

GENDER, ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE PERCEPTIONS, AND UNION ORGANIZING

by

PATRICIA A. SIMPSON
Institute of Human Resources & Industrial Relations
Loyola University Chicago
820 N. Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60611
(312) 915-6611
psimpso@luc.edu

and

MICHELLE KAMINSKI
School of Labor and Industrial Relations
Michigan State University
413 S. Kedzie Hall
East Lansing, MI 48842

* A paper presented at the *Women and Unions: Still the Most Difficult Revolution?* Conference, Cornell University, Nov. 21-23, 2003. Address all correspondence to Patricia Simpson.

GENDER, ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE PERCEPTIONS, AND UNION ORGANIZING

I. What We Know About Organizing Women

Never before in U. S. history has the relationship between women and unions assumed such strategic and practical importance. Changes in the U. S. economy have moved the question of better integrating women into the labor movement to center stage. A globalized economy and economic restructuring have led to a contraction of the industrial and manufacturing sector. This decline in the traditional base of union power has occurred simultaneously with the growth of the service sector where jobs are often characterized by contingent work arrangements. Business units are also typically smaller, presenting an especially difficult challenge to union organizing efforts. Further, under the guise of gaining greater flexibility to accommodate an intensively competitive external environment, companies have adopted practices like contracting out and offshore production, while also increasing their attacks on basic labor rights through the use of union busting firms.

Briskin and McDermott (1993) have applied the term “feminization of labor” to the impact that the above trends have had on the content of work in modern industrial economies. That is, A larger share of the work performed over the last quarter century in America and Western Europe resembles traditional women’s work in that it is highly insecure, offers low wages and few benefits, and provides not even the crudest due process protections. Not surprisingly, a parallel trend has been an increasing representation of women in the labor forces of industrializing countries. As a consequence, the fates of unions and women workers have become increasingly interdependent. Neither unions nor women workers can do very well without the other.

There have been some important successes in organizing women in private service sector jobs within the last decade. Yet, clearly there remains considerable room for expanding union membership among women workers. Currently 11.5 percent of female employees are union

members, compared to 15.2 percent of male employees (AFL-CIO, 2001a). Women also make up 42 percent of union membership, while accounting for 48 percent of the overall workforce (AFL-CIO, 2001a).

For women, the gains of union membership are considerable. Union members in the U. S. had a 28 percent wage premium in comparison to nonunion workers in 2000, but the wage premium for union women was 31 percent compared to nonunion women (AFL-CIO, 2001b; see also Spalter-Roth, Hartmann, and Collins, 1994). Further, unions can play an important role in helping women to address inequities in the workplace and the “double burden” generated by traditional social roles (e.g., seeking flex time; on-site child care facilities). Further, participation in union organizing campaigns and in local union affairs has often provided important transforming experiences for women workers who have been socialized to be self-effacing and diffident in their interactions with others. Case histories have repeatedly identified women who have been personally empowered through union work (Baker, 1993; Coulter, 1993; McDermott, 1993).

Both unions and women can obviously benefit where larger numbers of women are brought into the labor movement. In contrast to longstanding myths, survey data have in recent years indicated stronger interest in being unionized among women than among men (Schur and Kruse, 1992; Farber, 1989; Leigh and Hills, 1987). This recognition has fostered an increasingly animated discussion on the optimal approaches to organizing women. While some still argue that the best practices for organizing women and men are one and the same (see Crain, 1994), there is increasing evidence that gender matters in an organizing campaign. Admittedly, declining somewhat in recent years, (Blau, Simpson, and Anderson, 1996), occupational segregation - wherein women and men are heavily concentrated in different jobs often in different industries - makes the issue of targeting campaigns by gender even more relevant.

One example of targeting pertains to the structure of a union organizing campaign. Bronfenbrenner and Juravich (1995) have demonstrated that worker-centered campaigns have been

especially successful in organizing women workers. This organizing model incorporates a substantial amount of rank and file participation and flexible timeframes adaptable to protracted and repeated personal contacts with all potential bargaining unit members. This is in contrast with the conventional model of organizing that evolved in the post-World War II era within male-dominated mass production manufacturing industries. This model placed emphasis on an elite core of staff organizers and relatively small numbers of rank and file activists who mobilized as quickly as possible to determine the existing levels of pro- and anti-union sentiment and made quick strategic decisions to continue or end the campaign based on their assessment. At the core of the conventional model is an assumption that the workers targeted for a campaign are already familiar with unions because they work in an occupation or market sector marked by high levels of unionization. Clearly this is not the case within many of the occupations and market sectors where women work. Indeed, a recent multi-country study conducted by the International Labour Organization found that the top most reason why it is difficult to organize women is their lack of familiarity with unions (International Labour Organization, 2001).

