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Chapter I

THE PURPOSE AND THEORY

The Problem

"We have a message for George Meany. We have a message for Leonard Woodcock. We have a message for Frank Fitzsimmons ...You can tell them we didn't come here to swap recipes."¹

Demands, not recipes, were the order of the day as women representing fifty-eight labor unions gathered at the founding convention of the Coalition of Labor Union Women (CLUW). The women union members present resolved to: press for child-care legislation, full employment and job opportunities for women, ratification of the Equal Rights Amendments and an extension of truly protective legislation for all workers; urge union women to take an active role in their unions and within the trade-union movement as a whole; seek positive action against job discrimination in hiring, promotion, classification, and to lead "union brothers" to aid such affirmative action in the workplace; and organize the millions of unorganized women workers in the labor force,² all largely within the framework of the present labor movement.

The recent founding of CLUW appears to have been part of a trend. A number of unions and state AFL-CIO organizations have been startled

¹The words of Myra Wolfgang, Vice-president of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees Union, as she addressed more than 3,000 women who gathered in Chicago in 1974 to form the Coalition of Labor Union Women (CLUW).

by the tremendous response to women's conferences and women unionist "schools" in the past few years. These meetings have centered on how to get better jobs for women in industry, and leadership posts in the unions. In California, an organization called Union WAGE (Women's Alliance to Gain Equality) has been formed, and its purpose stated: "...to fight against discrimination in the unions and on the job."^3 In Chicago, the United Union Women's Caucus (formed in 1972, and representing women from at least thirty different unions) has lobbied for unemployment compensation for pregnant women, higher minimum wages, and passage of the Equal Rights Amendment. This organization has worked with groups pressing for day-care facilities, and has urged the AFL-CIO to make child care accessible to union members. A similar federation, the Cleveland Council of Union Women (also formed in 1972) stated at the time of its formation: "We are no longer satisfied with our minor role in the labor movement...Our aim is to educate, encourage and assist in whatever way possible all labor women in Cleveland to have more of a voice not only within their own unions, but within the entire local, state and national labor organizations."^4 Clearly, women in trade unions are demanding a stronger voice.

It has been suggested that the formation of CLUW and the sweeping clamour of women activists for the leadership roles within the unions constitute affirmation of the "spread" of women's liberation ideology

---


to blue-collar women. This viewpoint was exemplified in the *Time* account of the genesis of CLUW: "...evidence of a new, pragmatic offshoot of the women's liberation movement: blue-collar feminism. Encouraged by their recent breakthroughs into traditionally male jobs such as apprentice seaman and construction worker, women on the lower levels of the economic ladder are taking a more aggressive stance.\(^5\)

The relationship between union activism and "women's liberation" ideology is the major focus of this study. In addition, the participation of women in their union locals and the barriers to their participation will be examined. Whatever the extent of the influence of "blue-collar feminism" on them, it is certain that the women of CLUW and other women union activists have a staggering task before them: Of the nation's 34 million women workers, only 4 million belong to labor unions. Although more than 25 percent of AFL-CIO membership consists of women, they hold less than 5 percent of the key posts.\(^6\) We should not be surprised, then, if the men who lead the nation's top labor organizations get the idea that many of their "natives" are restless!


\(^6\) Nancy Seifer (op. cit., 33) has put union leadership posts held by women at 4.6 percent calling this "a figure that has even fallen slightly." According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (Berquist, Virginia, "Women's Participation in Labor Organizations." *Monthly Labor Review*, XXVII (October 1974), 39), women have remained rare at the governing and high appointive levels of almost all of the 177 unions in the U.S. Women accounted for only seven percent of the members elected to governing boards of unions and employee associations in 1970. In appointed positions, women most often were research directors, editors, or heads of social insurance departments, but women were found even in these positions infrequently. Although statistical data concerning women in leadership positions below the national level have not been collected, fragmentary information gathered by the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates that women held leadership roles at the local levels only slightly more frequently than at the national level.
The Historical Background

The position of women within the American labor movement has always been paradoxical. In fact, perhaps nowhere in this industrial society has the role of women been more inconsistent than within organized labor. In the earliest days of mass production, women and girls organized spontaneous "turnouts" in resistance to sweatshop conditions. By the early 1800's, women textile mill workers in New England were staging some of the earliest "strikes", in which they demanded the right to unionization, higher wages, and shortening of the twelve hour day. Yet, outside the clothing industry, women were barred from the trade unions of men workers (some unions formed "Jane Crow" locals). In some cases, women were allowed to form "auxiliaries" to the established trade unions: the famed Daughters of St. Crispin, for example, was patterned after and occasionally aided by the trade union of men shoemakers).

In industries where mechanization occurred rapidly, creating a demand for less skilled labor and hence lowering wages, male unionists persistently attacked the competition of women workers, as well as the displacement caused by machine. Many strikes occurred protesting the employment of women in industries dominated by men, before male unionists extended the hand of organization to women. Only with the emergence of the Knights of Labor in the 1880's, however, did organizing


among women gain acceptance.

The 1880's and 1890's began a period of tremendous industrial growth, a time when cheap, tractable labor was much in demand. Women workers were recruited into the lowest paying factory and service jobs. Throughout that era, and several decades after, the AFL functioned as an umbrella for highly autonomous unions organized along craft lines, and the task of organizing low-paid and unskilled trades (where women were largely concentrated) was left wanting.\(^9\) The tradition of women attempting to organize themselves continued sporadically, and without marked results, until the formation of the National Women's Trade Union League in 1902.\(^10\)

The National Women's Trade Union League drew support from men's trade unions, and had some success organizing women to fight for better

\(^9\)Foner (Foner, Phillip, "Women and Negro Workers." History of the Labor Movement in the United States, New York: International Publishers, 1964, 219-255) concentrates specifically on the question of the relationship of the American Federation of Labor to women workers. Statements by Samuel Gompers and convention resolutions promoting equality and the need to organize among women are presented alongside accounts of discrimination against women in various locals. Foner attributes this discrepancy in part to the structure of the AFL. The unions were autonomous from the Federation where any regulations were concerned, and the AFL could not compel unions to admit women. Moreover, Gompers' "assistance" to women unionists appears to have only been vocal patronage.

