leaders in their unions. Civil service leaders may feel less need for involvement in union/management issues due to having less bargaining rights than trade union leaders.

Marxist work beliefs, the belief that work provides selffulfillment, but that fulfillment is thwarted by the way work is organized (Buchholz, 1978), may also vary between leaders of different unions and at different levels of union leadership. Marxist work beliefs predict union participation (Fullagar & Barling, 1989) and directly influence union loyalty and responsibility to the union. Both of these commitment variables, in turn, influence participation in union activities through the willingness to work for the union (Kelloway & Barling, 1993). Marxist work beliefs indirectly influence participation in union activities. The stronger Marxist work beliefs union members hold, the greater their participation in the union. Therefore, union executives should report a greater degree of Marxist work beliefs than union stewards due to their higher involvement in union activities. Similarly, trade union leaders who have more bargaining rights, and are likely to have more involvement in union activities, should report stronger Marxist work beliefs than civil service union leaders.

Union commitment is the intense attitude of favorability towards the union and approval of its over-all policies (Purcell, 1954; Stagner, 1954). It encompasses three factors: Union Loyalty, Responsibility to the Union, and Willingness to Work for the union

(Kelloway, Catano, & Southwell, 1992). Union Lovalty is defined as affective attachment to the union. Responsibility to the Union reflects members' willingness to take on the day to day responsibilities of union membership. Willingness to Work for the union reflects members' willingness to do extra work for the union (e.g., hold union office, serve on committees). Considering how it is defined, union commitment may vary across levels of leadership or types of unions. For example, union executives who engage in more consistent union activities than union stewards and rank-and-file members should report higher levels of union commitment than stewards and rank-and-file members. Similarly, stewards should report higher levels of commitment to the union than rank-and-file members. There is a positive relationship between union commitment and participation in union activities (Fullagar, 1986; Fullagar & Barling, 1989; Gordon et al., 1980). Since a greater degree of participation in the union is required of union executives. compared to stewards and rank-and-file members, there should be a positive correlation between level of union leadership position and union commitment.

Union commitment may also vary across the two types of unions.

Perceived instrumentality of union effectiveness by employees

influences voting intentions (Brett, 1980; Youngblood et al., 1984) and union commitment (Fullagar & Barling, 1989; Kelloway et al., 1990). This is apparently true in white-collar (Fullagar & Barling, 1989) and blue-collar (Kelloway et al., 1990) unions. The sample in the current study affords a unique opportunity to examine the effects of bargaining rights on union commitment. The Trade Union, predominantly comprised of blue-collar employees, has the right to strike; thus, its leaders may perceive it as having higher instrumentality than the civil service union leaders perceive the effectiveness of the civil service union, comprised mostly of white-collar employees. Therefore, trade union leaders may report higher levels of union commitment than civil service union leaders.

Involvement in the union can be defined as the importance of union activity in a union leader's life and the identification of the leader with union activity. This definition is derived from psychological involvement with the job (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965; Rabinowitz & Hall, 1977). Despite many studies conducted on job involvement, there is a dearth of information on union involvement. Research conducted on job involvement has shown there is no consistent relationship between job involvement and union commitment (Barling, Wade, & Fullagar, 1993; Kelloway et al.,

1990). However, in the present study, psychological involvement in the union is hypothesized to correlate positively with union commitment. Union executives, who spend more hours performing union duties than union stewards, should report greater involvement in their union work. Similarly, trade union leaders, who may participate more in union activities than civil service leaders, should also report higher levels of psychological involvement in the union.

#### Job Satisfaction

Much research has been conducted on the relationship between unionization and job satisfaction. Many studies have found a negative relationship between job satisfaction and union participation, concluding that there is likely to be more participation in union activities by employees who are dissatisfied with their jobs than employees who are satisfied with their jobs (Brett, 1980; Kelloway & Barling,1993a, Kryl, 1990; McShane, 1986; Nicholson et al., 1981). Although Brett (1980) suggested that job dissatisfaction predicted union participation, more recent studies based on structural equation modeling suggest that union participation predicts job dissatisfaction (Kelloway & Barling, 1993a). Regardless of the direction of the relationship between job

satisfaction and union participation, there is a negative relationship between job satisfaction and union participation. Therefore, union executives who spend more time on union activities than stewards, should be expected to report lower levels of job satisfaction than union stewards.

Job satisfaction research also suggests that differences might be related to types of union (Blyton et al., 1981; Brett, 1980; Kochan, 1979). Brett (1980) and Kochan (1979) noted that dissatisfaction with economic factors was more influential with respect to union participation than dissatisfaction with job content, especially among blue-collar workers suggesting differences between blue-collar and white-collar employees. In addition, Blyton et al. (1981) found a positive correlation between job status and job satisfaction confirming Form's (1976) observation that high status jobs provide greater opportunities for social interactions with other workers and, thus, higher job satisfaction. The sample for the present study consists of civil service union leaders, primarily white-collar workers, and trade union leaders, traditionally composed of blue-collar workers. However, the trade union leaders have the right to strike

whereas civil service union leaders do not have this right; this difference could have a impact on union leaders' job satisfaction. Despite the fact that both unions can address many aspects of their jobs that cause dissatisfaction, trade union leaders have the right to strike for their issues whereas civil service union leaders often have to have their grievances resolved through arbitration. Therefore, it is predicted, despite the findings of Blyton *et al.* (1981), that Trade Union Leaders will report less job satisfaction than civil service union leaders.

#### Subjective Norms

Subjective norms influence participation in union activities (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Kelloway & Barling, 1993). Subjective norms are the extent to which an individual believes reference groups (family, coworkers, and people important to the respondents) support participation in union activities (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Subjective norms have been shown to predict behavioural intention (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975) and union loyalty (Kelloway & Barling. 1993). Past research that has also indicated a positive relationship between union loyalty and willingness to work for the union and positive effects of willingness to work for the union on union participation. If subjective norms predict union loyalty which is

positively correlated with union participation, then, union members who participate more in union activities should believe that their participation is supported by their influence groups more so than those who participate to a lesser degree. Therefore, union executives who more actively participate in union activities than union stewards should report higher subjective norms.

Subjective norms may also vary between leaders of trade and civil service unions. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) proposed a model of unionization which asserted that the two main predictors of unionization were union instrumentality and subjective norms. Basically, if workers believe that the union will achieve certain outcomes and believe specific reference groups will support unionization, then they will vote for unionization. Extending this to union leadership, union leaders from dissimilar unions may report different levels of subjective norms due to the perceived instrumentality of the union. Civil service union leaders may feel less support from reference groups than trade union leaders because they are leaders of a union without the right to strike. Their respective reference groups may see little use in being a leader of a union which does not have the bargaining right to strike and may attempt to discourage civil service leaders from being union leaders. Therefore, civil service union leaders may report lower levels of subjective norms than trade union leaders.

#### Charismatic Leadership Perceptions

Much of the current research on union leadership has focused on the charismatic leadership style (Catano, 1993; Fullagar et al., 1993; Fullagar et al., 1992). Conger and Kanungo (1992) identified eight perceived behavioural attributes of charismatic leadership. Charismatic leaders are perceived as agents of radical change, striving to change status quo, sensitive to follower needs, and realistic assessors of their environments. Charismatic leaders are visionaries who can strongly articulate their case and who are willing to engage in unconventional behaviour and in activities that involve personal risk. Charismatic leadership may predict local union satisfaction (Kelloway & Barling, 1993) and may be related to union socialization (Fullagar et al., 1992), and union commitment (Fullagar et al., 1993). Union leaders often have to rely upon charismatic behaviour to involve their members in the union. Unlike managers, who may rely on transactional leadership, union leaders have few rewards to exchange for compliance. If charismatic leadership predicts union satisfaction and is related to union socialization and commitment, then union executives should report

higher levels of charismatic behaviors than union stewards. If a union leader increases union satisfaction of union members, assists in socializing new members to the union, and is more committed to the union than other leaders, then it is logical that the leader would be more likely elected to an executive position. In addition, union executives are often involved not only with union members but also communicate more often than stewards with management where charismatic leadership is required. Therefore, union executives should report higher levels of charisma than union stewards. That is, they will believe themselves to be seen as more charismatic by their followers than will stewards.

Kelloway and Barling (1993) examined differences in union satisfaction between members of a passive union local and members of an active union local; charisma was the best predictor of union satisfaction in both samples. However, members of the "active" union had more favorable perceptions of their shop stewards' charisma. This suggests that perceptions of leadership styles vary across different types of unions. The trade union leaders in the present study may have higher charismatic leadership perceptions because of the right to strike than civil service union leaders because trade union leaders would have more opportunity to use

charisma as to convince their members to take more extreme actions (e.g., vote to strike, etc.).

Unconventional Behaviour, Militancy, and Willingness To Strike

Willingness to engage in unconventional behaviour involves taking non traditional or risky courses of action to achieve objectives (Conger & Kanungo, 1992). Unconventional behaviour is positively correlated with charisma and individual consideration and negatively correlated with caretaking and resource management roles. Unconventional behaviour varies with leadership roles (Conger & Kanungo, 1992).

Militancy can be thought of as an extreme form of unconventional behaviour. It is the willingness to engage in activities such as illegal strikes, violence during strikes, creating chaos to support the union, or participating in rotating absences. In contrast to unconventional behaviour, militancy is more extreme. Willingness to engage in unconventional behaviour concerns achieving goals in an unorthodox manner but within the legal framework whereas militancy often entails willingness to engage in behaviors that are illegal (go on illegal strike, engage in violence, etc.). Militancy is an important consideration in union leadership

because of its relationship to strike propensity (Martin, 1986) and union loyalty (Barling et al., 1992).

Stewards and executives have different leadership roles within unions. Stewards often consult with rank-and-file members and represent members at the lower stage of grievances. They are expected to carry out union policy in performing their duties. Union executives may also represent union members at initial stages of grievances; however, they are also involved at higher stages and must consult with other union executives about union policies. Union executives may feel more certain about their actions because of their more frequent consultation, with other union procedures. This greater confidence and security may allow union executive members a greater willingness, than stewards, to engage in unconventional behaviour and militant acts. Therefore union executives should report higher levels of willingness to engage in unconventional behaviour and militant acts, including a willingness to stay on strike longer than union stewards.

Trade and civil service union leaders may also differ in their willingness to engage in unconventional work behaviour and militancy. Trade union leaders have the option, to influence their

members to stop working, to strike and to take other types of militant job actions during a strike. Therefore, trade union leaders should indicate a greater willingness to engage in unconventional behaviour and militancy and to report more willingness to stay on strike than civil service union leaders to achieve their goals.

#### Familial Influences

Union members' family background may influence members' future union activity. Union activists are more likely to have been socialized in environments where family members were actively involved in unions (Purcell, 1953; Seidman et al., 1958). Barling, Kelloway, & Bremermann (1991) investigated parental influence on pre-employed late adolescents. The little work experience that the adolescents had was unlikely to have a major effect on their attitudes towards unions and the effect of their willingness to join a union. Familial socialization (perceptions of their parents' participation and union attitudes) on their own union attitudes was at least twice as large as the combined effect of Marxist work beliefs and humanistic work beliefs. In addition, perceived parental union attitudes directly influenced their own union attitudes, and parental participation in union activities had an indirect effect on

union attitudes through the perceived parental attitudes and Marxist work beliefs.

participation in unions, it should also influence involvement in leadership activities. The more extensive the parental involvement, the more likely that the member will be to undertake activities which require greater participation. It follows, then, that union executives should report greater perceived parental involvement in union activities than stewards. It is also likely, based on difference in participation, that trade union leaders will report greater parental participation in unions than civil service leaders. That is, executives and trade union leaders should be more likely to report that their parent were members of a union, held union office, or striked as a member of a union that stewards and civil service leaders, respectively. Finally, mothers and fathers may have different influences on union leadership, although it is not clear from previous research what these separate effects might be.

## Reasons for Becoming Involved in Union Activities

Union members become union leaders for a variety of reasons (Clegg et al., 1961; Dean, 1954; McShane, 1986; Nicholson, 1976;

Nicholson *et al.*, 1981; Strauss & Sayles, 1953). Some union members became leaders reluctantly; that is, they were forced into standing for office even elected against their personal protests (Nicholson, 1976). Other members become union leaders to gain a voice in how the organization operates (Glick *et al.*, 1977; Seidman *et al.*, 1950); they view their union activity as an attempt to improve working conditions (Seidman *et al.*, 1950). Still other members may believe also that work, as presently organized, exploits workers (Buchholz, 1978); consequently, these members who may see themselves as victims become involved in union activities remove sources of dissatisfaction and exploitation.

Union leadership activities provide opportunities for social interaction with other workers (Form, 1976); some union members may simply become union leaders to maintain this social involvement. Given that participation in union activities positively correlates with job status, some ambitious union members may believe that union leadership is a path to getting ahead either in the union or the organization (Blyton, 1981). Blyton *et al.* (1981) suggested that social and ambitious reasons were similar factors; as individuals with an ambition to extend their influence in the workplace may take on a leadership role in order to socialize with

management and union leaders, in hope of furthering their career.

This previous research suggests at least five different types of union leaders: a) those who join to gain a voice; b) those who join reluctantly; c) those who join because they feel victimized; d) those who join for socialization; and e) those who join out of ambition. There is no reason to expect that these different types of leaders will differ across either type of leader or type of union. However, an exploratory analysis, based on such types may further our understanding of union leadership.

#### Summary of the Hypotheses

The present study explores differences between union stewards and union executives, and between trade union and a civil service union leaders on several variables of interest to union researchers. It also investigates differences of these variables in relation to the reasons why the leaders become leaders. The hypotheses developed above are summarized here for convenience.

# Hypothesis I -Stress Variables

a) Given the difference in their union duties and responsibilities, members of union executives will report higher levels of stress and role conflict than stewards.

b) Given the difference in nature of trade and civil service unions, civil service union leaders will report higher levels of stress, and role conflict than trade union members.

#### Hypothesis II-Attitudinal Variables

- a)i Given the differences in their union duties and responsibilities, union executives will spend more time on union duties than stewards and will also report stronger union attitudes, perceived instrumentality, union commitment (loyalty, willingness to work for the union, and responsibility to the union), Marxist work beliefs, union work involvement, subjective norms, and less job satisfaction.
- a)ii Union stewards, on the other hand, should report more union commitment than rank-and-file union members.
- b) Given the difference in the nature of trade and civil service unions, trade union leaders are expected to report spending more time on union duties and would also report stronger union attitudes, perceived union instrumentality, union commitment (willingness to work for the union, loyalty to union, and responsibility to the union), Marxist work beliefs, union work involvement, subjective norms and less job satisfaction than civil service union leaders.