Another topic that has garnered attention is the gender of union organizers. Union personnel express decidedly mixed views on this subject. Women more often maintain that women workers respond better to women organizers, while men more often express the view that matching organizers and rank and file by gender has little independent value (Crain, 1994). Of course, personal bias arguably accounts for these alternative perspectives. The male doubters should take heed, moreover, of recent empirical studies confirming that women workers generally have a more positive attitude towards unions when women are strongly represented among local leaders and paid professional staff. Further, women seem to respond more positively to having same-sex leadership than do men (Mellor, 1994).

Unfortunately female representation in union leadership roles remains woefully inadequate. Although some improvements have occurred especially since the ascendancy of John Sweeney to

head the AFL-CIO in 1995, women still remain both underrepresented and confined to less influential positions across the union leadership population. (Izraeli, 1985; Melcher, Eichstedt, and Erickens, 1992). Recruiting and retaining female organizers is made particularly difficult because of the long hours and extensive travel requirements associated with the job. Women who must juggle work and family roles find it particularly difficult to fulfill these requirements over long periods of time (Crain, 1994; Needleman, 1993). The historic prevalence of men among union organizers has also contributed to the evolution of an occupational culture that simultaneously glorifies and reinforces masculine modes of behavior. Frequent visits to bars to plan campaign strategy have long been the modus operandi of male organizers (with sometimes serious long-term consequences to their physical and mental health). Women often feel uncomfortable in such settings (Cuneo, 1993; Stinson and Richmond, 1993).

Women's issues have, however, received a great deal of attention in recent years. The relationship between union organizing success and paying attention to unequal treatment in the workplace and family friendly policies - discouraging sexual harassment, and encouraging child care, maternity leave, affirmative action, and pay equity - have all been taken up at the bargaining table (for an overview, see Cook, Lorwin, and Daniels, 1992). Clearly the union's ability to demonstrate that they have addressed these concerns - both in their contracts and through legislative efforts - demonstrates the value of union membership for women (Creese, 1996). Moreover, educating women workers about what is achievable through unionization furthers and extends discontent with present circumstances in their workplace.

More recently, because the economic changes described above have opened up new points of vulnerability among women workers in particular, efforts to address issues like contingent work and temporary work relationships have become decidedly gendered. Analysts have pointed out the importance of winning over women workers by coming up with creative solutions to these realities. For example, nonstandard work arrangements often mean that workers are less identified with

particular employers and more with a set of skills or an occupation. Under these circumstances, occupational approaches to union representation take on added importance, as does organizing workers around issues of access to jobs, training, work standards, portable benefits, and wage standards (Cobble, 1991, 1993; Gerson, 1993). Although fully addressing these issues requires substantial changes in labor law in the United States, recent successes in organizing home health care workers and experiments conducted by SEIU and 9 to 5: The Association of Working Women point to the way of the future (Needleman, 1996; Ness, 1999).

It seems then that there is a growing body of data to confirm that approaches to organizing men and women, especially in sex-segregated facilities, should differ in some fundamental ways. One area that we believe has been woefully neglected, however, pertains to organizational justice (defined below). As we see it, there is no more than a hint in the literature on organizing that suggests that women and men may have distinctively different views on organizational justice and that these differences require alternative organizing agendas and ways of framing discussions about the benefits of unionization. Our purpose in the rest of this paper is to more clearly specify what has only been alluded to in the literature to this point. We also present preliminary data from an ongoing study designed to determine whether existing anecdotal evidence has merit. Specifically, we test the proposition that men and women differ significantly in their views on organizational justice.

II. Organizational Justice

Researchers have broadly defined organizational justice as “people’s perceptions of fairness in organizational settings” (Greenberg, 1996). As such the concept is relevant to the process of organizing because securing fair treatment for union members at the workplace is perhaps the most important goal of unionization. Indeed, researchers have demonstrated that workers feel more positive about their union to the extent that they perceive it to have altered the organizational environment and organizational rewards systems to be fairer (Mellor, Barnes-Farrel, & Stanton,

1999). Organizational justice is also relevant to the process of union organizing because it has been shown to have impact both on employee satisfaction and organizational commitment. Research has also confirmed high levels of employee dissatisfaction and low levels of organizational commitment as antecedents of willingness to join unions (e. g., Hamner & Smith, 1978; Schriesheim, 1978).

Distinctive dimensions of organizational justice have been identified in the literature. These are: 1) distributive justice; 2) procedural justice; 3) interactional justice (Greenberg, 1996).

Distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of reward allocation within an organization, such as their current pay and benefit levels. Procedural justice refers to the formal level of the decision-making process associated with these and related outcomes, including the provision of some system of employee complaint or appeal regarding the consequences of first-stage decision-making.

Finally, the most recent dimension of distributive justice to be distinguished in the literature is interactional justice. This organizational justice dimension has been called the “social side of justice” and refers to the perceived fairness of the way employees are treated by others, particularly organizational decision-makers and authority figures.

These dimensions of organizational justice constitute broad classification domains that subsume complex subsets of social norms and rules determining perceptions of fair treatment within these domains. With regard to distributive justice, numerous studies have demonstrated that individuals differ in terms of how they define fair allocation outcomes (for a review, see Dornstein, 1991). Some believe in an equity norm in arguing that individuals should be rewarded based on their individual level of productivity. Others support an equality standard in which all individuals in the same job should receive the same levels of compensation. Yet others prefer a need standard in which individuals are rewarded based on personal circumstances. While these have been identified as the major distributive justice norms, however, they can also be further adapted to accommodate other more particularized rules for reward allocation. Pay equity, for example, is arguably an approach to compensation that represents an adaptation of the equality norm (where

women's jobs have generalized skills and competencies requirements equal to men's jobs, the pay levels for the women's and men's jobs will be equal).

Similarly, while due process falls within the procedural justice category, it is a specific particularized form of procedural justice. Interestingly, given the nature of most grievance procedures, it is also the specific procedural justice standard that has consistently been shown to correlate most closely with perceptions of fairness (Thibaut & Walker, 1975; Tyler, 1988; Lind & Tyler, 1988). Pivotal in generating these perceptions are features such as offering employees or their representatives the opportunity to present their complaints before a neutral third party and granting final authority for resolving the complaint with this outside neutral.

This discussion of specific norms and rules within the organizational justice dimensions makes it clear that individuals vary with regard to how their perceptions of organizational justice are determined. Multiple sources of variation have been identified ranging from personality attributes to group membership (for a review, see Greenberg, 1996). Indeed, the current authors have identified some variation between union leaders and managers in their support for different distributive justice standards (Simpson & Kaminski, 2001). More recently, moreover, researchers have demonstrated that individuals differ in the value they give to the overall dimensions. That is, some individuals appear to particularly value distributive justice, while others value procedural or interactional justice more highly. Further, individuals have different priorities across the three dimensions (Sweeney & McFarlin, 1997; Lee, Pillutia, & Law, 2000).

This brings us back to women and organizational justice. Although not couched in the organizational justice conceptual framework, the popular as well as academic literature on organizing contains repeated observations that women and men differ in the importance that they place on each of the three dimensions. A fairly consistent message is that women place lesser value on distributive justice than men, while placing higher value on either or both of the remaining dimensions. In a thorough review of the literature on organizing women, Hallock (1997) observed

that one of the most frequent themes coming out of recent campaigns among women workers “is the call for dignity and respect.” “Women often believe,” she further notes, “their work is invisible and undervalued. For women seeking to improve their workplace, demands for dignity, respect, and participation go hand-in-hand.” Here the implication seems to be that because women’s work is so often low-status, interactional justice, being treated with dignity and respect, and possibly also procedural justice, being afforded some input into decision making, assume comparatively greater importance for them. With regard to interactional justice in particular, it is interesting to note that feminist sociologists examining the role of emotions in the workplace have noted that low-status workers more often endure outbursts of anger and other negative emotional displays from superiors than do workers in other types of jobs in the economy (Kemper, 1978; Hochschild, 1983; Thoits, 1989).

Crain (1994) has also implicitly suggested that women and men may differ in the value placed on organizational justice dimensions. Based on her survey of union organizers, she criticized those who “are narrowly focused on ‘bread and butter’ economic issues, such as wages and benefits, rather than on social issues such as dignity, discrimination, or voice which are likely to appeal to pink-collar and service workers.” She argues further that organizers make the mistake of overemphasizing “bread and butter” issues with women workers because “the target population has historically been conceived of as largely male” in their minds.

The literature then contains repeated observations about gender variation in the relative valuation and priority given to distinctive dimensions of organizational justice. These observations are admittedly reformulations of what the experts, namely union staff and local activists, have observed based on their first-hand experience and thus have some evidential basis. There has, however, been no systematic analysis of this issue in the industrial relations literature to date. Further, as previously suggested, union staff and activists sometimes have biased views of gendered approaches to organizing.

As we have previously observed, systematic study may help better guide unions in developing gender-distinctive organizing agendas and ways of framing discussions of the totality of benefits derived from unionization. Further, it may help to resolve the still debatable issue of just what weight to place on economic items like wage and compensation when organizing women. In the rush to affirm the need for unions to address other problem and concerns especially important to women at this historical juncture, the old “bread and butter” concerns are perhaps at risk of being undervalued.