\(^10\)The NWUTC was proclaimed in its platform to be a "federation of trade unions with women members, with an individual membership of those accepting" its platform. Its objective was not to encourage separate unions for women alone, but rather "increasing the membership of women in existing unions, and developing organization in trades where none exist and where many women are employed." _______, "Platform and Purposes of the NWUTC of America." Life and Labor, (May 1913), 4).
ter working conditions. The organization was closely linked with the suffrage movement, and had in its membership a number of non-working wealthy members (who were, nevertheless, willing to lend financial support to the first large strikes in the women's trades). The militant Industrial Workers of the World (the "IWW", organized in 1904) was the first union to unequivocally seek the membership of women and unskilled, immigrant, and migratory workers (Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, one of the most famous of the "Wobblies" organizers, joined the union at age 15. She is perhaps best remembered for her efforts toward removal of the stigma from women engaging in strike activities).

World War I brought a mass entrance of women into industry, and a further increase in unionization among women. During those years, women who sought admission to the AFL continued to confront apathy and discrimination. Finally, in 1925, the AFL for the first time produced a "Tentative Plan to Organize Women", and implemented a drive in that direction.

Women had remained in the work force after World War I, although they had been pushed out of most skilled and industrial jobs. When the Depression struck in 1929, women workers were among the most destitute of those twelve to seventeen million workers who were unemployed. As the Depression deepened, women workers were widely urged to

---

11 Craton, Ann W., "Women in Industry in New York State." Industrial and Labor Information, II (April 1921), 675, compiled statistics from the 1920 Census. This report estimated that the ratio of women to men industrial workers was, by then, one to four. Yet, only ten percent of the women employed in factories as of that date were unionized.

stay home and leave what few jobs there were to the men, while many of the women workers themselves (the unorganized as well as those who were union members) formed unemployed councils, fought evictions, and demanded relief for unemployed workers. Numerous strikes occurred involving women in mills, in shoe factories, and in the clothing industries. During this period, the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (a union in which, to this day, women predominate) grew to five times its former size. In 1935, the CIO broke away from the AFL, and began to organize women on an industry-wide basis in unprecedented numbers.

By the beginning of World War II, over six million women had entered the labor force. During the war years, the number of married women in the work force doubled, changing the profile of the average woman worker, and setting a trend which has continued through the present, 13 a trend which, doubtless, has continuing implications for the participation of women in unions. In addition, the average age of the employed woman shifted upward to the mid-thirties age bracket during this period (up from 28 in 1920), and has remained there for several decades (39 in 1973). 14 The UAW was one of several unions which ex-

13The U.S. Department of Labor Women's Bureau reported in 1973 that almost three-fifths (58 percent) of all women workers are married and living with their husbands, while approximately one-fifth (23 percent) are single. Another one-fifth (19 percent) are widowed, divorced or separated from their husbands.

14Valerie Kinkaid Oppenheimer has commented interestingly on the interaction of supply and demand operating when this influx of older married women into the labor force occurred: the decline of typical male worker and the demand for female labor opened up job opportunities which had not previously existed for married and older women. The rush of this group into the labor force was, in part, a response to increased job opportunities—but also a creator of certain jobs. (Oppenheimer, Valerie K., The Female Labor Force in the United States, Berkeley: University of California, Institute of International Studies, 1970, 186-187).
panded greatly due to the enrollment of women—350,000 women joined during the war years, and a permanent Woman's Bureau was set up by the union in response to the needs and interests of the new women members.

After WW II, some labor leaders were among those who again suggested that women should relinquish their jobs, although the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor and the UAW Woman's Bureau worked diligently against such pressures. Both the Labor Department's Women's Bureau and the UAW Woman's Department conducted surveys in 1944 among women workers and found, respectively, that 85 percent and 80 percent of the women sampled intended to continue working. By 1958, women unionists totaled 3.2 million, or 18.2 percent of the total of all union membership. Ten years later (1968), their number had risen to 19.5 percent of all union members (3.9 million). In 1970, women members of labor unions numbered 4.3 million, or approximately 20 percent of all union members. Significantly, throughout the period of 1958-1970, the ratio of women union members to employed women has declined—union organizing among women has not kept pace with the entrance of

15 Tobias, Shelia, and Anderson, Lisa, "Whatever Happened to Rosie the Riveter?" Ms., II (February 1974), 92-94.

16 1958 was the first year the Bureau of Labor Statistics began collecting data on women union members.

women into the labor force. Moreover, the vast majority of women members remain lumped within a few unions (see TABLE I). Even in several industries where the majority of employees are women, unionization remains negligible in contrast to the extent of unionization in industries where men constitute the majority (see TABLE II).

The reasons for this low level of involvement of women with the movement of organized labor will be examined in detail in later sections of this research report. At the outset, it seems necessary to present the claim often heard when women union activists gather: that working women continue to be regarded as marginal workers not only by employers, but also by unions in many instances. The formation of CLUW and other women's labor caucuses are pointed to as the necessary offspring of the perennial disregard women suffer in the hands of the unions. The relatively high number of discrimination suits filed by women against unions may be cited as partial evidence. In Fiscal 1970, 2,684 sex discrimination charges were filed by women employees against employers, while in the same year, at least 488 sex discrimination charges were filed by women against unions (mostly their own