# Hypothesis III-Behavioural Variables

- a) Given the difference in their duties and responsibilities, union executive members, will be more likely to engage in militancy in unconventional work behaviour, and to strike than union stewards. In addition, union executives will believe that they exhibit more charismatic leadership behaviors than do stewards.
- b) Given the difference in the nature of trade and civil service unions, trade union leader are expected to be more likely to engage in militancy, in unconventional work behaviour, and to strike than civil service union leaders. In addition, trade union leaders will believe that they exhibit more charismatic leadership behaviors than do civil service leaders.

## Hypothesis IV - Family Influence

- a) Union executives will be more likely to have had parents who were union members, striked as a member of a union, or held a union office than will stewards.
- b) Trade union leaders will be more likely than civil service union leaders to have parents who were union members, striked as a member of a union, or held a union office.

#### Method

#### <u>Participants</u>

Participants for the present study were stewards and executives of union locals of a large union of approximately 13,000 members in eastern Canada. The union represents a wide spectrum of employees including clerical workers, medical service professionals, educational instructors, trade workers, and technicians. The vast majority of the membership constitute white collar workers. Approximately 9,000 members are organized under a civil service act which requires all disputes to be resolved through arbitration. Another 4,000 members are organized under a trade union act which provides them with the right to strike.

Questionnaires were mailed to all steward and executive members of both unions (N = 643) during the third week of November, 1993. The questionnaires were accompanied by a covering letter from the Education Officer of the Union stating the nature of the survey (Appendix A) and a stamped paid return envelope.

By the cutoff date, 248 questionnaires were returned (response rate = 38.5%) with approximately the same return rate for trade

union leaders (110 of 298; response rate = 36.9%) and civil service union leaders (138 of 345; response rate = 40.0%). 33% of the sample reported holding executive positions. Table 1 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the respondents. Based on the completed demographic information, 63% of the respondents were male and 37% female, although approximately 60% of union members are female. The respondents were relatively young with 75% between the ages of 25 and 45 and with only 4.2% older than 55 years (Mean = 40.66 years). The educational level of the sample was relatively high with 53.5% reporting some type of education beyond Grade 12 or vocational school; nearly 25% completed university degrees. Over 84% had less than two dependents. Table 2 compares the demographic characteristics between trade union leaders and civil service union leaders while Table 3 compares the demographic characteristics of stewards and executives.

#### Questionnaire

The questionnaire (Appendix B) consisted of 180 items which included twelve demographic items and 13 measurement scales.

Unless otherwise noted, items were measured on a five point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The questionnaire was developed in consultation with the Executive and

TABLE 1
Summary of Demographic Variables for the Sample

Characteristic	%	
Sex (N=243)		
Male	63.0	
Female	37.0	
Age (N=236)		
<=24	.8	
25 - 34	23.9	
35 - 44	47.2	
45 - 54	24.6	
55 - 60	4.5	
Education (N=243)		
Less than Grade 12	13.2	
Grade 12/Vocational School	33.3	
Some College/University	28.8	
University Degree	15.2	
Post Graduate Study	5.8	
Post Graduate Degree	3.7	
Marital Status (N=241)		
Single (Never Married)	10.8	
Married	69.3	
Separated/Divorced	13.3	
Common Law	5.0	
Widowed	1.6	
<u>Union (N=248)</u>		
Trade	44.4	
Civil Service	55.6	
Union Position (N=248)		
Stewards	<b>66.9</b>	
Executives	33.1	

TABLE 2
Demographic Characteristics of Trade Union and Civil
Service Unions

Characteristic	Trade %	Civil Service %
Sex	(N=107)	(N=136)
Male	66	60
Female	34	40
Age	(N=104)	(N=132)
<=24	1	1
25-34	26	20
35-44	46	46
45-54	22	27
55-60	5	6
Marital Status	(N=106)	(N=135)
Single(N)	12	10
Married(N)	75	65
Separated/Divorced(N)	7	18
Common Law (N)	4	6
Widowed(N)	2	1
# of Dependents	(N=107)	(N=137)
None	24	31
One	21	21
Two	38	34
Three	12	9
Four	4	4
>Four	1	1

TABLE 2 (CON'T)

Characteristic	Trade %	Civil Service %
Education	(N=107)	(N=136)
< Grade 12	17	10
Grade 12/Vocational School	45	24
Some College/University	21	35
University Degree	10	19
Post-Grad Study	3	8
Post-Grad Degree	4	4
Stewardship Tenure	(N=97)	(N=129)
Less than 5 years	68	43
5 - 10 years	26	36
Greater than 10 years	6	21
Executive Tenure	(N=42)	(N=39)
Less than 5 years	70	54
5 - 10 years	21	23
Greater than 10 years	9	23

TABLE 3

Demographic Characteristics of Stewards and Executives

Characteristic	Stewards %	Executives %
Sex	(N=161)	(N=82)
Male(N)	66	57
Female(N)	34	43
Age	(N=155)	(N=81)
<=24	1	1
25-34	24	21
35-44	45	49
45-54	24	25
55-60	6	4
Marital Status	(N=160)	(N=81)
Single	10	12
Married	74	61
Separated/Divorced	11	19
Common Law	4	6
Widowed	1	2
# of Dependents	(N=162)	(N=82)
None	29	26
One	18	27
Two	38	31
Three	10	12
Four	4	4
>Four	1	1

TABLE 3 (CON'T)

Characteristic	Stewards %	Executives %
Education	(N=161)	(N=82)
< Grade 12	14	12
Grade 12/Vocational School	30	40
Some College/University	32	23
University Degree	16	13
Post-Grad Study	6	6
Post-Grad Degree	2	5
Stewardship Tenure	(N=153)	(N=73)
Less than 5 years	57	48
5-10 years	31	33
Greater than 10 years	12	19

staff of the union. A description of each measurement scale follows along with the internal consistency for the scale in the present study.

#### 1) Industrial Relations Stress Scale

(Bluen & Barling, 1987) - 45 items assessed stressful events associated with the practice of industrial relations. These items were measured on a 7 point Likert-type scale ranging from extremely unfavorable (-3) to extremely favorable (3). (Cronbach's alpha = .91).

# 2) Reasons for Union Activity Scale

15 items were developed to assess why respondents became involved in union activities. Respondents answered either "Yes", "No", or "Uncertain" to each of the possible reasons for becoming involved in leadership activities.

# 3) Instrumentality of Participation Scale

(Kelloway & Barling, 1993) - 7 items assessed the extent to which members need to participate in unions. (Cronbach's alpha = .75).

#### 4) Transformational Leadership Assessment Scale

(Conger & Kanungo, 1992) - 6 items assessed union leaders' projected attitudes on how union members view them as charismatic leaders. This scale was originally developed to measure charismatic leadership of managers and subjects were asked to rate their manager on these items. In the current study, the scale was modified by asking union leaders their projected views of how union members thought of them as leaders. This was done by inserting "Union members think I am .......". (Cronbach's alpha = .82).

## 5) <u>Unconventional Behaviour Scale</u>

(Conger & Kanungo, 1992) - 10 items assessed the extent to which respondents would engage in unconventional behaviour to pursue union objectives. This scale was originally developed to measure unconventional behaviour of managers to achieve organizational goals. Therefore, in the current study, the scale was modified by inserting "union" where in the original scale there was "organization". (Cronbach's alpha = .87).

#### 6) Union Attitude Scale

(Brett, 1980) - 8 items assessed the extent to which respondents held prounion attitudes. (Cronbach's alpha = .86).

#### 7) Union Commitment Scale

(Kelloway, Catano, & Southwell, 1992) - 13 items assessed the respondents' degree of commitment to the union. This scale consisted of three factors. Union Loyalty (6 items) reflected respondents' sense of pride in belonging to the union and an appreciation for the benefits of the union (Cronbach's alpha = .89). Willingness to work for union (3 items) reflected members' willingness to engage in activities above and beyond those required by all members (Cronbach's alpha = .88). Finally, Responsibility to the Union consisted of 4 items which assessed members' willingness to undertake the day-to-day responsibilities of union membership (Cronbach's alpha = .83).

## 8) Subjective Norm Scale

(Kelloway & Barling, 1993) - 6 items assessed the extent to which respondents act according to what they believe their families and coworkers expect. (Cronbach's alpha = .76).

#### 9) Marxist Work Belief Scale

(Buchholz, 1978) - 10 items measured union leaders' attitudes on the working class and wealthy to assess the extent to which respondents hold Marxist work beliefs. (Cronbach's alpha = .77).

## 10) Union Work Conflict Scale

8 items assessed the extent to which respondents experienced conflict between their union work and family responsibilities. This scale was derived from Kopelman, Greenhaus, and Connoly's (1983) work conflict scale. The words "union work" replaced the word "work" from the original scale to make the scale more applicable to union stewards. The scale showed an alpha of .89 in the Kopelman *et al.* (1983) study and an alpha of .91 in the present study.

# 11) Union Work Involvement Scale

derived from Lodahl and Kejner's (1965) Job Involvement Scale.

This 6-item scale assessed the extent to which respondents were involved in their union work. The words "union work" replaced the word "work" from the original scale to make the scale more applicable to union leaders. (Cronbach's alpha = .86).

## 12) Militancy Scale

Derived in part from Martin (1986) and Southwell (1990). This 11-item scale measured the extent to which respondents would be willing to take militant action on behalf of the union (Cronbach's alpha = .65).

# 13) Job Satisfaction Scale

(Warr, Cook, & Wall, 1979) - 15 items assessed the extent to which respondents were satisfied with their jobs and present work environment (Cronbach's alpha = .89).

#### Design and Analyses

The effects of union type (Trade vs. Civil Service) and union position (Executive vs. Steward) on 14 dependent measures were assessed through a 2 X 2 between-subjects multivariate analysis of variance. Descriptive analyses were also performed on the dependent measures. As well, chi square analyses were used to assess differences on the demographic and categorical variables.

The 15-item Reasons for Union Activity Scale was further analyzed to determine the different "types" of union leaders who participated in the study. Each leader was categorized according to their predominant type. The 14 dependent variables were reanalyzed using a MANOVA with "Type of Leader" as the independent variable.

Finally, differences in union commitment between stewards and rank-and-file members were analyzed through a series of t tests.

Data for rank-and-file members were obtained from Southwell's (1990) study which involved the same union. Catano, Cole, and Hebert (in press) established that this baseline archival data remained stable over time.

#### Results

#### Descriptive and Correlational Results

Table 4 presents estimates of internal consistency and correlations for the dependent variables. Industrial relations stress correlated positively with willingness to engage in unconventional work behaviour (r = .19), Marxist work beliefs (r = .24), and responsibility to the union (.13) and negatively with job satisfaction (r = .35). Need for involvement correlated positively with transformational leadership assessment (r = .36), unconventional behaviour (r = .24), union attitude (r = .41), the three union commitment dimensions (.31 < r < .44), Marxist work beliefs (r = .24), union work involvement (r = .47), militancy (.26), and the degree leaders acted according to others' expectations (subjective norms) (r = .31).

Transformational leadership assessment was positively associated with willingness to engage in unconventional work behaviour (r = .30), union attitudes (r = .19), the three union commitment subscales (.18 < r < .28), Marxist work beliefs (r = .20), interrole conflict (r = .13), militancy (r = .20), and subjective norms (r = .43). Willingness to engage in unconventional work behaviour

TABLE 4
Zero-Order Correlations and Internal Reliability Between
Variables of Interest

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. IR	(.91)			***********			***************************************
2. NEED	07	(.75)					
3. LEAD	.01	.36	(.82)				
4. UNCON	.19	.24	.30	(.87)			
5. UNATT	06	.41	.18	.13	(.86)		
6. LOYAL	04	.44	.22	.20	.62	(.89)	
7. RESP	.13	.31	.18	.14	.37	.57	(.83)
8. WILL	04	.39	.28	.24	.39	.60	.43
9. MARX	.24	.24	.20	.29	.22	.19	.37
10. INTROL	.06	.10	.13	.34	.01	08	08
11. INVOL	05	.46	.40	.51	.34	.37	.19
12.SAT	35	01	01	23	.03	.04	10
13. MIL	.12	.26	.20	.38	.31	.34	.20
14. NORM	07	.31	.43	.29	.22	.36	.26
Mean	-9.00	25. <b>28</b>	20.23	24.24	35.46	24.24	16.79
Standard Dev.	19.38	4.23	3.68	7.24	4.78	4.45	2.94

Note: Values exceeding r > + or - .13, p < .05; Values exceeding r > + or - .22, p < .001.

TABLE 4 (CON'T)

Variable	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
8. WILL	(.88)						
9. MARX	.18	(.77)					
10. INTROL	.05	.05	(.91)				
11. INVOL	.48	.27	.28	(.86)			
12. SAT	06	30	12	10	(.89)		
13. MIL	.35	.25	.07	.36	-,22	(.65)	
14. NORM	.35	.26	.03	.37	04	.25	(.76)
Mean	11.78	37.00	18.60	15.10	60.40	31.11	19.24
Standard Dev.	2.68	5.88	6.20	4.36	17.80	6.19	4.28

IR = Industrial Relations Stress Scale; NEED = Need Involvement Scale;

LEAD = Transformational Leadership Assessment Scale;

UNCON = Willingness to Engage in Unconventional Behaviour Scale; UNATT = Union Attitude Scale; LOYAL = Loyalty to Union Subscale; RESP = Responsibility to Union Subscale; WILL = Willingness to work for Union Subscale; MARX = Marxist Work Belief Scale; INTROL = Interrole Conflict Scale; INVOL = Union Work Involvement Scale; SAT = Job Satisfaction Scale; MIL = Militancy Scale; NORM = Subjective Norm Scale.

was postively associated with union attitudes, the union commitment subscales (.14 < r < .24), Marxist work beliefs (r= .29), interrole conflict (r = .34), union work involvement (r = .51), militancy (r = .38), and subjective norms (r = .29) and negatively with job satisfaction (r = -.23). Union attitudes were positively related to union commitment subscales (.37 < r < .62), Marxist work beliefs (r = .22), union work involvement (r = .34), militancy (r = .31), and subjective norms (r = .22).

The union commitment subscale of loyalty to the union correlated highly with the other two commitment subscales of responsibility to the union (r = .57) and willingness to work for the union (r = .60), Marxist work beliefs (r = .19), union work involvement (r = .37), militancy (r = .34), and subjective norms (r = .36). Responsibility to the union correlated highly with Willingness to Work for the Union (r = .43), Marxist work beliefs (r = .35), union work involvement (r = .22), militancy (r = .35), and subjective norms (r = .26). Willingness to Work for the Union correlated positively with Marxist work beliefs (r = .18), union work involvement (r = .49), militancy (r = .35), and subjective norms (r = .35). Marxist work beliefs were positively related to union work involvement (r = .27),

militancy (r = .36), and to subjective norms (r = .37). Interrole conflict was positively associated with union work involvement (r = .28). Union work involvement was positively related to militancy (r = .36) and to subjective norms (r = .37). Militancy was negatively related to job satisfaction (r = -.22) and positively to subjective norms.