III. The Study

A. Sample

We decided to conduct a study to examine gender differences in views of organizational justice. Thus far, we have collected 286 questionnaires from individuals employed both in public and private sector organizations. We selected part of the sample from among unionized workers attending labor education classes provided for local affiliates of the United Steel Workers of America and the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees. The response rate on surveys in these classes was 100 percent. There was also a 100 percent response rate in a private sector non-union hospital where the co-authors personally administered the survey to a random sample of employees identified by the Director of Human Resources. The response rate was lower in two non-union private sector organizations where human resources administrators to all non-supervisory personnel distributed surveys. One of these firms filled medical prescriptions; the other was a computer data processing firm.

The total number of respondents in our sample was $N=290$. The gender breakdown of our sample was 70 percent ($N=198$) female and 30 percent ($N=85$) male. The average age of respondents was 40.5 years ($SD=10.7$ years). Eighty-one percent ($N=228$) were white, while 19 percent ($N=52$) were members of minority groups. At 10.7 percent ($N=31$) Blacks comprised the

largest portion of the racial minorities. Latin Americans at 1.7 percent (N=2) made up the second largest minority group. The distribution across broad occupational groups was 19.4 percent (N=55) service, 14.4 percent (N=41) clerical, 3.2 percent (N=9) manufacturing/skilled trades, 59.2 percent (N=168) professional/technical, 3.9 percent (N=11) other occupational groups. Twenty-six percent (N=74) were union members; 74 percent (N=216) were not union members. The breakdown for income level was 18.4 percent (N=51) earned less than \$25,000, 46.2 percent (N=128) earned between \$25,000 and \$49,999, 27.1 percent (N=75) between \$50,000 and \$74,999, 6.1 percent (N=17) between \$75,00 and \$99,999, and 2.2 percent (N=6) above \$99,999. For education, .7 (N=2) percent had less than a high school education, 14.9 percent (N=42) had high school degrees, 34.8 percent (N=98) had completed some college courses, 33 percent (N=93) had college degrees, and 16.6 percent (N=47) had attended graduate school.

B. Instruments and Measures

We developed a survey instrument that included questions covering basic demographic information, employee satisfaction, commitment to the union (where applicable) and organization, and attitudes towards organizational justice. Because the results we report here today are preliminary, we focus on a forced-choice section of the survey concerned with organizational justice preferences and demographic characteristics.

For the forced-choice items we employed a technique similar to that used by Hackman and Oldham (1980). The anchors for the items were adapted from measurement tools commonly used by organizational justice researchers. Items covering distributive justice were drawn from the Distributive Justice Index (Price and Mueller, 1986). Procedural and interactional justice items were borrowed from indices developed by Moorman (1991) and since used repeatedly by other researchers (Skarlicki and Latham, 1996; Skarlicki and Folger, 1997; Lee, Pillutla, and Law, 2000).

Respondents were asked to choose which of two job characteristics they would prefer. For example, respondents were asked if they would prefer a job in which the level of pay is fair or a job

in which management treats them with dignity and respect. Respondents indicated the strength of their preference on a five-point scale (e.g., Strongly prefer A to strongly prefer B). Two items that measure different forms of organizational justice were placed in random order in the questionnaire.

To create the variables that measure the relative priority of each form of justice, we took the mean of the eight items that measure a specific form of justice in comparison to the other two forms of justice. (Reverse scoring was necessary on some items so that a larger number reflected a higher priority.)

Our gender dummy variable was coded 1=women or 2= men.

Our control variables included the following:

- 1) age - A continuous variable developed from a question asking, "In what year were you born?"
- 2) race – A dummy variable coded 1=white or 2= minority.
- 3) union status – A dummy variable coded 1=not a union member or 2=union member.
- 4) occupational group – A categorical variable coded service (1), clerical (2), manufacturing/skilled trades (3), professional/technical (4), or other (5).
- 5) income - An ordinal variable coded \$0-\$25,000 (1), \$25,000-\$49,999 (2), \$50,000-\$74,999 (3), \$75,000-\$99,999 (4), and \$100,000 and above (5).
- 6) education – An ordinal variable coded less than a high school degree (1), high school degree (2), some college (3), college graduate (4), and graduate education (5).

IV. Results

Table 1 contains results from a simple MANOVA analysis. In this analysis the variables representing prioritization of the three organizational justice dimensions were dependent variables and gender was the independent variable. We used multivariate analysis of variance because we assumed that priorities might be correlated across the three organizational justice dimensions. The table gives the mean scores for males and females, as well as associated F-values and significance levels.