18Of course, it is well known that union membership, overall, is growing slowly and, as a percentage of the total workforce, is actually declining, even when the pattern of growth among service and public employee unions is taken into account. Wertheimer and Nelson have estimated that only 13 our of every 100 women workers today are union members (based on the updated—1975—total of 4.8 million women in the workforce). They state: "The ratio of women unionists to women in the workforce has actually dropped from 13.8 to 12.5 percent in the last ten years." (Wertheimer, Barbara, and Nelson, Ann, Trade Union Women: A Study of Their Participation in New York City Locals, New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975, 7).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union:</th>
<th>1958</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of</td>
<td># of</td>
<td># of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Government Employees (AFGE)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ladies Garment</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clothing Workers</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Electrical Workers (IBEW)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teamsters</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Communication Workers</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Automobile Workers</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Service Employees</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Hotel Workers</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. State, County, Municipal (AFSCME)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, all unions</td>
<td>3,274</td>
<td>3,940</td>
<td>4,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Women to Total Membership

|                                                  | 1958 | 1968 | 1972 |
|                                                  | %    | %    | %    |
| 1. Government Employees (AFGE)                    | *    | 33.0 | *    |
| 2. Ladies Garment                                | 75.0 | 80.0 | 80.0 |
| 3. Clothing Workers                              | 75.0 | *    | 75.0 |
| 4. Electrical Workers (IBEW)                     | 30.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 |
| 5. Teamsters                                     | 11.0 | *    | 14.0 |
| 6. Communication Workers                        | 60.0 | 50.0 | 55.0 |
| 7. Automobile Workers                            | 10.0 | 12.0 | 13.0 |
| 8. Service Employees                             | 20.0 | 40.0 | 35.0 |
| 9. Hotel Workers                                 | 40.0 | 32.0 | *    |
| 10. State, County, Municipal (AFSCME)            | *    | *    | 33.0 |
| Total, all unions                                | 18.2 | 19.5 | 20.0 |

*Data not reported, but BLS estimates included in totals


TABLE II
Women as a Percent of Employment by Industry,¹ and Estimated Extent of Union Organization by Industry²:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Group</th>
<th>Women as a % of Total Employment in the Industry</th>
<th>Extent of Unionization</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordnance and accessories</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and bev. products</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco products</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel &amp; fabric products</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile (mill products)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>less than 25%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumbar &amp; wood products</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and fixtures</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25-50%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper products</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>over 75%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing &amp; publishing</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical products</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>over 75%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum products</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>over 75%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber products</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather products</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>25-50%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone, clay, glass, concrete</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary metal products</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricated metal products</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25-50%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25-50%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical products</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation equipment</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>over 75%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific instruments</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25-50%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous manufacturing</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>less than 25%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manufacturing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, quarrying, &amp; drilling</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>over 75%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>over 75%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone &amp; telegraph</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities services</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale &amp; retail trade</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>less than 25%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, insurances, &amp; real</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estate</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>less than 25%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous service</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>less than 25%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Excluding agricultural employment
2 Extent of unionization is based on total membership


unions). Yet, lest we should be misled, a research team at the University of Michigan which has studied sex discrimination has found that working women who do not belong to unions are among those subject to the highest levels of discrimination.

The Theoretical Perspectives

The available literature and union documents provide little insight into the exact character of women's involvement in the workforce and in the organized labor movement (see Chapter II, A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE). On the whole, the academic writing and research has been strikingly superfluous when attempts have been made to examine the economic and technological aspects of women's work and work-related activities. The vast preponderance of inquiries into the status of women's work and corresponding social change has been within the context of family studies. Women have generally been studied as adjuncts to men or families, and when the relationship of women to market institutions is discussed, it is generally in regard to conflict or change in the family roles of working wives and mothers. The literature concerned with unions—and that produced by unions—alternately portrays the woman worker as a strikebreaker, and then as a crusader shouldering through the unabashed misogyny of male unionists (neither


is without historical relevance, but both stereotypes have led away from the reality of the women unionists' position—which should not be stereotyped. The obvious and traditional sources, then provide little in the way of a theoretical touchstone for this category of research (working women as unionists).

The myriad of changes in the position of women in this century has had two central phases. First, as has been pointed out, millions of women have been added to the workforce. Employment statistics verify, but scarcely reveal the depth of the transformations in every sector of society contributed to and caused by this phenomenon. The outstanding feature of the second phase has been the accretion of married women in the workforce.\textsuperscript{21} Since most women who work have full-time jobs, and most working women are mothers,\textsuperscript{22} we know that most women who work are doing "two jobs". We should not be surprised, therefore, that the majority of analyses of women's participation in the workforce (and in unions) have been stated in terms of the "dual role" of women.


Until the early half of this century, all the functional assignments of women—childbearing, childrearing, and commodity production—were largely carried out in one place—the home—and combined in one role. As more and more of commodity production was removed from the home as a result of industrial expansion, production work by women was split off from the domestic role. A separate (worker) role developed for women as the industrialized economy became steadily more dependent upon the labor of women. Despite the steady influx of women into the labor force, the function of private household service predominated as the culturally approved ideal of women's role. And, despite the permanent nature of this change in the economic base, private employment policies and public policies in regard to women workers have lagged in recognition of the dual nature of women's work. In policy rationales, the employment of women has continued to center on women's childbearing and childrearing functions. Arguments against the employment of women have been based on its deleterious effect on the birth rate (and family life), while, on the other hand, the antinatalist arguments for the two-role ideology have encouraged women to get jobs as, in effect, a form of birth control.\(^{23}\) Today, women spend a significantly shorter portion

\(^{23}\)The relationship of women's employment to fertility is not entirely clear cut. Studies of developing countries have shown a definite drop in fertility among women who participate in the labor force. Other studies have viewed the decline in the birth rate as the independent variable (Mincer, Jacob, "Labor Force Participation." International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, New York: MacMillan, VIII (1968), 479). Contraception is more and more being emphasized in connection with pregnancy planning in this country, and Bernard has pointed out that the logic of the antinatalist argument for the two-role ideology "did not seem to work...Either jobs were not interfering with having babies or having babies was less and less interfering with labor force participation (ibid.). By the late 1960s, according to Census data (\_, "Fertility of the Population: January, 1969." Bureau of the Census, Series P-20, No. 203, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, July 6, 1970, Table 4, 12) the fertility of women in the labor force was nearly approaching the fertility of women not in the labor force.
of a somewhat longer life in the actual bearing and nursing of babies than in the past.\textsuperscript{24}

In spite of the often-cited extended use of household appliances, studies have indicated that women spend at least as much time on household tasks (excluding child-care) as their grandmothers did fifty years ago, although there is some evidence that women who work outside the home spend less time taking care of their homes than housewives do (the latter appears to be more indicative of greater efficiency in housework than a lowering of "standards" or any form of added help).\textsuperscript{25} Thus, the burden working women carry does not seem to be shrinking at all, even as they are compelled to spend longer and longer portions of their lives in the workforce. Still, systematic research into the resulting (possible) strain and means of adjustment has been minimal.