#### Comparison of Descriptive Variables

Trade union leaders were willing to strike for a longer period of time  $[\chi^2(24)=37.91,\ p<.05,\ \epsilon=.40]$ , had lower formal education  $[\chi^2(5)=19.45,\ p<.01,\ \epsilon=.28]$ , and served less time as stewards  $[\chi^2(19)=39.25,\ p<.01,\ \epsilon=.38]$  than civil service union leaders. On the other hand, civil service union leaders were more likely than trade union leaders to have mothers who belonged to a union  $[\chi^2(2)=9.09,\ p<.05,\ \epsilon=.19]$ , held union office  $[\chi^2(2)=8.76,\ p<.05,\ \epsilon=.18]$ , and striked as a member of the union  $[\chi^2(2)=7.69,\ p<.05,\ \epsilon=.18]$ . Summarization of descriptive variables of trade union leaders and civil service leaders are shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5

Descriptive Variables of Trade Union and Civil Service
Unions

Characteristic	Trade	Civil Service
	%	%
Stewardship Tenure	(N=97)	(N=129)
Less than 5 years	68	43
5 - 10 years	26	36
Greater than 10 years	6	21
Hours Spent on		
<u>Union Duties</u>	(N = 107)	(N = 136)
< 2 Hours	58	56
2-4 Hours	18	24
4-6 Hours	9	7
6-8 Hours	6	7
8-10 Hours	4	3
> 10 Hours	5	3
Father Belonging to Union	(N=104)	(N=137)
Yes	40	47
No	51	42
Uncertain	9	11
Father Holding a		
Union Office	(N = 88)	(N = 122)
Yes	1 4	1 2
No	73	79
Uncertain	13	9
Father Strike As		
Member of Union	(N=87)	(N=121)
Yes	25	19
No	56	65
Uncertain	19	16
Mother Belonging		
to Union	(N = 105)	(N=135)
Yes	14	27
No	76	70
Uncertain	10	3

TABLE 5

Characteristic	Trade %	Civil Service
Mother Holding		
Union Office	(N=88)	(N = 121)
Yes	` 0	. 5 ·
No	93	93
Uncertain	7	2
Mother Strike As		
Member of Union	(N≃76)	(N≈134)
Yes	1	4
No	87	93
Uncertain	1 2	3
Number of Days		
Willing to Strike	(N=80)	(N=97)
0 Days	12	15
1 - 30 Days	4 4	45
31-180 Days	14	11
181-364 Days	1	11
365 Days (Or as long as it takes)	29	18

Executives were willing to strike for a longer period of time  $[\chi^2(24)=36.90,\ p<.05,\ \epsilon=.43]$ , spent more hours per week  $[\chi^2(5)=63.48,\ p<.001,\ \epsilon=.50]$ , and a greater percentage of their time each week  $[\chi^2(9)=65.00,\ p<.001,\ \epsilon=.50]$ . Union executives were more likely than stewards to have a mother who belonged to a union  $[\chi^2(2)=5.95,\ p=.05,\ \epsilon=.14]$  and less likely to have a mother who striked as a union member  $[\chi^2(2)=6.68,\ p<.05,\ \epsilon=.16]$ . Summarization of descriptive variables of union stewards and executives is shown in Table 6.

#### MANOVA

A 2 X 2 between-subjects multivariate analysis was performed on fourteen dependent variables: industrial relations stress, need for involvement, leadership assessment, willingness to engage in unconventional behaviour, pro-union attitudes, villingness to work for the union, responsibility to the union, loyalty to the union, Marxist work beliefs, inter-role conflict, union work involvement, job satisfaction, militancy, and subjective norms. Independent variables were type of union (Trade vs. Civil Service) and union leadership position (Stewards vs. Executives).

TABLE 6
Descriptive Variables of Stewards and Executives

Characteristic	Stewards	Executives
	%	%
Stewardship Tenure	(N=153)	(N=73)
Less than 5 years	57	48
5-10 years	31	33
Greater than 10 years	12	19
Hours Spent on		
Union Duties	(N=161)	(N=82)
< 2 Hours	72	27
2-4 Hours	19	26
4-6 Hours	4	20
6-8 Hours	4	12
8-10 Hours	0	8
> 10 Hours	1	7
Father Belonging to Union	(N=160)	(N=81)
Yes	42	48
No	47	43
Uncertain	11	9
Father Holding a		
Union Office	(N = 136)	(N=74)
Yes	12	15
No	77	76
Uncertain	11	9
Father Strike As		
Member of Union	(N=135)	(N = 73)
Yes	20	25
No	62	60
Uncertain	18	1 5
Mother Belonging		
to Union	(N=160)	( N = 8 0 )
Yes	20	24
No	71	75
Uncertain	9	1

TABLE 6 (CON'T)

Characteristic	Stewards %	Executives %
Mother Holding		
Union Office	(N = 133)	(N=76)
Yes	2	4
No	92	95
Uncertain	6	1
Mother Strike As		
Member of Union	(N=134)	(N = 76)
Yes	5	4
No ·	83	93
Uncertain	12	3
Number of Days		
Willing to Strike	(N=120)	(N=57)
0 Days	18	` 5 ·
1 - 30 Days	5 1	47
31-180 Days	12	14
181-364 Days	0	2
365 Days (Or as long as it takes)	19	32

SPSS MANOVA was used for the analyses with the sequential adjustment for nonorthogonality. Order of entry of IVs was union position, then type of union. The total N of 248 was reduced to 226 due to missing data. There were no univariate or multivariate within cell outliers at  $\alpha$  = .001. Assumptions of normality, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, linearity, and multicollinearity were satisfied. Within cell correlations and standard deviations are reported in Table 7.

With the use of Wilks' criterion, the combined DVs were significantly affected by leader position,  $\underline{F}(14, 209) = 3.28$ ,  $\underline{p} < .001$ . However type of union ,  $\underline{F}(14, 209) = 1.45$ ,  $\underline{p} > .05$ , and the interaction of leader and union,  $\underline{F}(14, 209) = .79$ ,  $\underline{p} > .05$  did not significantly influence the DVs. The results reflected a moderate association between union position and the combined DVs  $\varepsilon^2 = .18$ . The association was less substantial between type of union and the DVs,  $\varepsilon^2 = .09$ 

TABLE 7
Within Cell Correlations with Standard Deviations on Diagonal

Varia	ables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	IR	19,40						
2.	UNATT	05	4.78					
3.	LEAD	.03	.18	3.61				
4.	LINCON	.22	.09	.27	7.11			
5.	MARX	.26	.23	.17	.28	5.89		
6.	MIL	.12	.28	.21	.34	.26	6.17	
7.	NEED	04	.41	.36	.18	.22	.26	4.11
8.	LOYAL	02	.61	.20	.13	.18	.31	.42
9,	RESP	.15	.36	.18	.12	.38	.18	.32
10.	WILL	.00	.37	.26	.19	.18	.34	.35
11.	INTROL	.08	03	.10	.27	.04	.01	.02
12.	INVOL	0 <b>2</b>	.34	.40	.49	.28	.36	.43
13.	SAT	33	.02	02	25	31	23	04
14.	NORM	09	.24	.39	.24	.27	.22	.31

IR = Ind \_trial Relations Stress Scale; NEED = Need for Involvement Scale; LEAD = \_ Leadership Assessment Scale; UNCON = Willingness to Engage in Unconventional Behaviour Scale; UNATT = Union Attitude Scale; LOYAL = Loyalty to Union Subscale; RESP = Responsibility to Union Subscale; WILL = Willingness to work for Union Subscale; MARX = Marxist Work Belief Scale; INTROL = Interrole Conflict Scale; INVOL = Union Work Involvement Scale; SAT = Job Satisfaction Scale; MIL = Militancy Scale; NORM = Subjective Norm Scale.

TABLE 7 (continued)

Variables		8	910	11	12	13	14	
8.	LOYAL	4.42				-		
9. 1	RESP	.57	2.94					
10.	WILL	.58	.45	2.56				
<b>11.</b>	INTROL	15	09	02	6.02			
12.	NVOL	.32	.21	.41	.21	4.10		
13.	SAT	.02	11	11	11	15	17.73	
14.	NORM	.39	.27	.38	-,07	.39	004	4.20

To investigate the impact of each main effect on the individual DVs, Roy-Bargman stepdown analysis was performed on the prioritized DVs, all DVs were judged to be sufficiently reliable to warrant entry in the stepdown analysis. Each DV was analyzed, in turn, with the higher-priority DVs treated as covariates and with the highest-priority DV tested in a univariate ANOVA. Homogeneity of regression was achieved for all components of the stepdown analysis. Results of this analysis are summarized in Table 8.

After the pattern of differences measured by industrial relations stress, union attitudes, and rank-and-file leadership perceptions was entered, differences were found between leaders of the Civil Service Union and Trade Union in willingness to engage in unconventional behaviour, (stepdown  $\underline{F}(1, 219) = 3.97$ ,  $\underline{p} < .05$ ). Trade Union leaders (adjusted mean = 25.39) reported higher willingness to engage in unconventional behaviour than Civil Service Union leaders (adjusted mean = 23.36). In addition, Trade Union leaders (adjusted mean = 25.93) scored higher on the need for involvement scale than Civil Service Union leaders (adjusted mean = 24.79); stepdown  $\underline{F}(1, 215) = 3.88$ ,  $\underline{p} = .05$ ).

TABLE 8

Tests Of Type Of Union, Union Position, And Their Interaction On Dependent Variables

		Univa	ariate	Step		
IV	DV	F	d f	F	df 	Prob.
Туре	IR	1.32	1/222	1.32	1/222	.25
of	UNATT	.02	1/222	.01	1/221	.92
Union	LEAD	1.74	1/222	1.81	1/220	.18
(Trade	UNCON	3.98	1/222	3.97	1/219	.047
vs	MARX	.16	1/222	.02	1/218	.88
Civil	MILIT	.50	1/222	2.17	1/217	.14
Service)	NEED	5.24	1/222	3.97	1/216	.048
	LOYAL	.93	1/222	.43	1/215	.51
	RESP	2.12	1/222	1.06	1/214	.30
	WILL	2.59	1/222	.75	1/213	.39
	INTRO	.17	1/222	.89	1/212	.35
	INVOL	.77	1/222	.76	1/211	.38
	SAT	3.04	1/222	2.77	1/210	.10
	NORM	3.20	1/222	.23	1/209	.63
Union	IR	.55	1/222	.55	1/222	.46
Pos'n	UNATT	2.55	1/222	2.43	1/221	.12
(Exec	LEAD	7.65	1/222	6.33	1/220	.01
vs	UNCON	6.08	1/222	3.59	1/219	.06
Stew)	MARX	1.56	1/222	.19	1/218	.66
	MILIT	4.52	1/222	.77	1/217	.38
	NEED	8.20	1/222	1.77	1/216	.18
	LOYAL	5.14	1/222	.64	1/215	.42
	RESP	.01	1/222	2.76	1/214	.10
	WILL	18.01	1/222	9.13	1/213	.003
	INTROL	5.63	1/222	10.86	1/212	.001
	INVOL	24.96	1/222	3.24	1/211	.07
	SAT	.02	1/222			.34
	NORM	7.61	1/222		1/209	.68

TABLE 8 (CON'T)

		Univa	ariate	Step	***************************************	
IV	DV	F	df	F	<b>d</b> f	Prob.
Туре	IR	.09	1/222	,09	1/222	.76
of	UNATT	.13	1/222	.12	1/221	.73
Union	LEAD	.04	1/222	.03	1/220	.87
by	UNCON	.07	1/222	.09	1/219	.77
Union	MARX	.03	1/222	.03	1/218	.86
Pos'n	MILIT	.03	1/222	.04	1/217	.83
	NEED	.16	1/222	.06	1/216	.80
	LOYAL	.55	1/222	1.74	1/215	.19
	RESP	1.97	1/222	1.47	1/214	.23
	WILL	.52	1/222	2.20	1/213	.14
	INTROL	.32	1/222	.10	1/212	.75
	INVOL	2.90	1/222	3.14	1/211	.08
	SATIS	.42	1/222	.68	1/210	.41
	NORM	.61	1/222	1.25	1/209	.26

IR = Industrial Relations Stress Scale, UNATT = Union Attitude Scale, LEAD = Leadership Assessment Scale, UNCON = Unconventional Behaviour Scale, MARX = Marxist Work Belief Scale, MILIT = Militancy Scale, NEED = Need for Involvement Scale, LOYAL = Union Loyalty Subscale, RESP = Responsibility to Union Subscale, WILL = Willingness to Work for Union Subscale, INTROL = Interrole Conflict Scale, INVOL = Union Work Involvement Scale, SATIS = Job Satisfaction Scale, and NORM = Subjective Norms Scale.

Note: F values > 3.89, p < .05, in univariate analyses. F values > 6.76, p < .01, in univariate analyses.

Three dependent variables-transformational leadership perceptions, willingness to work for the union, and interrole conflict, made significant contributions to the composite dependent variable that best distinguished between union stewards and union executives. The greatest contribution was made by interrole conflict (stepdown E(1, 212) = 10.86, p = .001). Union executives reported higher levels of interrole conflict (adjusted mean = 20.47) than union stewards (adjusted mean = 17.58). Union executives also expressed higher willingness to work for for the union (adjusted mean = 12.43) for the union than union stewards, (adjusted mean = 11.50; stepdown F(1, 213) = 9.13, p < .01). Finally, union executives believed rank-and-file members' held more positive views of them as union leaders (adjusted mean = 21.14) than did the union stewards (adjusted mean = 19.85; stepdown E(1, 221) = 6.33, p =.01). Univariate analyses revealed that union executives were more willing to engage in unconventional work behaviour ( $\underline{F}(1, 222) = 6.08$ , p = .01), more militant (E(1, 222) = 4.52, p < .05), and had a higher need for union involvement (E(1, 222) = 8.20, p < .01) than union stewards. Univariate analyses also revealed that union stewards were lower in union loyalty (E(1, 222) = 5.14, p < .05) and subjective norms ( $\underline{F}(1, 222) = 7.61$ ,  $\underline{p} < .01$ ) than union executives. Neither the

univariate or stepdown analyses revealed a significant interaction between union and union position; none of the dependent measures contributed significantly to the composite interaction effect.