The between-subjects results indicate that women scored significantly higher than men in the prioritization of distributive justice ($\text{mean}_{\text{women}}=3.10$, $\text{mean}_{\text{men}}=2.84$, $F=9.67$, $p \leq .01$), but they scored significantly lower than men in the prioritization of procedural justice ($\text{mean}_{\text{women}}=2.65$, $\text{mean}_{\text{men}}=3.05$, $F=18.90$, $p \leq .01$). There was no significant gender difference in the prioritization of interactional justice.

However in the presence of controls, the results differ markedly. We next conducted a MANCOVA analysis controlling for the effects of age, race, union status, occupational group, education, and income. Table 2 presents the results of this analysis. Gender no longer has significant effects. Instead, the union status variable has significant effects across all three justice measures. More detail derives from the marginal mean results. Specifically, union members gave lesser priority to distributive justice (marginal mean_{union} = 2.78, marginal mean_{non-union}=3.04, $F=5.28$, $p \leq .05$) and to interactional justice (marginal mean_{union} = 2.90, marginal mean_{non-union}=3.34, $F=20.27$, $p \leq .001$) than did nonunion members. However, union members give greater priority to procedural justice (marginal mean_{union} = 3.31, marginal mean_{non-union}=2.62, $F=43.726$, $p \leq .001$) than did non-union respondents.

One final effort was made to confirm the existence of gender effects. We conducted a third MANCOVA analysis that included a series of interaction terms combining gender with race, occupational group, and union status respectively. Table 3 reports these results. Again, the main effects of union status were significant. The main effects of gender remained insignificant. However, while no effects were noted for the other dimensions, the interaction of gender and race had significant effects on the value given to interactional justice. Further, marginal mean results for the interaction suggest that minority women valued interactional justice more highly ((marginal mean_{minority women} = 3.38, marginal mean_{white women}=3.09, marginal mean_{minority men}=3.14, marginal mean_{white men}, $F=5.52$, $p \leq .05$) than did either white women, minority men, or white men.

The marginal mean results also suggest some useful within-subject comparisons. For minority women, the 3.38 marginal mean value on interactional justice exceeds the marginal means for distributive justice (2.79) and for procedural justice (2.84). Thus, not only do minority women seem to value interactional justice more highly compared to white women and males, but they also seem to value interactional justice over either of the other two organizational justice dimensions.

To confirm this within-subject observation, we created three new variables. The first variable represented the difference obtained when scores on the interactional justice scale were subtracted from the distributive justice scale. The second variable represented the difference between scores on the interactional justice and procedural justice scales, and the third represented the difference between the distributive justice and procedural justice scale scores. We then regressed these mean differences on the same control and interaction terms that were used in Table 3. Based on the marginal means and standard error results from these regressions, we calculated whether marginal mean differences were significant. These results (not shown) indicated that the marginal mean differences between interactional justice and, respectively, distributive and procedural justice were significant for minority women only. Further, the absolute value of the differences confirmed that interactional justice was value more highly than either distributive or procedural justice by minority women.

IV. Discussion

The results suggest that it is the interaction of race and gender that create meaningful differences in attitudes towards organizational justice. Minority women do value interactional justice more than either distributive or procedural justice. They also value interactional justice more than either white women or males. In effect, these results add nuance to the anecdotal evidence regarding how best to organize women: it is not women in general, but minority women who may be most responsive to organizing campaigns that emphasize how unionization can improve how they are treated in routine interactions with supervisors and management.

This is not to say that the other two dimensions of organizational justice should be ignored, but rather that efforts might be made to better articulate the links between improvements in the other two organizational justice domains and being treated with dignity and respect in the workplace. For example, with regard to procedural justice, we interpret the data here to suggest that minority women might be more readily convinced of the usefulness of unions to the extent that they recognize the relationship between union due process mechanisms like grievance procedures and being accorded respectful treatment. Examples can be given of how successful grievances have been filed in the relevant industry or occupation when supervisors treat their subordinates in an abusive manner, e. g. using obscene language; public reprimands. At the same time, as anyone with any experience of unions comes to know, there are real limits to how much formal grievance procedures are likely to constrain behavior that is often subtle in form, difficult to measure by mutually agreed upon criterion, and therefore difficult to substantiate. Consequently, in private sector workplaces where minority female workforces predominate, union organizers might propose that a first contract include provisions that supervisors be trained in conflict management and non-authoritarian approaches to managing people. Also, recent studies have demonstrated that being treated with dignity and respect correlates with supervisors being willing to consider an employee's viewpoint when making decisions (e.g. Moorman, 1991). This points to the need for unions to take more seriously evidence from clerical worker organizing campaigns that working women want to participate more in organizational decision making. Indeed, when organizing minority women, being able to fashion practicable contract proposals that extend employee participation may be especially useful.