We do know that working women face objective obstacles in their attempts to conform to work norms. In addition to the remarkable juggling act many women perform to fulfill their child-care and housekeeping duties while working, women also very often have to leave work in emergencies, or work part-time, or (more significantly) interrupt their work lives altogether for longer periods of time. For all this, women workers are penalized. The lower pay women receive, across the board,

\textsuperscript{24}In 1956, women averaged three and one-half years in childbearing and nursing, compared with the corresponding average of 15 years, 50 years prior (Myrdal, Alva, and Klein, Viola, \textit{Women's Two Roles: Home and Work}, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1956, 20).

is the most striking penalty. Women lose seniority rights, pensions, and overall job security through interruptions, or never acquire them at all when they have part-time status. In many occupations, women continue to be excluded from training and promotion, and, as noted above, a significant proportion of working women continue to be concentrated in the most backward and least secure branches of industry.

The alleged cost factors incident to the employment of women, usually based on the "greater turnover" or "special services" they require, have traditionally been advanced by employers as the rationale for the lower pay they receive. Despite the increased staying power women have demonstrated in the work force in recent decades, the normative expectation is that women are, or should be, considerably less career oriented than men. Although scarcely anyone believes that women work for "pin money" any longer, there is a lag in the public conception of the great number of women who are now in the workforce all their lives.

About how women themselves view their persistent image as temporary or part-time worker little is known. Insufficient research has been directed to how women perceive their work lives or the barriers to their full participation in the work force (We might expect, however, that considerable research activity will be carried-out in this area in future years, due to the growing interest in "women's issues").

The notions of changing roles and "dual" roles for women have provided something of a framework for the innumerable statements of the "woman question" in recent years. Throughout our society, there is a vast popular recognition that there is surely something "happening
to women, and the idea of women's role has frequently been the nexus for examining marital strain, change in the family power relationships, the various effects on children, etc., when the employment of women is under consideration. To this extent, the concept of role (though it is usually not carefully defined, in the theoretical sense) is useful. Attempts to illuminate the role modification working women are undergoing, however, have not sufficiently described the apparent changes in the social structure.

Neither her changing role, nor her attitudes, nor her workforce habits have dictated the woman's position within the work world (and within organized labor). What does stand out as the principal determinant of the extent and character of the employment of women is their relationship to the predominating production relations and the state of the economy.

The emergence of women as wage laborers, a change directly linked with alterations in the mode of commodity production, has already been discussed. Women have always constituted a flexible and readily available reserve labor pool. However, the relationship of women's work-

26

The pervasive public deliberation offers remarkable (perhaps unprecedented) research possibilities to social scientists, but the latter have so far failed to produce much on this topic. Writers of women's magazines, editors of church newspapers, and even sports columnists have examined the change women (and therefore all of society) are undergoing in more direct terms and in a generally more definitive manner than sociologists and their academic counterparts. None of the researchers--industrial sociologists, role theorists, family sociologists, manpower and labor economists, industrial and occupational specialists, have contributed a work of significance specifically concerned with blue collar working women. Moreover, the available texts on "work" focus almost exclusively on men (see Chapter II).
force participation to the cycles of market expansion and contraction is not clear cut. Some economists believe that there is an inverse relationship between wages and the size of the labor force. Thus, when times are good and a family's real income rises, women and other "marginal" workers are less eager to secure employment. Conversely, (according to this theory), the labor force swells during production crises, not only because wages fall, but because the unemployment of breadwinners forces wives, children, older persons, and those not normally in the workforce to seek employment. Support for this theory is seen in the swelling of the workforce by such "additional" workers during times of severe economic crisis (such as the 1930's).

Other theorists assert that the labor force expands during economic booms, because women and youth are lured into easily available jobs and relatively high wages. Some see the cyclical variation as having double peaks, with troughs showing-up during recession and in early phases of recovery.

These arguments seem to contradict each other, and also fail to account for demographic and other socio-economic factors which may affect the proportion of women in the labor force (marriage and birth rates, changing family sizes, migration between rural and urban areas, immigration, wars, improved standards of living, etc.). Unfortunately, the available statistical data do not shed much light on the propensity of women to be employed as it is affected by business cycles, but the fact remains that women at all times provide a source of cheap and temporary labor, both in periods of expansion and periods of
Women's "role," as it is usually delineated, is little more than an elaboration of the variable sex division of labor in regard to women. Of course, the distribution of labor and the social meaning of labor are, and always have been, subject to continual change. For example, the present movement of women into the sphere of public work does not mark the first participation of women in society-wide production. As Engels put it:

In the old communist household, which embraced numerous couples and their children, the administration of the household, entrusted to the women, was just as much a public, a socially necessary industry as the providing of food by the men. This situation changed with the patriarchal family, and even more with the monogamous individual family. The administration of the household lost its public character. It was no longer the concern of society. It became a private service. The wife became the first domestic servant, pushed out of participation in social production. Only modern large-scale industry again threw open to her—and only to the proletarian woman at that—the avenue to social production; but in such a way that, when she fulfills her duties in the private service of her family, she remains excluded from the public production and cannot earn anything; and when she wishes to take part in public industry and earn her living independently, she is not in position to fulfill her family duties.  