Finally, the union commitment of stewards was compared to archival data of rank-and-file members for the same union. Union stewards showed more loyalty to the union  $\underline{t}(1045) = -11.79$ ,  $\underline{p} < .001$ , more responsibility to the union,  $\underline{t}(1057) = -9.69$ ,  $\underline{p} < .001$ , and more willingness to work for the union  $\underline{t}(1070) = -13.06$ ,  $\underline{p} < .001$  than rank-and-file union members.

#### Factor Analysis

The 15-item Reasons for Union Activity Scale was factor analyzed using principal components analysis with varimax rotation. Six factors were extracted. Communality values tended to be low. Using a criteria of .55 for inclusion of an item in a factor, 14 of the 15 items loaded on the six factors.

Factor loadings, communalities, and percents of variance are shown in Table 9. Variables are ordered and grouped by size of loading to facilitate interpretation. Loadings under .55 (30% of variance) are replaced by zeros. Interpretive labels are provided for each factor; these are voice, victim, reluctant, social, ambition, and social/ambition.

Union leaders were classified as "types" of leaders based on the following criteria. Responses to items on the Union Activity Scale were coded, assigning a value of 1 to "No", a value of 2 to "Uncertain", and a value of 3 to "Yes" responses. Mean scores in each factor were calculated for each leader. Leaders were classified according to the highest mean factor score. For example, leaders were classified as "Victim" leaders if the mean for the "Victim" factor exceeded the mean calculated for any of the other factors. Of

TABLE 9
Factor Loadings, Communalities, Percents of Variance for Principal Factors Extraction and Varimax Rotation on Union Activity Items

Items		1 Factor 2 (Victim)		Factor 4 (Social)	Factor 5 (Ambit)	Factor 6 (Soc/Amb)	Commun
Wanted say in how union was run.	.83	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.72
Wanted say in how workplace was run.	.77	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.68
Victimized by management.	.00	.83	.00	.00	.00	.00	.71
Personal issue to settle with mngmt.	.00	.83	.00	.00	.00	.00	.71
Pressure from union leaders.	.00	.00	.79	.00	.00	.00	.71
Pressure from coworkers.	.00	.00	.66	.00	.00	.00	.51
Nobody else would take job.	.00	.0 <b>0</b>	.51	.00	.00	.00	.48
Believed in principles of unionism.	.00	.00	.00	.70	.00	.00	,59
Wanted to help fellow workers.	.00	.00	.00	.65	.00	.00	.46
Had friends who were active in the union.	e .00	.00	.00	.58	.00	.00	.54
Wanted to get ahead in company.	.00	.00	.00	۰۵۵،	.75	.00	,60
Could do better job than incumbent.	.00	.00	.00	،00	.68	.00	.65
Family members wer active in union.	e .00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.72	.54
Wanted leadership role in union.	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.53	.55
Wanted to protect job rights.	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.47
Percent of var.	10.00	12.40	36.50	18.40	12.90	7.10	

the 248 respondents, 30 were classified as "Victim" leaders, 29 were classified as "Reluctant" leaders, and 149 were classified as "Voice" leaders. The remaining 28 leaders were distributed among the the remaining three groups in numbers ranging from 5 to 13. Because of the small sizes and a similarity in the three factors (Social, Ambition, Social/Ambition), these three factors were combined into a Social/Ambition category for further analytical purposes. Demographic characteristics of the different "types" of leaders are shown in Table 10. As can be seen, the number of "Voice" leaders far exceeded the other three types of union leaders.

# Analysis of Descriptive Dependent Variables between Type of Union Leader

"Types" of union leaders were compared with respect to descriptive variables (i.e., father/mother belonging to the union). The only difference between these "types" of union leaders was that "voice" and "reluctant" leaders were more likely than "victim" and "social/ambitious" leaders to have a father who held a union office  $[\chi^2(6) = 13.47, \, p < .05, \, \epsilon = .14)$ . Summarization of descriptive variables of the different types of union leaders is shown in Table 11.

TABLE 10

Demographic Characteristics of Victim, Reluctant,
Social/Ambitious, and Voice Leaders

Characteristic	Victim %	Reluctant %	Soc/Amb %	Voice %
Sex	(N = 30)	(N = 28)	(N=28)	(N=146)
Male	77	68	54	61
Female	23	32	46	39
Age	(N = 30)	(N = 26)	(N = 28)	(N=142)
<=24	0	0	4	1
25-34	37	15	18	22
35-44	37	5 <b>0</b>	5 0	46
45-54	26	27	21	25
55-60	0	8	7	6
Marital Status	(N = 30)	(N = 26)	(N = 28)	(N=145)
Single	7	19	14	9
Married	70	62	71	72
Separated/Divorce	10	19	11	12
Common Law	13	0	0	5
Widowed	0	0	4	2
# of Dependents	(N = 30)	(N = 28)	(N = 28)	(N = 146)
None	<b>3</b> 3	43	25	25
One	23	1 4	11	23
Two	27	25	43	37
Three	13	14	18	9
Four	4	4	0	5
>Four	0	0	3	1
Education	(N=30)	(N=28)	(N = 28)	(N=145
< Grade 12	10	18	12	13
Grade 12/Voc School	30	29	21	39
Some College/Univer	33	36	46	23
University Degree	10	1 4	14	17
Post-Grad Study	10	3	7	4
Post-Grad Degree	7	0	0	4
Stewardship Tenu	<u>ire (N=27)</u>	(N=24)	(N=27)	(N=137
Less Than 5 years	48	29	67	58
5-10 years	37	5 8	26	28
Greater than 10 year		13	7	14
Executive Tenure	(N=10)	(N=7)	( N = 1 0 )	(N = 54)
Less Than 5 Years	50	70	70	61
5-10 years	40	Ô	20	22
Greater than 10 year		30	10	17

TABLE 11

Descriptive Characteristics of Victim, Reluctant, Social/Ambitious, and Voice Leaders

Characteristic	Victim %	Reluct %	Soc/Amb %	Voice %
Hours Spent on				
Union Duties	(N = 29)	(N=28)	(N = 28)	(N=147)
< 2 Hours	48	60	64	55
2-4 Hours	24	17	4	24
4-6 Hours	10	11	14	8
6-8 Hours	10	4	4	8
8-10 Hours	4	4	7	2
> 10 Hours	4	4	7	2
Father Belonging				
to Union	(N = 30)	(N = 28)	(N = 28)	(N≈143)
Yes	` 43 ′	` 54	61	41
No	47	36	29	51
Uncertain	10	10	10	8
Father Holding				
a Union Office	(N = 28)	(N=26)	(N = 24)	(N=123)
Yes	7	19	4	13
No	93	77	75	76
Uncertain	0	4	21	11
Father Strike As				
<u>Member of Union</u>	(N=28)	(N = 25)	(N = 24)	(N = 123)
Yes	1 4	32	21	21
No	82	56	58	59
Uncertain	4	12	21	20
Mother Belonging				
<u>to Union</u>	(N = 30)	(N = 28)	(N=28)	(N=143
Yes	27	21	25	21
No	70	68	71	74
Uncertain	3		4	5
Mother Holding				
Union Office	(N=29)	(N=26)	(N = 25)	(N = 120)
Yes	3	4	Ö	3
No	93	92	96	93
Uncertain	4	4	4	4

TABLE 11 (CON'T)

Characteristic	Victim %	Reluct %	Soc/Amb %	Voice %
Mother Strike As		Mile address delegal design trape Calaba April 2 andre 1447 8 andre service		nak dina sa di wasa sang ang pang bina i sa dina
Member of Union	(N = 29)	(N = 26)	(N=25)	(N = 121
Yes	3	8	0	6
No	90	85	96	85
Uncertain	7	7	4	9
Number of Days				
Willing to Strike	(N = 25)	(N = 20)	(N = 18)	(N = 108)
0 Days	12	25	22	11
1-30 Days	56	4 5	50	48
31-180 Days	12	20	22	11
OTTOO Days		•	0	4
•	0	0	v	
181-364 Days 365 Days	0 20	10	6	29

## MANCOVA between Types of Union Leaders

A multivariate analysis of variance was performed on 14 dependent variables: industrial relations stress, union attitudes, leadership assessments, unconventional work behaviour, Marxist work beliefs, militancy, need for involvement, union loyalty, responsibility to the union, willing sess to work for the union, interrole conflict, union work involvement, job satisfaction, and subjective norms. The independent variable was the different types of union leader (victim, reluctant, social/ambitious, and voice). Leader position was included as a covariant to control for the variance associated with this variable since the first analysis showed that it was a significant factor.

SPSS\* MANOVA was used for the analyses with sequential adjustment for nonorthogonality. Order of entry of IVs was union position, then type of leader. Total Cof 248 was reduced to 215 due to missing data. There were no univariate or multivariate withincell outliers at  $\alpha = .001$ . Results of evaluation of assumptions of normality, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, linearity, and multicollinearity were satisfactory. Within cell correlations and standard deviations are shown in Table 12.

TABLE 12
Within Cell Correlations with Standard Deviations on Diagonal

/ariables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
. IR	18.93				<del></del>		
2. UNATT	04	4.69					
B. LEAD	04	.18	3.53				
t. UNCON	.18	.08	.26	7.00			
5. MARX	.21	.22	.11	.23	5.69		
6. MIL	.09	.31	.21	.28	.22	6.08	
7. NEED	07	.41	.38	.21	.22	.29	4.14
B. LOYAL	.01	62	23	08	20	26	47
. RESP	09	36	13	08	33	13	32
o. WILL	.02	41	26	15	18	31	41
1. INTROL	.05	03	.07	.29	.02	.02	.01
12. INVOL	06	.32	.38	.53	.25	.39	.45
13. SAT	29	.03	.07	22	23	22	01،
14. NORM	06	.20	.41	.24	.30	.23	.35

IR = Industrial Relations Stress Scale; NEED = Need Involvement Scale;

LEAD = Transformational Leadership Assessment Scale;

UNCON = Willingness to Engage In Unconventional Behaviour Scale; UNATT = Union Attitude Scale; LOYAL = Loyalty to Union Subscale; RESP = Responsibility to Union Subscale; WILL = Willingness to work for Union Subscale; MARX = Marxist Work Belief Scale; INTROL = Interrole Conflict Scale; INVOL = Union Work Involvement Scale; SAT = Job Satisfaction Scale; MIL = Militancy Scale; NORM = Subjective Norm Scale.

TABLE 12 (continued)

Variables	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
8. LOYAL	4.28						
9. RESP	.59	2.86					
10. WILL	.65	.49	2.54				
11. INTROL	.13	.10	.06	6.06			
12. INVOL	35	22	43	.22	4.04		
13. SAT	.00	.11	.12	12	08	16.69	
14. NORM	37	30	39	11	.39	05	4.16

With the use of Wilks' criterion, the combined DVs were significantly affected by type of leader, E(42, 576) = 2.12, p < .001. The results reflected a moderate association between type of leaders and combined DVs,  $\eta^2 = .34$ . To investigate the impact of each main effect on the individual DVs, a stepdown analysis was performed on prioritized DVs. Results of this analysis are summarized in Table 13. An experimentwise error rate of 5 percent was achieved by the apportionment of alpha as shown in the last column of Table 13 for each of the DVs.

Five DVs-Industrial relations stress, union attitudes, transformational leadership assessments, Marxist work beliefs and job satisfaction-made significant contributions to the composite DV that best distinguished between "types" of union leaders. The greatest contribution was made by job satisfaction, adjusted by industrial relations stress, union attitudes, transformational leadership perceptions, unconventional work behaviour, Marxist work beliefs, militancy, need for involvement, union loyalty, responsibility to the union, willingness to work for the union,

TABLE 13

Results of MANCOVA on Different Types of Leaders (while controlling for Union Position Effects)

		Univaria	ate	Step		
17	DV	F	df	F	df	Prob.
Туре	IR	3.23	3/210	3.23	3/210	.02
of	UNATT	3.03	3/210	3.10	3/209	.03
Leader	LEAD	4.32	3/210	3.83	3/208	.01
	UNCON	1.89	3/210	.66	3/207	.58
	MARX	6.73	3/210	4.57	3/206	.004
	MILIT	1.10	3/210	.83	3/205	.48
	NEED	2.89	3/210	2.62	3/204	.05
	LOYAL	2.57	3/210	2.21	3/203	.09
	RESP	2.40	3/210	.34	3/202	.80
	ILL	1.28	3/210	.98	3/201	.40
	INTROL	1.20	3/210	.60	3/200	.62
	INVOL	1.63	3/210	.16	3/199	.92
	SAT	8.77	3/210	4.94	3/198	.002
	NORM	.45	3/210	1.29	3/197	.28

Note: F values > 3.89, p < .05, in univariate analyses.

F values > 6.76, p < .01, in univariate analyses.

IR = Industrial Relations Stress Scale, UNATT = Union Attitude Scale, LEAD = Transformational Leadership Assessment Scale, UNCON = Unconventional Behaviour Scale, MARX = Marxist Work Belief Scale, INTROL = Interrole Conflict Scale, MILIT = Militancy Scale, NEED = Need Involvement Scale, LOYAL = Union Loyalty Subscale, RESP = Responsibility to Union Subscale, WILL = Willingness to Work for Union Subscale, INVOL = Union Work Involvement Scale, SATIS = Job Satisfaction Scale, and NORM = Subjective Norm Scale.

interrole conflict, and union work involvement, [Stepdown E(3, 198) = 5.53, p < .01. Union leaders that became leaders for reluctant reasons indicated higher job satisfaction (adjusted mean = 69.89) than "victim" leaders (adjusted mean = 53.52), "social/ambitlous" leaders (adjusted mean = 61.13), and "voice" leaders (adjusted mean = 60.17). Industrial relations stress made a significant contribution to the composite IV [Stepdown E(3, 210) =3.23, p < .05]. Reluctant leaders reported lower levels of industrial relations stress (adjusted mean = -1.08) than victim (adjusted mean = -16.76), social/ambitious (adj. mean = -9.79), and voice leaders (adj. mean = -8.06). The different types of union leaders also differed in pro-union attitudes [ Stepdown E = 3.10, p < .05]. Social/ambitious leaders reported higher pro-union attitudes (adj. mean = 37.91) than victim (adi. mean = 34.93), reluctant (adi. mean = 34.06), or voice leaders (adj. mean = 35.74). Victim leaders rated themselves higher as transformational leaders (adj. mean = 21.71) than rejuctant (adj. mean = 18.42), social/ambitious (adj. mean = 20.52), or voice leaders [adj. mean = 20.46; stepdown F(3, 208) =3.83, p < .05]. Finally, Marxist work beliefs made a unique contribution to the composite IV [Stepdown E(3, 206) = 4.57, p < .01. "Victim" leaders reported higher values on the Marxist work belief

scale (adjusted mean = 39.63) than "reluctant" leaders (adjusted mean = 34.87), "social/ambitous" leaders (mean = 35.26), and "voice" leaders (mean = 37.32). Univariate analysis indicated that need for involvement significantly contributed to the composite DV [E(3, 210) = 2.89, p < .05], however this difference was not significant when the differences by higher-priority DVs were represented.