In communicating with minority women workers, it behooves unions to reaffirm the link that sociologists have long recognized between pay and status in our society (e.g., Ridgeway, Boyle, & Kuipers, 1998). Improving wage levels of low-wage, low-status service sector workers obviously does not alter the fact that they hold jobs that will probably remain in the lower ranks of

occupational hierarchies in the near future (despite modest pay equity successes), but union workers typically are among the highest paid within an occupation – which plausibly boosts their status somewhat. In addition, the psychological literature (Chatterjee, 1960; Bernick, 1982) suggests that a wage increase may improve feelings of self-worth to a point where once abusive supervisors find former “easy targets” capable of “standing up for themselves.” The question is how best to communicate these psychological interconnections without sounding too much like an academic. Feminist researchers have recognized the pedagogical value of women’s stories, particularly stories about women’s working lives (e.g., Geiger, 1986). Therefore, we believe that telling relevant stories of how women have been personally transformed by their engagement with unions would be a good approach.

REFERENCES

- AFL-CIOb. 2001a. <http://www.aflcio.org/uniondifference/uniondiff4.htm>. Dec. 17, 2001.
- AFL-CIO. 2001b. <http://www.aflcio.org/uniondifference/uniondiff13.htm>. Dec. 17, 2001.
- Baker, P. 1993. “Reflections on Life Stories: Women’s Bank Union.” In Briskin, L. and McDermott, P. (eds.), *Women Challenging Unions: Feminism, Democracy, and Militancy*, pp. 62-86. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Bernick, M. S. 1981. “The Overlooked Relation Between Self-Esteem and Work.” *Political Psychology*, Vol. 3, pp. 211-220.
- Blau, F., Simpson, P. A., & Anderson, D. 1998 “Continuing Progress? Trends in Occupational Segregation in the United States Over the 1970’s and 1980’s.” *Feminist Economics*, Vol. 4, pp. 29-71.
- Briskin, L., and McDermott, P. (eds.). 1993. *Women Challenging Unions: Feminism, Democracy, and Militancy*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, K., and Juravich, T. 1995. *Overcoming Barriers to Organizing Women Workers in the Public and Private Sector*. Washington, DC: Institute for Women’s Policy Research.
- Chatterjee, R. 1960. “Job Satisfaction.” *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 12, pp. 262-264.
- Cobble, D. S. (ed.). 1993. *Women and Unions: Forging a Partnership*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Cobble, D. S. 1991. “Organizing the Postindustrial Work Force: Lessons from the History of Waitress Unionism.” *Industrial and Labour Review*, Vol. 44, pp. 419-436.
- Coulter, R. 1993. “Alberta Nurses and the ‘Illegal’ Strike of 1988” In Briskin, L. and McDermott, P. (eds.), *Women Challenging Unions: Feminism, Democracy, and Militancy*, pp. 44-61. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

- Cook, A., Lorwin, V. R., and Daniels, A. K. 1992. *The Most Difficult Revolution: Women and Trade Unions*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Crain, M. 1994. "Gender and Union Organizing." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 47, No. 2, pp. 227-248.
- Creese, G. 1996. Gendering Collective Bargaining: From Men's Rights to Women's Issues. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, Vol. 33, pp. 437-456.
- Cuneo, C. J. 1993. "Trade Union Leadership: Sexism and Affirmative Action." In Briskin, L. and McDermott, P. (eds.), *Women Challenging Unions: Feminism, Democracy, and Militancy*, pp. 109-136. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Dornstein, M. 1991. *Conceptions of Fair Pay: Theoretical Perspectives and Empirical Research*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Farber, H. S. 1989. "Trends in Worker Demand for Union Representation." *American Economic Review*, Vol. 79, No. 2, pp. 166-171.
- Geiger, S. N. G. 1986. "Women's Life Histories: Method and Content," *Signs*, Vol. 11, pp 334-351.
- Gerson, J. 1993. "Clerical Homeworkers: Are They Organizable?" In Cobble, D. S. (ed.), *Women and Unions: Forging a Partnership*, pp. 226-245. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Greenberg, J. 1996. *The Quest for Justice on the Job: Essays and Experiments*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hackman, J. R., and Oldham, G. 1980. *Work Redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Hallock, M. 1997. "Organizing and Representing Women: Lessons from the U.S." In Pollock, B. (ed.), *Strife: Sex and Politics in Unions*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Hamner, W. C., and Smith, F. J. 1978. "Work Attitudes as Predictors of Unionization Activity." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 63, pp. 415-421.
- Hochschild, A. R. 1983. *The Managed Heart*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- International Labour Organization. 2001. *Executive Summary: The Role of Trade Unions in Promoting Gender Equality and Protecting Vulnerable Workers: First Report of the ILO-ICFTU Survey*. <http://www.ilo/public/english/employment/gems/worker/>. Dec. 17, 2001.
- Izraeli, D. 1985. Sex Differences in Self-Reported Influence Among Union Officers." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 70, pp. 148-156.
- Kemper, T. D. 1978. *A Social Interaction Theory of Emotions*. New York: Wiley.
- Lee, C., Pillutia, M., and Law, K. S. 2000. "Power-Distance, Gender and Organizational Justice." *Journal of Management*, Vol. 26, pp. 685-704.
- Leigh, D., and Hills, S. 1987. "Male-Female Differences in the Potential for Union Growth Outside Traditionally Unionized Industries." *Journal of Labor Research*, Vol. 8, pp. 91-101.
- Lind, E. A., and Tyler, T. 1988. *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*. New York: Plenum.
- McDermott, P. 1993. "The Eaton's Strike: We Wouldn't Have Missed It for the World." In Briskin, L. and McDermott, P. (eds.), *Women Challenging Unions: Feminism, Democracy, and Militancy*, pp. 23-43. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