The nuclear family is viewed as the primary arena for the maintenance and production of labor power. Labor is divided by sex so

---

27 Oppenheimer has argued rather persuasively that there has definitely been an increase in the demand for female labor, not merely a general rise in the demand for general labor power thereby affecting women (Oppenheimer, Valerie K., "Demographic Influence on Female Employment and the Status of Women." American Journal of Sociology, LXXVIII (January-May 1973), 73-74.

that virtually all of this necessary work is performed by women, while men move in an entirely different productive sphere—the man's contribution to the family is the wage "earned" by his expenditure of labor for the capitalist. Marx pointed out that this system of maintenance and reproduction of labor-power is necessarily "individual consumption," a process in which the laborer turns the money paid him for his labor-power into means of subsistence.\(^29\) The wage system is the link between the capitalist mode of production and the system of individual consumption. Tradition has women and men approaching the wage system from very different points of view, and, as is frequently pointed out in the "women's liberation" literature, this is one of the central contradictions inherent in the individual family. Of course, not all women are strictly concerned with the creation of "use-values" (the creation of items for individual consumption)—throughout the history of capitalist production women have also functioned as wage laborers. Industrialization has brought an ever-increasing involvement of women in socially-productive activity.

Pre-industrial values still hold a prominent place in questions having to do with women's work. The division of labor by sex remains almost as rigid on the job as in the family (although change has occurred more rapidly in the workplace than in the home). The doctrine of male supremacy, which arose upon the economic foundation of the individual family, remains a prime aspect of the employment picture, while the unhalting process of the erosion of the family as an economic unit

presents a principal contradiction.

The culture is, at present, undergoing rapid change with regard to women's work, presenting mammoth inconsistencies. The increasing demand for female labor, along with shifting consumption patterns and life-style values, stand in opposition to vestigial pre-industrial values (above) and the continuing "discontinuity of labor force attachment" women experience. Further, automation and other technological advances diminish the importance of the comparative physical weakness of women and therefore open doors to the divestment of sex segregation in employment—but, at the same time, automation seems to be leading to structural unemployment in some industries that have been important to women workers (although some of this slack has been and will continue to be taken up by rapid growth in the service sector). It appears that women will continue to face high levels of unemployment and uncertainty in the job market, and conflicting cultural norms regarding their participation in the workforce.

More consistency appears in the apparent changes in the work values of women themselves. In 1975, McCall's magazine printed a questionnaire directed to women workers, and designed to "find out just who these women are, why they work, what they do, how they deal with house and jobs and children and husband, what, if any, strains

30An expression coined by Turner (Turner, Marjorie, Women and Work, Los Angeles: Institute of Industrial Relations, 1964, 14) to refer to job interruptions resulting from family responsibilities, yet the term could apply very suitably to the general instability of women's employment—a problem which is severe in industry and some segments of the service occupations.
working imposes on their family, their marriage, themselves."31 Within a month, the magazine reported 30,000 replies had been received, with "carloads" still pouring in. Overall, the extraordinary response was summarized as suggesting:

...that these women feel that the fact of their working is central to their lives, determining every other aspect of it—their relationships with husband and children, their style and standard of living and, most of all, their sense of themselves. The working woman, for better or worse, feels she is entirely different from her nonworking friends. She feels a close kinship with other women who work and does a great deal of thinking about the problems that flow from her working.32

A study reported in MS. magazine conducted among blue collar women (an undeterminable proportion of whom were employed) reported similar, important changes in attitude over past years. The Investigators, Social Research, Inc., of Chicago, have been probing the attitudes of blue collar women for twenty-five years, and as late as 1965 predicted that no important changes were expected, for the blue collar woman was viewed as: "captive of the triangle of husband, children, and home."33

In 1974, these researchers were surprised to find:

--A shift in career values—almost a third say they would not choose homemaking as a career if they were 15 years old.
--A new desire for independence—eight years ago, close to half of the women queried thought that a second car was just a luxury; today, the same number see it as a necessity.
--A desire for fewer children—In 1965, most blue collar wives thought four children were an ideal family. Today, 71 percent in their early twenties say they plan to have two children, one—or none at all.
--A new interest in community and jobs—the blue collar wife

31Cadden, Vivian, "How do Women Really Feel About Working?" McCall's, XXXII (June 1974), 87-90, 125-130.
32loc. cit., 88.
33________}  "f j 0 More Starch for Blue Collar Wives." Ms., II (February 1974), 18.
is expressing a marked interest in the larger world, no longer confining herself to domestic matters.34

In yet another study last year, Daniel Yankelovich interviewed 3,500 youths of both sexes and compared the responses of the college students with those of the young workers. In addition to the overall attitude favoring greater sexual freedom—which Yankelovich contends will put marriage and the family under greater stress—the survey found most young people subscribing to the "assertions of women's 35 While the college women viewed the women's movement as giving them more of a chance to combine marriage and career, the young working women saw the movement as: "making motherhood and marriage less attractive to them unless combined with a career."36

These findings appear to confirm that women's outlooks toward both work and "women's role" are undergoing a significant metamorphosis in keeping with the structural change described above (a gradual alteration of the sex division of labor, bringing progressively more females into the socially productive work, despite the pull of backward forces). Although the studies focused primarily on the attitudes of younger women, and we have no research information on the more mature women workers—many of whom, perhaps, have lived through more painful subjective aspects of this change than future generations of women workers will have to endure—there is every reason to believe that these older workers have also had a part in the attitude transformation which has

34 Ibid.
35 McCormack, Patricia (UPI Family Editor), "Survey Shows Youths Favor Sex Freedom: Unrest Now Found Among Those In Workforce." Kalamazoo Gazette, CXXXI (June 2, 1974), B-6.
36 Ibid.
been occurring.37

The data which document the changing female role fail to shed light on the class-dynamics of the apparent change. The question of how this monumental social trend was set in motion has been answered by two basically different points of view. One, the "feminist" viewpoint, credits the changing consciousness of womankind for the modification of women's roles. Women's realization of their subjugation and exploita-
tion at the hands of men is both the source and the continuation of the "women's liberation movement." Women's participation in work outside their households is seen as (voluntary, and) a reflection of attitudes of increased self-worth in relation to men, as well as the result of victories in the cultural and economic spheres.

Considerations of socio-economic class are usually not an impor-
tant part of the "feminist" viewpoint, except for the recognition of education as an important determinant of "feminism". Of course, the organizational apparatuses of the women's liberation movement have traditionally rested on the shoulders of educated liberal bourgeoisie. Until recent years, feminist literature and culture have also been the domain of the more privileged class elements. Implicit in the "fem-
inist" viewpoint of women's changing role, then, is that "feminist" ideology trickles down to the masses of women.