## Post Hoc Analyses

In order to determine the differences of the various types of union leaders on the fourteen dependent variables, post hoc comparisons were conducted. Comparisons consisted of comparing each of the "type" of union leader with the other three types (i.e., Victim leaders versus the other three types, reluctant leaders versus the three other types, etc.). Again, the effects due to union position were controlled.

With the use of Wilks' criterion, Victim leaders differed from the other three types of leaders on multivariate composite [E(14, 197) = 3.10, p < .001]. Reluctant leaders also differed from the the other leaders [E(14, 197) = 3.11, p < .001]. However,

social/ambitious leaders did not differ from the other leaders [E(14, 197) = 1.06, p > .05], nor did voice leaders did from other leaders [E(14, 197) = 1.59, p > .05] on the composite.

Stepdown analyses were performed on prioritized DVs; all DVs were judged to be sufficiently reliable to warrant stepdown analysis. Results of these analyses are summarized in Table 14. An experimentwise error rate of 5 percent was achieved by the apportionment of alpha as shown in the last column of Table 14 for each of the DVs.

After controlling for union position, victim union leaders reported higher industrial relations stress (adjusted mean = -16.77) than the other leaders [adjusted mean = -7.30; stepdown E(1, 210) = 6.95, p < .01]. Victim leaders had higher views of themselves as transformational leaders (adjusted mean = 21.71) than the other "types" of union leaders [adjusted mean = 20.18; stepdown E(1, 208) = 6.37, p = .01]. Victim leaders also significantly differed from the other leaders in Marxist work, after variance attributable to industrial relations stress, union attitudes, leadership perceptions,

TABLE 14 Post Hoc Comparisons of Different Types of Union Leaders

		Univa	ariate	Stepd	own	
COMPAR	ISON	F	df	F	df	Prob.
Victim	IR	6.95	1/210	6.95	1/210	.009
vs	UNATT	1.21	1/210	.88	1/209	.35
Other	LEAD	5.39	1/210	6.37	1/208	.01
	UNCON	4.82	1/210	1.34	1/207	.25
	MARX	15.97	1/210	11.37	1/206	.001
	MILIT	2.02	1/210	.26	1/205	.61
	NEED	.02	1/210	.94	1/204	.33
	LOYAL	.61	1/210	.27	1/203	.61
	RESP	.99	1/210	.16	1/202	.69
	WILL	.00	1/210	.12	1/201	.73
	INTROL	1.10	1/210	.11	1/200	.74
	INVOL	1.13	1/210	.003	1/199	.95
	SAT	20.11	1/210	9.08	1/198	.003
	NORM	.12	1/210	3.53	1/197	.06
Reluc	IR	6.25	1/210	6.25	1/210	.01
vs.	UNATT	3.90	1/210	4.34	1/209	.04
Other	LEAD	11.96	1/210	9.57	1/208	.002
	UNCON	2.14	1/210	.00	1/207	.99
	MARX	11.14	1/210	4.43	1/206	.04
	MILIT	.52	1/210	.71	1/205	.40
	NEED	4.25	1/210	.10	1/204	.76
	LOYAL	1.51	1/210	.29	1/203	.59
	RESP	6.43	1/210	.98	1/202	.32
	WILL	3.15	1/210	.41	1/201	.52
	INTROL	1.45	1/210	.63	1/200	.43
	INVOL	4.82	1/210	.24	1/199	.63
	SAT	16.63	1/210	11.81	1/198	.001
	NORM	.54	1/210	1.73	1/197	.19

Note: F values > 3.89, p < .05 in univariate analyses. F values > 6.76, p < .01 in univariate analyses.

TABLE 14 (CON'T)

		Univ	ariate	Stepo	down	
COMPAR	ISON	F	df	F	df	Prob.
Social/	IR	.07	1/210	.07	1/210	.79
Ambit	UNATT	8.01	1/210	8.08	1/209	.005
VS	LEAD	.79	1/210	.15	1/208	.69
Others	UNCON	.01	1/210	.31	1/207	.58
	MARX	.85	1/210	2.76	1/206	.10
	MILIT	.02	1/210	.28	1/205	.60
	NEED	.34	1/210	.21	1/204	.65
	LOYAL	7.34	1/210	2.09	1/203	.15
	RESP	2.85	1/210	.34	1/202	.56
	WILL	1.73	1/210	.01	1/201	.93
	INTROL	.43	1/210	.09	1/200	.77
	INVOL	.92	1/210	.41	1/199	.52
	SAT	.20	1/210	.00	1/198	.96
	NORM	1.27	1/210	.41	1/197	.53
Voice	IR	.18	1/210	.18	1/210	.67
٧S	UNATT	.03	1/210	.02	1/209	.88
Others	LEAD	.28	1/210	.25	1/208	.62
	UNCON	.60	1/210	. <b>7</b> 7	1/207	.38
	MARX	.58	1/210	.93	1/206	.34
	MILIT	1.49	1/210	1.69	1/205	.20
	NEED	6.04	1/210	7.50	1/204	.007
	LOYAL	1.57	1/210	5.60	1/203	.019
	RESP	.05	1/210	.00	1/202	.96
	WILL	.50	1/210	2.80	1/201	.10
	INTROL	1.83	1/210	1.44	1/200	.23
	INVOL	.10	1/210	.02	1/199	.89
	SATIS	.20	1/210	.69	1/198	.41
	NORM	.02	1/210	.07	1/197	.80

IR = I/R Stress Scale, UNATT = Union Attitude Scale, LEAD = Charismatic Lead., UNCON = Unconventional Behaviour, MARX = Marxist Work Belief, MILIT = Militancy, NEED = Need for Involvement, LOYAL = Union Loyalty, RESP = Responsibility to Union, WILL = Willingness to Work for Union, INTROL = Interrole Conflict, INVOL = Union Work Involvement, SATIS = Job Satisfaction NORM = Subjective Norms.

and unconventional work behaviour was removed [stepdown E(1, 206)] = 11.37, p = .001]. Victim leaders reported higher levels of Marxist work beliefs (adjusted mean = 39.63 vs. 36.71). Finally, after variance for the first 12 dependent variables (industrial relations stress to union work involvement) was removed, victim leaders reported lower job satisfaction (adjusted mean = 53.84) than the other leaders [adjusted mean = 61.66; stepdown E(1, 198) = 9.08, p < .01]. Univariate analyses showed that victim leaders were more likely to engage in unconventional leadership behaviour (E(1, 210) = 4.82, p < .05). However this difference was not significant when differences attributable to higher-order DVs were taken into account.

Five dependent variables-industrial relations stress, prounion attitudes, transformational leadership assessment, Marxist work beliefs, and job satisfaction-made significant contributions to the composite dependent variable that best distinguished reluctant leaders from other leaders. The greatest contribution was made by job satisfaction [Stepdown F(1, 198) = 11.81, p = .001]. Reluctant leaders had higher job satisfaction (adjusted mean = 70.48) than other leaders (adjusted mean = 59.20). Reluctant leaders also reported lower levels of industrial relations stress (adjusted mean = -1.08) than other union leaders [adjusted mean = -9.66; Stepdown E(1, 210) = 6.25; g = .01]. Reluctant leaders reported lower prounion attitudes (adjusted mean = 34.06), after controlling for union position and industrial relations stress, than other leaders [adjusted mean = 36.31; stepdown E(1, 209) = 6.82, g < .05). Differences were also found between reluctant and other leaders in their assessments themselves as transformational leaders [Stepdown E(1, 208) = 9.57, g < .01]. Reluctant leaders had lower views of themselves as transformational leaders (adjusted mean = 18.42) than other leaders (adjusted mean = 20.67). Finally, reluctant leaders reported lower Marxist work beliefs (adjusted mean = 34.87) than other leaders [adjusted mean = 37.43; Stepdown E(1, 206) = 4.43, g < .05].

Univariate analyses also revealed that reluctant leaders had reported less need for involvement, less responsibility to the union, and less union work involvement than other leaders. However, these differences were not significant in the stepdown analyses, when variance attributable to higher-priority dependent variables was accounted for.

Although differences in the dependent variables between social/ambitious and other leaders did significantly contribute to the composite, results of the stepdown analyses indicated that social/ambitious leaders had higher pro-union attitudes (adjusted mean = 37.11) than other union leaders [adjusted mean = 35.38; Stepdown E(1, 209) = 8.08, p < .01]. Univariate analyses also revealed than social/ambitious leaders reported higher loyalty to the union than other leaders. However, when variance attributable to higher-priority dependent measures was accounted for, this difference was not significant.

Stepdown analyses also revealed that, despite no composite difference between voice leaders and other leaders, voice leaders differed from other leaders in two dependent variables. Voice leaders reported a higher need for involvement (adjusted mean = 25.94) than other union leaders [adjusted mean = 24.55; Stepdown E(1, 204) = 7.50, g < .01]. In addition, voice leaders reported lower in loyalty to the union (adjusted mean = 23.98) than other union leaders [adjusted mean = 25.09; Stepdown E(1, 203) = 5.60, g < .05].

#### Discussion

The present study found that stewards and executive within the same union differ with respect to several variables. Whether the stewards and executives belonged to local bargaining units which had the right to strike under the Trade Union Act or were governed by a Civil Service Act which prohibited strike action made no difference with respect to the study variables. Exploratory analyses indicated overall differences based on the reasons the union leaders who became involved in union activities. These findings are discussed in detail below, organized around the hypotheses that were considered.

# Hypothesis Ia. - Stress Variables

Hypothesis la proposed that given the difference in their duties and responsibilities union executive members would experience higher levels of stress and role conflict than union stewards. This hypothesis was partial supported. Union executive members spent more time performing union-related duties; consequently, they reported more role conflict between family and union work than did stewards. However, stewards and executives did not differ in industrial relations stress. Union leaders often experience stress due to role conflict, role ambiguity, and role

overload (Bluen & Barling, 1988; Bluen & Edelstein, 1993; Fried & Tiegs, 1993; Kelloway et al., 1993; Martin & Berthiaume, 1993; Nandram & Klandermans, 1993; Shirom & Mayer, 1993). The present study confirms that being a union leader is stressful, and goes on to show that it is equally stressful regardless of the level of leadership. Union executives, however, do spend more time on unionrelated duties than union stewards and report more conflicts with their family responsibilities. Therefore, it is not the stress from industrial relations that increases with the level of leadership but the stress experienced by performing more union-related tasks which conflict with family responsibilities. This role conflict could reduce the interest of members, particularly females, in union executive positions. Family responsibilities discourage union participation; often, family responsibilities fall disportionately on women (Barling, 1990). Unions might attract more interest in executive positions by attempting to reduce the conflict between family and union responsibilities by increasing the number of executive positions to reduce the workload of each member, by holding family workshops for leaders and their families as a means of coping with stress, and by reducing as much as possible the time

spent away from family. In addition, unions have a responsibility to educate those members interested in leadership positions about the stress associated with leadership positions and to help leaders deal with the effects of that stress.

#### Hypothesis Ib

Hypothesis Ib proposed that, given the difference in the nature of trade and civil service unions, civil service union leaders would report higher levels of stress and role conflict than trade union leaders. This hypothesis was not supported. Leaders from civil service and trade unions experienced similar levels of stress and conflict between their families and union work. Whether a union has the right to strike does not appear to influence the level of stress experienced by the union leader. However, the exercise of the right-to-strike by the trade union leader may bring with it increased stress and role conflict. This remains to be determined by examining union leaders while their union is on strike.

#### Hypothesis IIa)i - Attitudinal Variables

Hypothesis IIa)i predicted that union executives would spend more time on union duties than union stewards. In addition, they

were expected to have stronger need for involvement, union attitudes, union commitment, Marxist work beliefs, union work involvement, subjective norms and less job satisfaction than union As expected, union executives spent more hours per stewards. week performing union-related duties than did union stewards. difference is understandable since union executives often performed their executive duties in addition to stewardship duties. What is surprising, however, is that stewards and executives did not differ in need for involvement, union attitudes, Marxist work beliefs, union loyalty, responsibility to the union, union work involvement, subjective norms, and job satisfaction despite previous research suggesting otherwise (Barling et al., 1991; Brett, 1980; Fishbein & Ajzen; 1975; Kanungo, 1979; Nicholson et al., 1981). These rariables appear to be constant over different levels of union leadership and may represent a "ceiling effect". For example, those who become involved in union activities may report stronger Marxist work beliefs than those who do not become involved (Fullagar & Barling, 1989); however; differences disappear when viewing levels of union leadership. These variables may influence who becomes involved in union leadership activities but not the degree of involvement in leadership activities.

Few studies have reported a positive association between participation in union activities and job satisfaction (Spinrad, 1970; Strauss, 1977); this was not the case here. Stewards and executives reported the same level of job satisfaction although executives participated more extensively in the union. The extent of participation in union activities does not appear to influence job satisfaction.

Consistent with previous research findings (Fullagar, 1986; Kelloway & Barling, 1993a), union executives did report more willingness to work for the union than union stewards. Willingness to work for the union, but not overall union commitment, varied over union leadership levels. Those members with higher levels of willingness to work for the union are more likely to assume executive union positions, which require a considerable time commitment. This result demonstrates that willingness to work for the union predicts participation at different levels of the union organization and supports Kelloway and Barling's (1993a) position that the different aspects of union commitment are differentially related to participation in the union.

## Hypothesis IIa)ii

Hypothesis IIa)ii predicted that union stewards would report more union commitment, that is union loyalty, responsibility to the union, and willingness to work for the union, than rank-and-file union members of the same union. Union stewards were, in fact, more loyal to the union, more responsible to the union, and more willing to work for the union than rank-and-file members. result, in conjunction with the fact that union executives had a higher willingness to work for the union than stewards, demonstrates that higher levels of union commitment are associated with participation at higher levels of union leadership. These findings both confirm and extend previous research showing that union commitment was associated with participation in union activities (Fields, Masters, & Thacker, 1987; Fullagar, 1986; Gordon et al., 1980). Although the three factors of union commitment predict who becomes involved in union stewardship activities, only willingness to work for the union predicts level of leadership activity within the union. Overall union commitment predicts who initially become union stewards; however, specific facets of union commitment predict the level of leadership position within the union.