- Melcher, D., Eichstedt, J., and Eriksen, S. 1992. "Women's Participation in Local Union Leadership: The Massachusetts Experience." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 45, pp. 267-280.
- Mellor, S. 1994. "Gender Composition and Gender Representation in Local Unions: Relationships between Women's Participation in Local Office and Women's Participation in Local Activities." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 80, pp. 706-720.
- Mellor, S., Barnes-Farrel, J, and Stanton, J. M. 1999. "Unions as Justice-Promoting Organizations: The Interactive Effect of Ethnicity, Gender, and Perceived Union Effectiveness." *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, Vol. 40, pp. 33-34.
- Moorman, R. H. 1991. "Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Do Fairness Perceptions Influence Employee Citizenship." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 76, pp. 845-855.
- Needleman, R. 1993. "Space and Opportunities: Developing the Leaders to Meet Labor's Future." *Labor Research Review*, Vol. 20, pp. 5-20.
- Needleman, R. 1996. *Building Relationships for the Long Haul Between Unions and Community-Based Organizations*. Paper to AFL-CIO/Cornell University Conference on Organizing for Success. April. Washington, DC.
- Ness, I. 1999. "Organizing Home Health-Care Workers." *Working USA*, Vol. 3, pp. 59-95.
- Price, J. L., and Mueller, C. W. 1986. *Handbook of Organizational Measures*. Marshfield, MA: Pittman.
- Ridgeway, C., Boyle, E. H., and Kuipers, K. J. 1998. "How Do Status Beliefs Develop? The Role of Resources and Interactional Experience." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 63, pp. 331-350.
- Schriesheim, C. A. 1978. "Job Satisfaction, Attitudes Toward Unions, and Voting In a Union Representation Election." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 63, pp. 548-552.
- Schur, K., and Kruse, D. L. 1992. "Gender Differences in Attitudes Towards Unions." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 46, No. 1, pp. 89-102.
- Simpson, P. A., and Kaminski, M. 2001. *Unionists' Reactions to Rising Wage Inequality: The Relationship Between Microjustice and Macrojustice Revisited*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Skarlicki, D. P., and Folger, R. 1997. "Retaliation in the Workplace: The Roles of Distributive, Procedural, and Interactional Justice." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 82, pp. 434-443.
- Skarlicki, D. P., and Latham, G. P. 1996. "Increasing Citizenship Behavior Within a Labor Union: A Test of Organizational Justice Theory." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 81, pp. 161-169.
- Spalter-Roth, R., Hartmann, H., and Collins, N. 1994. *What Do Unions Do for Women?* Washington, DC: Institute for Women's Policy Research.
- Stinson, J., and Richmond, P. 1993. "Women Working for Unions: Female Staff and the Politics of Transformation." In Briskin, L. and McDermott, P. (eds.), *Women Challenging Unions: Feminism, Democracy, and Militancy*, pp. 136-156. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Sweeney, P. D., and McFarlin, D. B. 1997. "Process and Outcome: Gender Differences in the Assessment of Justice." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 18, pp. 83-98.
- Thibaut, J., and Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Thoits, P. A. 1989. "The Sociology of Emotions." *Annual Review of Sociology* 15: 317-342.
- Tyler, T. R. 1988. "What is Procedural Justice?" *Law and Society Review*, Vol. 22, 301-335.