The opposing, "Marxist" point of view claims that the women's

37Mature women are now in the labor force far more than they ex-
pected to be. A longitudinal study of women workers has found that those in the 35 to 44 year age group have revised their plans and are staying in the workforce (________, Years for Decision, III, Columbus: Ohio State University Center for Human Resource Research, 1973, 17.)
liberation movement has always been, and is, part and parcel of the comprehensive advance of labor in capitalist society. The dramatic alterations of the woman's role and of the modern industrial family is largely a result of the great concentration of proletarian women in the workforce. The movement of women into public work has ensued from the labor needs of capitalist production—rather than a spontaneous leap forward in the consciousness of womankind (the "Marxist" approach to this question does account for the influence of ideology...involvement in public production does change the values and expectations of women and families in the direction of support for expanded work force participation for females).

The "Marxist" viewpoint accounts for the literary and organizational leadership by the liberal bourgeoisie in the women's liberation movement in the same way the "feminist" does—women of the elite have felt the sting of male supremacy the same as the poorest women, and they, moreover, have traditionally had the education, resources, and leisure time to participate in feminist organizations, write, etc. But, it is the working class woman who has dramatically altered the modern industrial family, the "Marxist" viewpoint asserts, by reducing the economic dependency of women and children on men, and therefore, weakening the family as an economic unit. This has a super-structural effect on all classes. Thus, the Marxist viewpoint contends that working class women are the backbone of the women's liberation movement, rather than the class element to whom this ideology has filtered down. (The very broad question of the class origin of the women's liberation movement is perhaps empirically unmanageable...however, this
research does aim to get at the extent of women's liberation ideology among working women who are not part of the cultural tradition of the feminist movement).

Along these same lines, it is necessary to mention the often-cited antipathy between blue collar women and the liberal feminists who are largely petty-bourgeois (white collar). Despite the absence of scientifically conducted research in this area, the popular literature has suggested that most blue collar women do not see the liberal feminists as "speaking for them". Opinion polls have found that the majority of blue collar women support the goals of women's liberation groups, but not those groups per se, or the "rhetoric" they use. Kathleen McCourt's 1972 study in the Chicago area found many "lower middle class" women agreeing that "women are as capable as men of being good leaders in science, education, and politics," and "wives should have as much to say as husbands in making important household decision," and yet those same women referring to feminists as "kookie," "man-hating," and "bra-burners." As to the viewpoint of blue collar women who are union members toward the feminist spokeswomen, we have little save the comments of Alice B. Cook, who wrote in 1968 that the "women's liberation movement" wasn't "doing a whole lot to help me...And when I say me, I mean my kind of people." She wrote further:

---


Although I think it would be a really great thing to be able to come in and say to my husband, 'Sorry, I'm going away for the weekend,' and demand my freedom, that's not the important thing.

I think women's liberation has got to be the kind of group that is willing to go out and educate the husbands and the men, and that it's got to be involving people like me and the things that are really important to us, like if we've got work, a job where we can earn a decent salary—or women alone should be able to support their own families. 40

However the women unionists view the liberal feminists, they have in common with them the struggle for the basic rights of women. The struggle for women's equality is also very much part of the general struggle for democracy and democratic control within the unions.

In summary, we may say that the separation of the sexes and job segregation remain the primary bases for discrimination against women in unions. Labor unions, like other institutions, reflect the economic base, and women's place within organized labor has always been inextricably tied to the status of women within the labor force. We know little about union structure as regards women's participation, except that change within labor unions is slow in coming—despite unions being based on the tradition of struggle. This lag is due both to increasing bureaucratization, and apparently, to unwieldy communication networks.

Chapter II
A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

No research has previously investigated the relationship between union activism and women's liberation ideology. No studies of working women's involvement with women's liberation or the concept of women's liberation have been published, to date.\(^{41}\) The research which has preceded this in the area of women union member's attitudes and participation has been limited.

Research Focused on the Individual Union Member As the Unit of Analysis

Only one study, to date, has examined the participation of women in their labor unions. Barbara Wertheimer and Anne Nelson, of Cornell University's School of Industrial and Labor Relations, began in September of 1972 an extensive inquiry into the barriers that keep women from participating more fully in their unions. The project centered on seven unions in the Metropolitan New York area, and involved questionnaires to over 1,500 rank and file men and women, as well as a number of interviews with women rank and file leaders. Wertheimer and Nelson's findings\(^{42}\) were interpreted by them as indicating that women's participation at every level of union activity is jeopardized by lack of

\(^{41}\) Janet Spence, Robert Helmreich, and Joy Stapp of the University of Texas have developed an "Attitude Toward Women Scale," which contains a few items appropriate for measuring women's liberation ideology in women, but the whole scale cannot be readily adapted for these purposes. Other researchers who have produced "feminism" scales which are interesting, but not adaptable to this project, are Anne Steinman (1960), Joan Acker (1974), and Jean Stockard (1971).

\(^{42}\) op. cit., 93.
information, training, and experience (relative to male members), and not by lack of interest on their parts. Another phase of the study was a questionnaire to the chief officers of local unions in New York City with over ten percent women members (the latter brought responses covering 108 locals). The results of these questionnaires showed that the union position women most often hold is that of shop steward, and that when women are found in executive boards, they tend to hold the posts of secretary or trustee.

Several earlier studies have centered on union membership trends without concentrating on, or even looking at, women's participation. Walker and Guest,^43 who sampled auto workers in the early 1950's, found members participating in the union to the extent that they felt a sense of belonging in it. Form and Dansereau^44 also attempted to uncover the dynamics of union participation from the point of view of the individual member. Their research indicated that members who tend toward a "social activist orientation" are most likely to participate in union activities. Members who emphasize their economic interest in the union were cited as those second most involved in the union.^45

In yet another study which focused on the individual, Rosen and Rosen^46 grouped union members, by their attitudes, into four categories.