## Hypothesis Ilb

Hypothesis IIb asserted that, because of the difference in the nature of their duties, trade union leaders would report spending more time performing union-related duties, and would also report having stronger need for involvement, union attitudes, union commitment, Marxist work beliefs, union work involvement, and subjective norms and less job satisfaction than civil service leaders. Contrary to what was expected, trade and civil service union leaders reported spending the same amount of time on unionrelated duties. Neither did these leaders differ in union attitudes. union commitment, Marxist work beliefs, union work involvement, subjective norms, or job satisfaction. The lack of bargaining rights for a union does not lead to less work for the union leader or to differences in union-related or job attitudes. One difference that did arise was in need for involvement. Trade union leaders had a stronger need to get involved in union activities than did civil service union leaders. An examination of the need for involvement scale items (e.g., "...gives me a chance to express my feelings", "....gives me a say in how workplace is run") suggests that the trade union leaders may feel more satisfied with their union than their civil service counterparts. If this is true, the lower need for involvement among the civil service leaders may reflect

an underlying dissatisfaction with their union and its effectiveness in the workplace. It must be kept in mind, however, that the sources of the need for involvement in union activities are rooted in early socialization (Strauss, 1977). Since more trade union leaders in the present study had mothers who were involved in union activities, the difference in need for involvement may reflect early socialization experiences rather than the nature of the union. Furthermore, the need for involvement may be associated with the need to participate in union and management affairs (Nicholson, 1981). Further examination on differences in the need for involvement between unions is warranted to determine if these differences are due to dissimilarities in bargaining rights or due to differences in other extraneous variables.

# Hypothesis IIIa) - Behavioural Variables

Hypothesis Illa) proposed that union executive members would be more militant, more willing to engage in unconventional work behaviour, and more willing to strike than union stewards. Union executives did report more militancy and willingness to engage in unconventional behaviour; however, when other variables were taken into account, these differences were no longer significant.

Nonethelass, union executives did remain willing to strike for a longer period of time than union stewards. These results suggest that the willingness to undertake more extreme types of action in support of union positions (e. g., willingness to strike) varies over union leadership levels. Executive members appear willing to strike for a longer period of time than stewards who, in turn, may be more willing to strike than rank-and-file members. These findings have implications for unions. Executive members are responsible for developing and communicating union policies and procedures. Given that union executives may be willing to strike for a longer period of time than the membership they represent, they run the risk of becoming isolated. Like any other leader, while union leaders may take views that differ from those of their followers, these positions can not differ radically, or the leader will cease to be a leader. These results also suggest that the willingness to strike may be a useful predictor in screening candidates for union leadership positions.

Charismatic leadership is positively correlated with the willingness to engage in unconventional behaviour (Conger & Kanungo, 1992). Consistent with this, union executives reported more willingness to engage in unconventional behaviour and more

charismatic leadership behaviors. Behavioural attributes of charismatic leaders include "being an agent of radical change" and "willing to engage in activities that involve personal risk"; these are characteristics that exemplified executives more than stewards. Executives were more likely to go on strike and stay on strike, an activity which is an agent of radical change and which involves personal risk or sacrifice. Union leaders do not have formal power bestowed by organizational authority. To succeed, a union leader may have to rely on charismatic leadership to accomplish the goals of the union organization (Bass, 1985). These results are consistent with previous research (Fullagar *et al.*, 1992; Kelloway & Barling,1993). Not only did charismatic leadership predict union satisfaction and union socialization but it also predicted the leadership position held by members.

## Hypothesis IIIb)

Hypothesis IIIb) proposed that trade union leaders would be more militant, more willing to engage in unconventional behaviour, and more willing to strike than civil service union leaders. There were no differences in militancy, however, trade union leaders were more willing to engage in unconventional work behaviour and were more willing to strike than civil service union leaders. This pattern

of results may reflect the legislative reality under which both types of leaders operate. Civil service union leaders may not be willing to engage in disruptive work practices or in strike action because of the apparent futility of taking such action, given their lack of a right to strike. Trade union leaders, on the other hand, may perceive the instrumentality of engaging in unconventional work behaviour. Willingness to engage in unconventional work behaviour does not generalize across unions with dissimilar bargaining rights. Nonetheless, leaders of unions with different bargaining rights remain similar in militancy. Leaders from both types of unions appear equally unlikely to engage in illegal acts to meet union objectives. This can be seen in reviewing items from the militancy scale which assess the willingness to take such illegal activities (e.g. "go on an illegal strike", "engage in violence"). Therefore, trade union leaders are more likely to engage in unconventional behaviour than civil service union leaders but both are similar in their willingness to engage in illegal activity to achieve their objectives. Both types of union leaders also had similar views of themselves as charismatic leaders suggesting that union leaders share similar charismatic leadership behaviour regardless of the type of union they lead or the bargaining rights of their union.

## Hypothesis IV - Family Influence

Hypothesis IV proposed that union executive members would be more likely to have had parents who were union members, striked as a member of a union, or held a union office. A similar percentage of executives and stewards had fathers who were members of a union. striked as members of a union, or held union offices. However, executive members were more likely to report having had mothers who belonged to a union or who had striked as a member of the union Barling et al. (1991) believed that perceptions of parental participation and union attitudes (family socialization) had a direct influence on Marxist work beliefs and humanistic beliefs. However, mothers and fathers may have differential influence on their children's attitudes. The influence of mothers' union involvement may have even more impact in the future as more women enter the workplace. The mothers of most union leaders in this study would have participated in workplace unions prior to the recent influx of women into the labour force. Most of the leaders in the current study were males; this raises the question of whether the same-sex or opposite-sex parent is more influential in the socialization of pro-union activities. Nonetheless, parents' involvement in unions, particularly that of the mother, may influence the future involvement of their children in leadership positions in unions.

## Hypothesis IVb)

Hypothesis IVb) proposed that trade union leaders would be more likely to have had parents who were involved in union activity. This was not the case. In fact, civil service union leaders were more likely to have had mothers who were union members, who striked as a member of a union, and who held a union office.

Mothers' involvement in union activities predicted whether a respondent was a trade or civil service union leader. This suggests that parental involvement in union activities and its influence on children varies across different types of unions. Therefore, researchers, when examining parental influence of union members, should bear in mind the type of union they are examining and differential influences of each parent's union activities on the member.

### **Exploratory Results**

Union members became involved in leadership activities for different reasons. Overall, the different "types" of union leaders varied in industrial relations stress, union attitudes, charismatic leadership, Marxist work beliefs, union loyalty, and job satisfaction. Looking at specific types, those leaders who became involved in

union activities because they were victims (e.g., were victimized by management and had personal issue to settle with management) held higher Marxist work beliefs than other types of union leaders. Workers who hold strong Marxist work beliefs believe that they are exploited for the benefit of the company (Bucholz, 1979). Therefore, it is not surprising that victim leaders would have the strongest Marxist work beliefs. Victim leaders also reported higher levels of industrial relations stress and lower levels of job satisfaction than the other types of union leaders. Victim leaders appear to become "involved" in the union as a reaction to management rather than out of a strong commitment to the union or to unionism. Dissatisfaction with the job may trigger interest in unionization (Brett, 1980) and participation in union activities (Kelloway & Barling, 1993a). Victim leaders also believed that they were more charismatic than other leaders. Charismatic leaders strive to change the status quo and envision an idealized future. It is reasonable that leaders who see themselves as victimized by management would strive to remove the perceived cause of their plight and to obtain an idealized workplace free of exploitation.

Those leaders who became involved in union activities reluctantly (e.g., pressure from union leaders and coworkers, nobody else would take the job) reported lower industrial relations stress, higher job satisfaction, lower pro-union attitudes, and lower Marxist work beliefs than other types of leaders. In addition, "reluctant" leaders believed that they were less charismatic. Interest in unionization often stems from job dissatisfaction (Brett, 1980; Kelloway & Barling, 1993a; Premack & Hunter, 1988) and is related to Marxist work beliefs and pro-union attitudes (Brett, 1980; Buchholz, 1979). It follows that those union members who have more satisfaction with their jobs, lower Marxist work beliefs, and lower pro-union attitudes would be more reluctant to engage in union activities.

Reluctant leaders also reported lower levels of industrial relations stress. This could reflect their approach to union duties with less zeal than other types of union leaders. Nonetheless, they did not differ in amount of time spent performing union-related duties. Their lower stress might reflect a more objective and less impassioned view of their union duties. Similarly, "reluctant" leaders reported themselves as being less charismatic. If union

members are hesitant to become union leaders, they may be more likely to view their role as leader as less than important to union members than other leaders.

Social/Ambitious leaders were defined as leaders who became involved in union leadership activities because they had family/friends in the union and because they wanted to get ahead in the union and/or company. Voice leaders were those leaders who became involved in union activities because they wanted a say in how the union and workplace were run. Overall, these two types of leaders did not differ from any of the others with respect to the multivariate effects. However, social/ambitious leaders had stronger pro-union attitudes while voice leaders exposed more need for involvement and union loyalty.

Previous researchers have typified union leaders as "reluctant", "populists", "nascent", "leader", "cowboy", or "cautious" (Nicholson, 1976; Batstone et al., 1977; Marchington, 1983; Catano, 1993) and have examined different characteristics of different "types" of union leaders and their influences on their membership. However, few studies have examined specific differences between union leaders who become involved in leadership activities for

different reasons. The current study suggests that there are important differences in reasons for becoming union leaders.

Therefore, caution should be used when generalizing results from any union leadership study.

# Limitations of the Current Study

The current study has several limitations. First, the crosssectional design limits interpretation of the direction of the findings. For example, we now know that executives are more willing to work for the union than stewards. However, it is unclear whether this willingness to work for the union predicted the level of union leadership or whether that, by being involved in union activities, executives developed this willingness to work for the union. Second, by examining the differences between stewards and executives of different unions through a MANOVA design, we discover only overall differences in the dependent variables. However, information on how these and other variables interact and affect union leadership is void. We presently know, as a result of this study, how stewards and executives of two different types of union are dissimilar and how different "types" of union leaders vary in the dependent variables included in the study. Third, the post hoc comparisons conducted in this study were nonorthogonal and

therefore caution should be used in examining results of these analyses as some overlap in explained variance is present in these comparisons. Fourth, the union of the present study consisted employees in eastern Canada who were not employed in the manufacturing industry. Therefore, the external validity of the findings is limited. However, this study should provide a basis for future research on union leadership.

## Directions for Future Research

Bearing in mind the above-mentioned limitations, future research should focus on a longitudinal design of union leadership. Union stewards indicated a higher responsibility to the union, a higher loyalty to the union, and a higher willingness to work for the union than union members and union executives were higher than stewards in their willingness to work for the union. A longitudinal design would demonstrate that these aspects of union commitment, particularly willingness to work for the union, predict holding different leadership positions within the union. We only know, from the present study, that there is a positive correlation between union leadership position and the willingness to work for the union. In addition, such longitudinal data would be useful for LISREL type analyses.

The findings of the current study have other implications for future research on union leadership. Previous research has assumed that all types of leaders were similar and that union leaders from different unions were similar. However, union executives appear to be more charismatic leaders and to be more willing to work for the union than union stewards. In addition, trade union leaders reported a higher willingness to engage in unconventional behaviour and a higher need to get involved in union activities. Future research should take into account differences based on leadership level and type of union. The results of the exploratory analyses also have implications for future union leadership research; the reasons why people become union leaders must be taken into consideration and suggest caution when generalizing between studies.

- Barling, J. (1988). Industrial Relations-a "blind spot" in the teaching, research and practice of industrial/organizational psychology.

  <u>Canadian Psychology</u>, 29, 103-108.
- Barling, J., Fullagar, C., & Kelloway, E. K. (1992). <u>The Union & Its Members: A Psychological Approach</u>. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc..
- Barling, J., Fullagar, C., McElvie, L., & Kelloway, E. K. (1992). Union loyalty and strike propensity. <u>Journal of Social Psychology</u>, 132, 581-590.
- Barling, J., Kelloway, E. K., & Bremermann, E. H. (1991) Preemployment predictors of union attitudes: The role of family socialization and work beliefs. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 76, 725-731.
- Barling, J. & Milligan, J. (1987). Some psychological consequences of striking: A six-month longitudinal study. <u>Journal of Occupational</u> Behaviour, 8, 127-138.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). <u>Leadership and performance beyond expectations</u>. New York: Free Press.
- Batstone, E., Boraston, I., & Frenkel, S. (1977). Shop stewards in actions: The organization of workplace conflict and accommodation. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bluen, S. D. & Barling, J. (1987). Stress and the industrial relations process: Development of the Industrial Relations Event Scale.

  South African Journal of Psychology, 17, 150-159.

- Bluen, S. D. & Barling, J. (1988). Psychological stressors associated with industrial relations. In C. L. Cooper and R. Payne (Eds.), Causes, coping.and, the consequences of stress at work. (pp. 175-205). London: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bluen, S. D. & Edelstein, I. (1993). Trade Union Support Following an Underground Explosion. <u>Journal of Organizational Behaviour</u>, 14(5), 473-480.
- Blyton, P. (1981). Research note: The influence of job grade differences in white-collar shop stewart committee meetings. Industrial Relations Journal, 12, 72-74.
- Blyton, P., Nicholson, N.M. & Ursell, G. (1981). Job status and white-collar members' union activity. <u>Journal of Occupational</u>. <u>Psychology</u>, <u>54</u>, 33-45.
- Brett, J. M. (1980). Why Employees Want Unions. <u>Organizational</u> <u>Dynamics</u>, Spring, 47-59.
- Bucholz, R. A. (1979). An empirical Study of contemporary beliefs about work in American Society. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 63, 219-227.
- Burke, R. J. (1993). Stress, Work, and Professional Satisfaction and Militancy among Canadian Physicians <u>Journal of Organizational</u> <u>Behavior</u>, <u>14</u>(5), 459-472.
- Catano, V. M. (1993). Exploring the Culture of Union Leadership through Qualitative Analysis. Paper presented as part of the symposium entitled "Union Leadership" at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario.