Table 1:

Manova Analysis Determinants of Organizational Justice Preferences

Part A:				
Variable		Distributive Justice	Procedural Justice	Interactional Justice
<i>Gender</i>	<i>F- value</i>	9.668	18.904	2.546
	<i>Significance</i>	.002	.000	.112
Part B:				
Variable		Distributive Justice	Procedural Justice	Interactional Justice
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Female mean</i>	3.099	2.650	3.251
	<i>Male mean</i>	2.835	3.049	3.116

N= 219

Table 2:
Mancova Analysis Determinants of Organizational Justice References

Part A:		Distributive Justice	Procedural Justice	Interactional Justice
Variable				
<i>Gender</i>	F- Value	2.760	2.879	.001
	<i>Significance</i>	.098	.091	.974
<i>Race</i>	<i>F- Value</i>	.836	.204	2.043
	<i>Significance</i>	.361	.652	.154
<i>Occupational Group</i>	<i>F- Value</i>	.325	1.424	1.120
	<i>Significance</i>	.861	.348	.227
<i>Union Status</i>	<i>F- Value</i>	5.279	43.726	20.265
	<i>Significance</i>	.022	.000	.000
<i>Age</i>	<i>F- Value</i>	.238	.264	1.098
	<i>Significance</i>	.626	.608	.296
<i>Income</i>	<i>F- Value</i>	1.360	.483	3.795
	<i>Significance</i>	.245	.488	.053
<i>Education</i>	<i>F- Value</i>	.175	.030	.384
	<i>Significance</i>	.676	.862	.536

Part B:¹				
Variable		Distributive Justice	Procedural Justice	Interactional Justice
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Female Mean*</i>	2.973	2.846	3.181
	<i>Male Mean</i>	2.833	3.094	3.074
<i>Union Status</i>	<i>Non-Member Mean</i>	3.035	2.623	3.342
	<i>Union Member Mean</i>	2.782	3.314	2.904

N = 256

1. Besides our target variable gender, marginal means are indicated for variables that had either significant main effects or were significant in interaction with other variables.

* These are marginal means that represent the mean value controlling for other variables.

Table 3:
Mancova Analysis Determinants of Organizational Justice References

Part A:		Distributive Justice	Procedural Justice	Interactional Justice
Variable				
<i>Gender</i>	F- Value	.934	1.124	.010
	<i>Significance</i>	.335	.290	.920
<i>Race</i>	F- Value	.387	.191	1.249
	<i>Significance</i>	.535	.662	.265
<i>Occupational Group</i>	F- Value	.463	1.263	1.182
	<i>Significance</i>	.763	.285	.320
<i>Union Status</i>	F- Value	3.874	40.621	21.662
	<i>Significance</i>	.050	.000	.000
<i>Age</i>	F- Value	.501	.128	1.266
	<i>Significance</i>	.480	.721	.262
<i>Income</i>	F- Value	.049	.493	.951
	<i>Significance</i>	.825	.483	.330
<i>Education</i>	F- Value	.136	.006	.222
	<i>Significance</i>	.713	.937	.638
Gender * Race	F- Value	3.421	.143	5.524
	<i>Significance</i>	.066	.706	.020
<i>Gender * Occupational Group</i>	F- Value	.239	.172	.323
	<i>Significance</i>	.869	.916	.809
<i>Gender * Union Status</i>	F- Value	.240	.999	.290
	<i>Significance</i>	.624	.319	.591
<i>Gender * Age</i>	F- Value	.002	.020	.010
	<i>Significance</i>	.963	.887	.920
<i>Gender * Income</i>	F- Value	1.728	.297	.658
	<i>Significance</i>	.190	.418	.586
<i>Gender * Education</i>	F- Value	.064	.192	.531
	<i>Significance</i>	.801	.662	.467

Part B:¹		Distributive Justice	Procedural Justice	Interactional Justice
<i>Variable</i>				
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Female Mean*</i>	2.930	2.824	3.247
	<i>Male Mean</i>	2.811	3.107	3.082
<i>Race</i>	<i>White Mean</i>	2.931	2.938	3.131
	<i>Minority Mean</i>	2.833	2.936	3.231
<i>Gender * Race</i>	<i>White Female Mean</i>	3.105	2.810	3.085
	<i>Minority Female Mean</i>	2.790	2.835	3.376
	<i>White Male Mean</i>	2.733	3.084	3.193
	<i>Minority Male Mean</i>	2.920	3.139	3.139
<i>Union Status</i>	<i>Non-Member Mean</i>	2.974	2.640	3.387
	<i>Union Member Mean</i>	2.778	3.277	2.945

N = 256

1. Besides our target variable gender, marginal means are indicated for variables that had either significant main effects or were significant in interaction with other variables.

* These are marginal means that represent the mean value controlling for other variables.