---


44 Form, Nathan H., and Dansereau, Harry K., "Union Member Orientations and Patterns of Social Integration." Industrial and Labor Relations Review, XI (1957), 213-221.

45 loc. cit., 3-12.

Those identified as the "patriots" were those who consistently support the union, while the "pickers and choosers" actively supported the union on some issues. A third group had to be termed "fence sitters" for the purposes of the study, while the "gripers" were those constantly dissatisfied with the union.47

A survey conducted in the San Francisco Bay area by the University of California's Institute of Industrial Relations in the mid-60's48 aimed at determining the attitudes toward unionism of active and passive members. As would be expected, the results showed a clear relationship between participation in union affairs and positive attitudes toward unionism. Older members and members of long standing were found to be more likely to attend union meetings than younger members. Respondents who reported lower levels of educational attainment had better attendance records than the respondents with higher levels of educational attainment, although the differences between the highest and lowest groups were not great (a partial explanation may lie in the fact that the younger members have a higher average level of educational attainment than do their older counterparts).

Spinrad's unique examination of city versus suburban residency for its effects on union membership attitudes49 was reported in the

47 Ibid.


now well-known BLUE COLLAR WORLD. Distinctly different patterns were seen to emerge in union participation between the urban and suburban dwellers. In this work, Spinrad claimed that the city-dweller's unionism tends to be an outgrowth of his working-class milieu, while the suburbanite's unionism reflects an element of deliberate choice, and is correlated with the extent of work-group orientation and degree of ideological commitment to unionism. In Spinrad's view, the typical features of suburbia generally decrease attachment to the trade union. The industrial worker who lives in the suburbs is particularly subject to a dichotomy between work and home worlds, particularly because the suburban community contains many neighbors who are sociologically different from the city neighborhoods where industrial workers typically live. The suburban values cited by Spinrad as potentially inimical to unionism are: "...an inordinate concern for status and consumption display as an expression thereof; an insistence that disputes, including industrial disputes, can best be solved by discussion and conciliation rather than an aggressive action; an orientation toward individual initiative rather than collective activity for solving problems; a possible political conservatism, reflected in voting patterns."^50

The preliminary findings of one as yet unpublished study suggest that women union activists tend also to be deeply involved in nonunion community organizations.^51 Hagedorn and Labovitz's study of occupa-

^50 loc. cit., 216.

^51 Edna Raphael, sociologist at Pennsylvania State University, has a research report underway tentatively entitled, "From Sewing Machines to Politics: The Woman Union Member in the Community."
tional characteristics and participation in voluntary associations went beyond that simple correlation, although Hagedorn and Labovitz did not focus on women. Their findings indicated that skills acquired by performing as a leader in the work organization (we may certainly generalize to union work) are extended to voluntary associations. Leadership skills such as decision-making, discretion in giving orders, handling of discipline, taking responsibilities, and co-ordinating activities, were found to be both necessary and sufficient for participation, and sufficient for joining. In addition, the researchers reported that leadership is the dominant variable for joining three or more organizations. These findings suggest that women union members who perform as leaders in the work situation might be expected to emerge as leaders in the union organization, or perhaps in both the union and other voluntary associations.

The motivational factors of union participation are not clearly accounted for by Hagedorn and Labovitz. The extent to which ideological commitment leads to the development of leadership skills in the workplace, in the union, and in other voluntary activities was not accounted for by any researchers so far. Moreover, the workplace leadership Hagedorn and Labovitz examined appears to have been only that on the part of men, and only those in managerial positions. The development of leadership skills in women workers, first of all, might very well be different in both form and content from that cited by

---

Hagedorn and Labovitz. Then, too, practical experience indicates that workers who emerge as leaders on the shop floor (for example) do so less as a result of bureaucratic control or administrative skill than commitment to values shared with other workers. The obtaining of leadership skills in political parties, and in churches, time-honored traditions in the labor unions, also suggests ideological and political commitment can be considered an intervening or at least an important variable.

Research Focused On The Union As The Unit Of Analysis

Sayles and Strauss concentrated on the group dynamics of union participation, as they studied twenty union locals over a five-year period, hypothesizing that members tend to participate as a group. Their results indicated that union members often enter into union activism over particular issues, grouping together to obtain particular benefits. This initial activity leads to consolidation of former friendships and political groupings, while success in gaining benefits often brings further group participation. This study defined "participation" as expenditure of time on union affairs. The several measures of participation used by Sayles and Strauss—attending union meetings, paying dues, filing grievances, and taking part in strikes—were later adapted and used by Wertheimer and Nelson in their participation index. These measures have now been incorporated into this study,

54 loc. cit., 61-63.
in part, (see APPENDIX A).

In addition to their emphasis on the circular nature of group participation, Sayles and Strauss also discovered why some groups seem more likely to obtain desired goals from union activity than others. Four factors were suggested to be important: the homogeneity of the group (resulting in an ability to unite to achieve its objectives); its status or prestige in the plant community; the technical importance of the group or department's work to the company; and the nature of the job the group does (some departments or jobs leave the workers without time or too exhausted to discuss union affairs, while others offer opportunities to discuss the union and leave the workers fresh to spend extra hours after work on union activities).  

Sayles and Strauss also explored the patterns of participation of women and minority group members in their study, concluding only that the relationship of women and minority groups to the union is determined more by community attitudes and the cultural background of the membership than by what happens in the workplace.  

Studies Reporting On The Factor Of Job Satisfaction

A few studies have reported on job satisfaction, with reference to union participation. Spinrad found that union activists tend to like their jobs, although workers promoted to managerial jobs are less likely to remain active in the union. Wertheimer and Nelson's find-  

55loc. cit., 199-201.
56loc. cit., 210-219.
ings corroborate this, but those researchers have noted that women seem less likely than men to move into jobs that mean leaving the union or the security and companionship of their work groups. Spinrad's review of the union member participation literature suggests that the following factors are correlated with high levels of union member participation: small workplace size; intimacy in the workplace community; stability in the work group; workplace conditions conducive to mingling; homogeneity in the work group; high status jobs; workforce residing in a predominantly urban area; neighbors also working together; unionism in the family background; friendship with union leaders; workers originating in blue collar neighborhoods; shared ethnic backgrounds; and shared leisure-time activities among workers.