- Catano, V. M., Cole, G., & Hebert, N. (1995). Can union commitment be developed: A quasi-experimental analysis. In L. E. Tetrick & J. Barling (Eds). <u>Behavioural and Social perspectives on hanging employment relations</u>. Washington, DC. APA (in press).
- Clegg, H. A., Killick, A. J., & Adams, R. (1961). <u>Trade union officers.</u>

  <u>A study of full-time officers. branch secretaries. and shop stewards in British trade unions.</u> Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1992). Perceived Behavioural Attributes of Charismatic Leadership. <u>Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science</u>, 24(1), 86-102.
- Conlon, E. J. & Gallagher, D. G. (1987). Commitment to the employer and union: Effects of membership status. <u>Academy of Management Journal</u>, 30, 151-162.
- Dean, L. R. (1954). Union activity and dual loyalty. <u>Industrial and Labor Relations Review</u>, 12, 526-536.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). <u>Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research</u>. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Form, W.H. (1976). <u>Blue-collar stratification: Auto-workers in four countries</u>. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Fried, Y. & Tiegs, R. B. (1993). The Main Effect Model versus Buffering Model of Shop Steward Social Support: A Study of Rank-and-File Auto Workers in the U.S.A.. <u>Journal of Organizational Behavior</u>, 14(5), 481-494.
- Friedman, D. (1983). Why workers strike: Individual decisions and structural constraints. In M. Hechter (Ed.), <u>The microfoundations of macrosociology</u>. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Friedman, L. & Harvey, R. J. (1986). Factors of union commitment: The case for lower dimensionality. <u>Journal of Applied</u>
  <u>Psychology</u>, 71, 371-376.
- Fukami, C. V. & Larson, E. W. (1984). Commitment to company and union: Parallel models. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 69, 367-371.
- Fullagar, C. (1986). A factor analytic study on the validity of a union commitment scale. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, <u>71</u>, 129-137.
- Fullagar, C., Barling, J., (1989). A longitudinal test of a model of the antecedents and consequences of union loyalty. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 74, 213-227.
- Fullagar, C., Clark, P., Gallagher, D., & Gordon, M. E. (1993).

  <u>Leadership and the shop steward: Implications for union</u>

  <u>commitment and participation</u>. Paper presented as part of the symposium entitled "Union Leadership" at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario.
- Fullagar, C., McCoy, D., & Schull, C. (1992). The socialization of union loyalty. <u>Journal of Occupational Psychology</u>, 13, 13-26.
- Glick, W., Mirvis, P., & Harder, D. (1977). Union satisfaction and participation. <u>Industrial Relations</u>, 16, 145-151.
- Gordon, M. E., Philpot, J. W., Burt, R. E., Thompson, C. A., & Spiller, W. E. (1980). Commitment to the union: Development of a measure and an examination of its correlates. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 65(4), 474-499.

- Heaney, C. A., Israel, B. A., Schurman, S. J., Baker, E. A., House, J. S., & Hugentobler, M. (1993). Industrial Relations, Worksite Stress Reduction, and Employee Well-Being: A Participatory Action Research Investigation. <u>Journal of Organizational Behavior</u>, 14(5), 495-510.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1970). Exit. voice and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms. organizations. and states. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kahn, R. L. & Tannenbaum, A. S. (1954). Union leadership and member participation. <u>Personnel Psychology</u>, 10, 277-292.
- Kanungo, R. (1982). Work alienation: An integrative approach. New York: Wiley.
- Kelloway, E. K. & Barling, J. (1993a). Members' participation in local union activities: Measurement, prediction, and replication.

  <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 78, 262-279
- Kelloway, E. K. & Barling, J. (1993b). <u>Predictors of satisfaction with local and national unions</u>. Paper presented at the symposium entitled "Union Leadership" at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario.
- Kelloway, E. K., Barling, J., & Shah, A. (1993). Industrial Relations
  Stress and Job Satisfaction: Concurrent Effects and Mediation.

  Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 14(5), 447-458.
- Kelloway, E. K., Catano, V. M., & Southwell, R. R. (1992). The construct validity of union commitment: Development and dimensionality of a shorter scale. <u>Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology</u>, 65, 197-211.

- Klandermans, P. G. (1984). Mobilization and participation in trade union action: An expectancy-value approach. <u>Journal of Occupational Psychology</u>, <u>57</u>, 107-120.
- Klandermans, B. (1986). Psychology and trade union participation: Joining, acting, quitting. <u>Journal of Occupational Psychology</u>, 59, 189-204.
- Kochan, T. A. (1980). <u>Collective bargaining and industrial relations:</u>

  <u>From theory to policy and practice</u>. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Kopelman, R. E., Greenhaus, J. H., & Connolly, T. F. (1983). A model of work, family, and interrole conflict: A construct validation study. <u>Organizational Behavior and Human Performance</u>, 32(2), 198-215.
- Kryl, I. P. (1990). <u>Union participation: A review of the literature</u>

  Paper presented at the First European Congress of Psychology.
- Locke, E. A. (1986). <u>Generalizing from laboratory to field settings</u>. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Lodahl, T.M., & Kejner, M. (1965). The definition & measurement of job involvement. Journal of Applied Psychology, 49, 24-33.
- MacDonald, L. (1959). <u>Leadership dynamics and the trade union</u> <u>leader</u>. New York City Press, New York.
- Marchington, M. (1983). Typologies of shop stewards: A reconsideration. <u>Industrial Relation Journal</u>, 14, 34-48.
- Martin, J. E. (1986). Predictors of individual propensity to strike. Industrial and Labour Relations Review, 39, 214-22.

- Martin, J. E. & Berthiaume, R. D. (1993). Stress and the Union Steward's Role. <u>Journal of Organizational Behaviour</u>, 14(5),
- McShane, S. (1986). The multidimensionality of union participation. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 59, 177-187.
- Mills, C. W. (1971). <u>The New Men of Power: America'a Labor Leaders</u> New York, NY: Augustus M. Kelley. 433-446.
- Nandram, S. S. & Klandermans, B. (1993). Stress Experienced by Active Members of Trade Unions. <u>Journal of Organizational</u> <u>Behaviour</u>, 14(5), 415-432.
- Nicholson, N. (1976). The role of the shop steward: An empirical case study. <u>Industrial Relations Journal</u>, 7,15-26.
- Nicholson, N., Ursell, G., & Blyton, P. (1981). Social background, attitudes, and behavior of white collar shop stewards.

  British Journal of Industrial Relations, 18, 231-238.
- Premack, S. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1988). Individual unionization decisions. <u>Psychological Bulletin</u>, 64, 223-234.
- Purcell, T. V. (1953). The worker speaks his mind on company and union. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Robinowitz, S., & Hall, D. (1977). Organizational research on job involvement. <u>Psychological Bulletin</u>, 84, 245-258.
- Seidman, J., London, J., & Karsh, B. (1950). Leadership in a local union. American Journal of Sociology, 56, 229-237.

- Shirom, A. & Mayer, A. (1993). Stress and Strain among Union Lay
  Officials and Rank-and-File Members. <u>Journal of Organizational</u>
  <u>Behaviour</u>, 14(5), 401-414.
- Southwell, R. (1991). The dimensionality, antecedents, and consequences of union commitment: A study of a civil service union. (M. Sc. Thesis) Halifax, N.S.: Saint Mary's University.
- Stagner, R., Chalmers, W. E., & Derber, M. (1958). Guttman-Type Scales for Union and Management Attitudes Toward Each Other.

  <u>Journal ofApplied Psychology</u>, 42(5), 293-300.
- Strauss, G. (1977). Union government in the U.S.: Research past and future. <u>Industrial Relations</u>, <u>16</u>, 215-242.
- Strauss, G., & Sayles, L. R. (1953). Occupation and the selection of local union officers. <u>The American Journal of Sociology</u>, 58, 585-591.
- Tannanbaum, A. S., & Kahn, R. L. (1958). <u>Participation in local unions</u>. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Tayamiya, M. (1978). <u>Union Organization and Militancy</u>. Germany: CIP-Kurztitelaufnahme der Deutschen Bibliothek.
- Tetrick, L. E. & Martin, J. E. (1993). <u>Agreements and Disagreements</u>
  <u>between Rank-and-File Members and Stewards</u>. Paper presented
  at the symposium entitled "Union Leadership" at the annual
  meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto,
  Ontario.
- Thacker, J. W., Fields, M. W., & Barclay, L. A. (1990). Union commitment: An examination of antecedent and outcome factors Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63, 33-48.

- Thacker, J. W., Fields, M. W., & Tetrick, L. E. (1989). The factor structure of union commitment: An application of confirmatory factor analysis. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 74, 228-232.
- Van Tine, W. R. (1973). <u>The making of the labor bureaucrat: union leadership in the United States</u>. Amherst, University of Massachusetts Press.
- Warr, P., Cook, J., & Wall, T. (1979). Scales for the measurement of some work attitudes and aspects of psychological well-being.

  Journal of Occupational Psychology, 52(2), 129-148.
- Youngblood, S. A., DeNesi, A., Molleston, J.L., & Mobley, W. (1984).

  The impact of work environment instrumentality beliefs,
  perceived labor union image, and subjective norms on union
  voting intentions. <u>Academy of Management Journal</u>, <u>27</u>, 576-590.

# APPENDIX A

TO: ALL STEWARDS

RE: STEWARDS SURVEY

The current round of government budget reductions and lay-offs have understandably created apprehension and uncertainty among the general membership. This apprehension and uncertainty has undoubtedly resulted in a greater membership demand on the stewards and union activist in the workplace. In an effort to determine the extent and impact of this demand, and, subsequently, to determine what additional skills development you may require, if any, we are requesting that you complete the enclosed survey questionnaire and forward it to Head Office in the postage free envelope provided.

The extensive nature of the survey requires a sizable amount of information, and this has resulted in a lengthy questionnaire. Given the importance of the survey, however, I trust that the length of the questionnaire will not be a deterrent to your involvement in the study. We need your input and support. Please complete the questionnaire and forward to Head Office prior to February 15, 1994.

I should point out that the information will be treated in confidence. In fact, the questionnaire cannot be traced to the individual so that your anonymity is protected.

I look forward to your support.

In solidarity,

Norman Hebert Education Officer

NH/sdw

# APPENDIX B

Listed below are a number of items that may have happened to you in the past year. For each item you've experienced please indicate whether the event had a favorable or unfavorable effect on you when it occurred. Please use the following scale when responding (Note: If the event did not occur, please leave the item blank).

-3 = Extremely Unfavorable -2 = Moderately Unfavorable 2 = Moderately Favorable

-1 = Unfavorable 1 = Favorable

0 = No Effect

0 = No Effect	<b>~</b> 11						
1. Unfair labor practices	<u>EU</u> -3	-2		<b>NE</b> 0	1	2	<b>E.F</b> 3
2. Being victimized	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
3. Being discriminated against	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
4. Failure to use industrial relations procedure	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
5. Being intimidated	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
6. Being disciplined	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
7. Shop steward elections	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
8. Representing others	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
9. Injustice and inequality	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
10. Being called abusive names	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
11. Not knowing who to turn to	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
12. Resolving issues or disputes	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
13. Dealing with novel situations	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
14. Lack of trust	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
15. Dealing with irrational people	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
16. Making or handling complaints	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
17. Dealing with people who have different beliefs than you	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
18. Rumours of discontent	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
19. Having your authority or status questioned	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
20. Inconsistency between official industrial relations policy	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
and practice							
21. Job insecurity	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
22. Change in working conditions	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
23. Being forced to change the way you deal with others	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
24. Being unsure about your level of authority	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
25. Dealing with emotionally charged situations	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
26. Dealing with conflicting demands	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
27. Resolving issues or disputes	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
28. Not knowing how to handle a situation	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
29. Being criticized	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
30. Not having the authority to enforce your decisions	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
31. Changes in management commitment to industrial relations	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
32. Not getting important information	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
33. Fearing the results of one's actions	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3

34. Change in work rules	-3	<sub>"</sub> 2	-1	0	1	2	3
35. Conflict with superiors or subordinates	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
36. Retrenchment in the company	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
37. Being involved in negotiations	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
38. Strike or lockout	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
39. Making sensitive industrial relations decisions	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
40. Training in industrial relations	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
41. Dealing with resistance to change	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
42. Fear of change	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
43. Convincing others on industrial relations issues	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
44. Disagreeing with decisions	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3

People become involved in union activities for a variety of reasons - some of these are listed below. Please indicate which of the following reasons applies to your decision to become active in the union by circling YES, NO, or UNCERTAIN for each item.

<ol> <li>Nobody else would take the job.</li> </ol>	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
2. Pressure from coworkers.	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
3. Pressure from local union leaders.	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
4. Wanted to help fellow workers.	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
5. Had a personal issue to settle with management.	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
6. Thought you could do a better job than the incumbent.	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
7. Wanted to get ahead in the company.	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
8. Believed in the principles of unionism.	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
9. Wanted some say in how the workplace was run.	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
10. Had been victimized by management.	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
11. Wanted some say in how union was run.	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
<ol> <li>Had friends who were active in the union and encouraged me to get involved.</li> </ol>	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
13. Family members were active in unions.	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
14. Wanted a leadership role in the union.	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
15. Wanted to protect own job rights.	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN

The following items refer to peoples' reasons for participating in unions: Please use the following scale to rate your answer to why you participate in union activities.

(1=STRONGLY DISAGREE 2=DISAGREE 3=NEUTRAL 4=AGREE 5=STRONGLY AGREE)

	<u>S D</u>				
1. Participating in the union gives me a chance to express my feelings.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Participating in the union brings me into contact with other people.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Participating in the union gives me a say in what the union does.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Participating in the union allows me to influence other people.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Participating in the union identifies me with the labour movement.	1	2	3	4	5

6. Participating in the union gives me a say in how the workplace is run.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Active union members have more status than non-active members.	1	2	3	4	5

The following items refer to how the rank-and-file members—you are responsible for think of you as a union leader: Please use the following scale to rate how they perceive you as a union steward. (1=STRONGLY DISAGREE 2=DISAGREE 3=NEUTRAL 4=AGREE 5=STRONGLY AGREE)

My rank-and-file members think I am a good model for them to follow.	S D 1		<u>N</u> 3		<b>SA</b> 5
2. Union members who I am responsible for are proud to be associated with me.	1	2	3	4	5
<ol><li>My rank-and-file members think I have a special gift of seeing what is important for them to consider.</li></ol>	1	2	3	4	5
4. Union members who I am responsible for have complete faith in me.	1	2	3	4	5
5. My rank-and-file members think I encourage points of view of all members.	1	2	3	4	5
<ol><li>Union members who I am responsible for have a sense of mission which I transmit to them.</li></ol>	1	2	3	4	5

These next items ask you to rate the extent to which you use unconventional behaviour and/or perform activities that involve personal risk in achieving and pursuing union goals.( 1=STRONGLY DISAGREE 2=DISAGREE 3=NEUTRAL 4=AGREE 5=STRONGLY AGREE)

	SD		N		SA
In pursuing union objectives, I engage in activities that involve					
considerable self-sacrifice and personal risk.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I take personal risks for the sake of the union.	1	2	3	4	5
3. From time to time, I engage in acts of exemplary heroism.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I often incur high personal costs for the good of the union.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I advocate following risky paths and courses of action to achieve					
union goals.			3		
6. I use non traditional or counter-cultural means to achieve union goals.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I engage in unconventional behaviour in order to achieve union					
objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I often exhibit very novel behaviour that surprises other					
members of the union.	1	2	3	4	5
9. i demonstrate expertise in the use of unconventional tactics					
for achieving union goals.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I advocate following non-risky well-established paths and					
courses of action to achieve union goals.	1	2	3	4	5

The following questions deal with your attitudes toward unions in general. Please circle your answer. (1=STRONGLY DISAGREE 2=DISAGREE 3=NEUTRAL 4=AGREE 5=STRONGLY AGREE).

	<u> </u>		N		<b>5</b> A
Unions are a positive force in this country.	1	2	3	4	5
2. If I had to choose I would probably not be a member of a labour union.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I am glad that labour unions exist.	1	2	3	4	5
4. People would be just as well off if there were no unions in Canada.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Unions are an embarrassment to our society.	1	2	3	4	5

6. I am proud of the labour movement in this country.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Most people are better off without labour unions.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Workers are considerably better off when they belong to a labour union.	1	2	3	4	5

The following items also reflect feelings different people have about their union local. For the purpose of this questionnaire we are referring to the union local of which you are currently a member. Please circle your answer. (Same scale as above).

I feel a sense of pride in being part of the union.	<u>S D</u> 1	2	<u>N</u> 3		<b>S.A</b> 5
<ul> <li>2. Based on what I know now and what I believe I can expect in the future I plan to be a member of the union the rest of the time I work for my employer.</li> <li>3. The record of this union is a good example of what dedicated people can</li> </ul>	1	2	3	4	5
get done.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I talk up the union to my friends as a great organization to belong to.	1	2	3	4	5
5. There's a lot to be gained by being a union member.	1	2	3	4	5
6. It is every union member's responsibility to see to it that management					
'lives up to' all the terms of the collective agreement.	1	2	3	4	5
7. It is the duty of every union member to 'keep his/her ears open' for					
information that might be useful to the union.	1	2	3	4	5
8. It's every member's duty to support or help another union member use					
the grievance procedure.	1		3		
9. Every member must be willing to take the time and risk of filing a grievance.	1		3		
10. If asked I would serve on a committee for the union.	1	2	3	4	5
11. If asked I would run for elected office in the union.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I am willing to put a great deal of effort, beyond that normally expected of a					
union member, in order to make the union successful.	1		3		
13. Deciding to join this union was a smart move on my part.	1	2	3	4	5
14. People who are important to me and whose opinions I value think that					
I should be an active member in the union.	1	2	_	4	-
15. My coworkers think that I should be active in the union.	1		3		
16. My family believes I should be active in the union.	1		3		
17. Generally speaking I want to do what my coworkers think I should do.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Generally speaking I want to do what important people think I should do.	1	_	3		5
19. Generally speaking I want to do what my family thinks I should do.	1	2	3	4	5

# The following questions refer to people's opinions about work. Please circle your answer. (1=STRONGLY DISAGREE 2=DISAGREE 3=NEUTRAL 4=AGREE 5=STRONGLY AGREE)

Management does not understand the needs of the worker.	<u>S D</u> 1	2	<u>N</u> 3	4	<b>S.A</b> 5
2. Workplaces would be run better if workers had more of a say in management.	. 1	2	3	4	5
3. The most important work in Canada is done by the laboring classes.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The working classes should have more of a say in running society.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Wealthy people should carry their fair share of the burdens of life in Canada.	1	2	3	4	5
<ol><li>The rich do not make much of a contribution to society.</li></ol>	1	2	3	4	5
7. The work of the labouring classes is exploited by the rich for their own benef	it. 1	2	3	4	5
<ol><li>Workers should be more active in making decisions about production, financing, and capital investment.</li></ol>	1	2	3	4	5
9. The free enterprise system mainly benefits the rich and powerful.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Workers get their fair share of the economic rewards of society.	1	2	3	4	5

11. I feel my union work schedule often conflicts with family life.	1	2	3	4	5
12. After union work I come home too tired to do some of the things I'd like to.	1	2	3	4	5
<ol> <li>I have so much union work to do that it takes time away from my personal interests.</li> </ol>	1	2	3	4	5
14. I feel that my family dislikes how often I am preoccupied with my union work when I am at home.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Because my union work is so demanding, sometimes i am irritable at home.	1	2	3	4	5
16. The demands of my union work make it difficult to be relaxed all the time I am at home.	1	2	3	4	5
17. My union work takes up the time I'd like to spend with my family.	1	2	3	4	5
18. My union work makes it difficult for me to be the kind of spouse or parent I'd like to be.	1	2	3	4	5
19. The major satisfaction in my life comes from my union work.	1	2	3	4	5
20. The most important things that happen to me involve my union work.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I'm really a perfectionist about my union work.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I live, eat, and breathe my union work.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I am very much involved personally in my union work.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Most things in life are more important than union work.	1	2	3	4	5

This series of questions refers to peoples' opinions about their jobs. Please use the following scale:

1 = I'M EXTREMELY DISSATISFIED
2 = I'M MODERATELY DISSATISFIED
3 = I'M SLIGHTLY SATISFIED
5 = I'M SLIGHTLY SATISFIED
6 = I'M MODERATELY SATISFIED
7 = I'M EXTREMELY SATISFIED

4 = I'M NOT SURE

1. Labour relations between management and workers at your	ED		1	NS			ES
place of employment.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. The physical work conditions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Your rate of pay.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Your fellow workers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. The way your workplace is managed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Your immediate boss.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. The freedom to choose your own method of working.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. The recognition you get for good work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. The amount of responsibility you are given.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Your opportunity to use your abilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Your chance of promotion.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. The attention paid to suggestions you make.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Your hours of work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. The amount of variety in your job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Your job security.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

This section contains statements which allow you to express your views on strike issues. Please indicate how you feel, that is whether you Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Neither Agree or Disagree (N), Agree (A), or Strongly Agree (SA) with the following statements:

1. I would be willing to go on an illegal strike.			<u>N</u> 3		<b>SA</b> 5
2. I would be willing to go on an illegal strike to protest layoffs.	1	2	3	4	5
<ol><li>I would return to work from a legal strike if the government ordered me to return.</li></ol>	1	2	3	4	5
<ol> <li>I would return to work from an illegal strike if the government ordered me to return.</li> </ol>	1	2	3	4	5
<ol><li>I would engage in violence during a strike if management used outside employees.</li></ol>	1	2	3	4	5
6. I would work to rule to support NSGEU bargaining positions.	1	2	3	4	5
<ol><li>I would participate in rotating absence to support NSGEU bargaining positions.</li></ol>	1	2	3	4	5
<ol> <li>I would help to create chaos in my workplace to support NSGEU bargaining positions.</li> </ol>	1	2	3	4	5
9. I would cross a picket line of another NSGEU bargaining unit.	1	2	3	4	5
<ol> <li>Picket line violence would not be justified even if management used outside employees (scabs) to try to break a strike.</li> </ol>	1	2	3	4	5
<ol> <li>If a strike occurs in the NSGEU Bargaining Unit, my family, friends, neighbors, etc. would feel very favorable and supportive.</li> </ol>	1	2	3	4	5

For this next section, please circle the appropriate response as applied to you:

<ol> <li>How often do you vote in union elections:</li> </ol>	ทธา	lections	elections	unic	in	vote	you	do	often	1. How
---	-----	----------	-----------	------	----	------	-----	----	-------	--------

(1) Every election

(3) About half of the elections

(2) Most elections

(4) Some elections

(5) I have never voted in an election

#### 2. How would you describe your attendance at union meetings? (Please circle)

(1) I attend every meeting

(3) I attend about half of the meetings

(2) I attend most meetings

(4) I attend some of the meetings

(5) I never attend the meetings

#### 3. Have you ever run for or held an elected office in this union? (Please circle)

(1) Yes, and would do so again

(3) No, but would do so if asked

(2) Yes, but would not do so again

(4) No, not interested

#### 4. Are you or have you been, a member of a union committee? (Please circle)

(1) Yes, and would do so again

(3) No, but would do so if asked

(2) Yes, but would not do so again

(4) No, not interested

5. When I have a conflict with manager contact the union for help? (Please ci	rcle)		aint) I
<ul><li>(1) Always contact the union for help</li><li>(2) Usually contact the union for help</li><li>(3) Sometimes contact the union for help</li></ul>	(4) Rarely contact the (5) Never contact the	e union for help union for help	
	of the union? (Plea (4) Two to five years (5) Five to ten years (6) Over ten years	ase circle)	
7. Have you ever been on strike befor	e? (Please circle)	(1) Yes	(2) No
8. Have you ever filed a grievance? (Ple	ease circle)	(1) Yes	(2) <b>N</b> o
9. The most working days you would b		strike is:	
10. Sex: Male Female			
11. Age: years.			
12. Marital Status (Please check one of the	following):		
Single Separa	ited/Divorced		
Married Commo	on Law	Widowed	
13. How many dependents do you have	e (Please check one o	the following):	
None One	Two Three	Four	
Five Six	Seven More	than seven	
14. What is the highest level of educat	ion you have com	pleted?	
15. Please check one of the following	and reply:		,
I am now a shop steward and have t	peen for numb	er of years.	
I am a local executive member and h	ave been for n	umber of years.	
16. Have you held any other positions	in the union?	YES NO	
If yes, what other positions have yo			
17. Do you currently hold any other po			NO NO
If yes, what other positions do you			

18. Approximately how many hours per week do you spend (on average) in duties relate to your role as a shop steward?
hours DNA
19. How many of these hours are outside of your normal working hours (e.g., on you own time) ?
hours DNA
20. At the end of your current term, do you plan on standing again ?
YESNOUNCERTAIN
21. Would you run for any other union office?
YES NO UNCERTAIN

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND PARTICIPATION !

TO: ALL STEWARDS

RE: STEWARDS SURVEY

The current round of government budget reductions and lay-offs have understandably created apprehension and uncertainty among the general membership. This apprehension and uncertainty has undoubtedly resulted in a greater membership demand on the stewards and union activist in the workplace. In an effort to determine the extent and impact of this demand, and, subsequently, to determine what additional skills development you may require, if any, we are requesting that you complete the enclosed survey questionnaire and forward it to Head Office in the postage free envelope provided.

The extensive nature of the survey requires a sizable amount of information, and this has resulted in a lengthy questionnaire. Given the importance of the survey, however, I trust that the length of the questionnaire will not be a deterrent to your involvement in the study. We need your input and support. Please complete the questionnaire and forward to Head Office prior to February 15, 1994.

I should point out that the information will be treated in confidence. In fact, the questionnaire cannot be traced to the individual so that your anonymity is protected.

I look forward to your support.

In solidarity,

Norman Hebert Education Officer

NH/sdw

TO: ALL STEWARDS

RE: STEWARDS SURVEY

The current round of government budget reductions and lay-offs have understandably created apprehension and uncertainty among the general membership. This apprehension and uncertainty has undoubtedly resulted in a greater membership demand on the stewards and union activist in the workplace. In an effort to determine the extent and impact of this demand, and, subsequently, to determine what additional skills development you may require, if any, we are requesting that you complete the enclosed survey questionnaire and forward it to Head Office in the postage free envelope provided.

The extensive nature of the survey requires a sizable amount of information, and this has resulted in a lengthy questionnaire. Given the importance of the survey, however, I trust that the length of the questionnaire will not be a deterrent to your involvement in the study. We need your input and support. Please complete the questionnaire and forward to Head Office prior to February 15, 1994.

I should point out that the information will be treated in confidence. In fact, the questionnaire cannot be traced to the individual so that your anonymity is protected.

I look forward to your support.

In solidarity,

Norman Hebert Education Officer

NH/sdw

TO: ALL STEWARDS

RE: STEWARDS SURVEY

The current round of government budget reductions and tay-offs have understandably created apprehension and uncertainty among the general membership. This apprehension and uncertainty has undoubtedly resulted in a greater membership demand on the stewards and union activist in the workplace. In an effort to determine the extent and impact of this demand, and, subsequently, to determine what additional skills development you may require, if any, we are requesting that you complete the enclosed survey questionnaire and forward it to Head Office in the postage free envelope provided.

The extensive nature of the survey requires a sizable amount of information, and this has resulted in a lengthy questionnaire. Given the importance of the survey, however, I trust that the length of the questionnaire will not be a deterrent to your involvement in the study. We need your input and support. Please complete the questionnaire and forward to Head Office prior to February 15, 1994.

I should point out that the information will be treated in confidence. In fact, the questionnaire cannot be traced to the individual so that your anonymity is protected.

I look forward to your support.

In solidarity,

Norman Hebert Education Officer

NH/sdw

TO: ALL STEWARDS

RE: STEWARDS SURVEY

The current round of government budget reductions and lay-offs have understandably created apprehension and uncertainty among the general membership. This apprehension and uncertainty has undoubtedly resulted in a greater membership demand on the stewards and union activist in the workplace. In an effort to determine the extent and impact of this demand, and, subsequently, to determine what additional skills development you may require, if any, we are requesting that you complete the enclosed survey questionnaire and forward it to Head Office in the postage free envelope provided.

The extensive nature of the survey requires a sizable amount of information, and this has resulted in a lengthy questionnaire. Given the importance of the survey, however, I trust that the length of the questionnaire will not be a deterrent to your involvement in the study. We need your input and support. Please complete the questionnaire and forward to Head Office prior to February 15, 1994.

I should point out that the information will be treated in confidence. In fact, the questionnaire cannot be traced to the individual so that your anonymity is protected.

I look forward to your support.

In solidarity,

Norman Hebert Education Officer

NH/sdw

TO: ALL STEWARDS

RE: STEWARDS SURVEY

The current round of government budget reductions and lay-offs have understandably created apprehension and uncertainty among the general membership. This apprehension and uncertainty has undoubtedly resulted in a greater membership demand on the stewards and union activist in the workplace. In an effort to determine the extent and impact of this demand, and, subsequently, to determine what additional skills development you may require, if any, we are requesting that you complete the enclosed survey questionnaire and forward it to Head Office in the postage free envelope provided.

The extensive nature of the survey requires a sizable amount of information, and this has resulted in a lengthy questionnaire. Given the importance of the survey, however, I trust that the length of the questionnaire will not be a deterrent to your involvement in the study. We need your input and support. Please complete the questionnaire and forward to Head Office prior to February 15, 1994.

I should point out that the information will be treated in confidence. In fact, the questionnaire cannot be traced to the individual so that your anonymity is protected.

I look forward to your support.

In solidarity,

Norman Hebert Education Officer

NH/sdw