Studies Of Participation Based On Union Structure

The literature devoted to the union structural aspects of member participation is very limited. Rosen and Rosen have commented on the necessary aspects of communication within the union local: First, there is a constant necessity for the union officials to provide information and keep themselves accessible to the rank and file. Secondly, the local must provide opportunities for members to meet face to face. The results of the University of California's Institute of Industrial Relations project indicate that the most serious problem in the majority

---
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59 op. cit. ("Correlates of Trade Union Participation"), 115.
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of unions examined was that of communication. The survey demonstrated that the problem in communication is not a result of the rank and file's failure to inform the leadership of its views. Rather, the union leaders were found to be failing in their attempts to inform the membership of union affairs, policies, and events. A large number of members indicated that they do not know what is going on in the affairs of their locals and have difficulty in getting this sort of information through the usual channels. Wertheimer and Nelson's findings were similar in this regard. They noted the high response of their subjects to the cluster of choices around the items concerning learning and the need for more information about the union. Yet, no research has looked into the actual functioning of communication mechanisms in these union structures, or determined how obstacles to communication affect membership attitudes and activity. A number of writers have pointed to the increasing bureaucratization and professionalization of unions without examining what these changing administrative and social conditions represent to the rank and file.

Research Concerned With Democracy Within the Union

The concern over democracy within the union structure appears repeatedly in the literature. The University of California study found most active members agreeing that their unions were democratically managed and the leadership sensitive to their needs. Interestingly, those unions which were found to have been successful in obtaining

61 op. cit., 176.
62 op. cit., 104.
economic benefits were ranked below average by their members in regard to democracy. Lipset, Trow, and Coleman conducted research into union democracy, centering on the internal processes of a single trade union. Their report remained for some time the classic work in the general area of the internal processes of a union organization. The particular union they scrutinized was revealed to have a unique, long-recognized and long-continued two-party system. They pointed to an overall lack of democracy in labor unions, suggesting that our system of large-scale organizations tends to give union officials a near monopoly of power.

Lipset, Trow, and Coleman suggest several components of this concentration of power. First, unions tend to develop a bureaucratic structure, hierarchically organized, like all other large-scale organizations. The need to parallel the structures of business and government, along with the tendency of union officials to attempt to make their tenures permanent, give rise to bureaucracy. The effect is increased power at the top and decreased power among the rank and file. Secondly, union officials keep formal control over the means of communication, keeping the rank and file members' right of free speech from interfering with administrative power. Thus, even widespread discontent is seldom effectively expressed in organized opposition. Finally, one of the chief factors perpetuating the power of the incum-

63 op. cit.

bents is their almost complete monopoly of political skills and the absence of those skills among the rank and file. Lipset, et al., are generally supported by Wertheimer and others in their assertion that the principal source of leadership training within a trade union is the union administrative and political structure itself.

Alice Cook's more recent work, UNION DEMOCRACY: PRACTICE AND IDEAL, is based on a very concrete study of four unions. Cook sought to learn what democratic practices unions employ, and what constitutes union democracy. None of the four unions studied proved to be satisfactorily democratic in its government or in its institutions, according to Cook. Neither Cook, nor previous researchers, have concerned themselves to any extent with the relationship between the perceived level of union democracy and women and other minorities' attempts to participate.

Other Sources Of Information
On Union Membership

The remaining applicable data focusing on the union as the unit of analysis in regard to participation and membership are to be found in statistical reports published by the federal government. The Bureau of Labor Statistics surveys union membership regularly, and summarizes the various categories of membership yearly in the DIRECTORY OF NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL LABOR UNIONS IN THE UNITED STATES. The

65 loc. cit., 201-233.
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Bureau of the Census sometimes produces information on labor union membership in reports on current population characteristics. The Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, publishes data on women workers by state and region—data not generally available from any other source. Finally, the MONTHLY LABOR REVIEW routinely summarizes governmental studies and reports on labor trends. These reports of statistical data and related summaries tend to aim at the overall national trends in membership, without tracing the social or economic determinants of membership.

Literature Viewing The Union as a Political System

Non-trade-union political participation and voting studies offer little insight into the topic at hand—particularly since women are generally ignored, or at least not distinguished, within larger groupings in such studies. Yet, to the extent that a union can be thought of as a political system, or likened to a political party, women members are affected as much as men. Lipset et al., suggest that labor unions (like most voluntary organizations) more closely resemble one-party states in their internal organization than they do "democratic" structures with organized legitimate opposition and turnover in office. As regards individual predispositions in voting, Lipset et al. conclude that the social context within which the union member finds himself

exerts a powerful, and often unrecognized, influence on his vote.  Specifically, their research uncovered the tendency for the development of a political opposition, or challenge to leadership in elections, occurring most often in the large local, while the members of small union locals are much less likely to support or take part in opposition. Liptset and his associates also developed a schema for analyzing the climate of opinion of the union as a whole: concentric spheres of political influence surround the individual member ("shop sentiment" and "union climate") and these influence his predisposition to be active on particular issues or vote on particular issues. Additionally, the researchers found in both large and small locals a "hard core" of members for whom policy issues are important, and for who ideological disputes are the basis of opposition in union politics.69

Literature Pertaining to the Family Relationships of Working Women

The consequences of increased female participation in the labor force for the family have been amply documented by Goode70 (most notably) and others. These writers have pointed to changes in marriage patterns, child-bearing, child-rearing, marital conflict, and the divorce rate, resulting from the increase in working wives.

Change in the division of labor by sex has been one of the central concepts for describing the family, while the power relationship within the conjugal unit has been another. The recent "conjugal power" studies

69 op. cit., 166-174, 305-363.

fit the traditional framework—the emphasis is generally on the family unit. Most assume the rise of the "egalitarian" family to some extent, and the overall rise of women in the economy. These analyses appear to rely on earlier cross cultural and kinship research which state that the relationship between husband and wife is altered in the direction of a more democratic form as the wife gains in economic importance.71

Blood and Wolfe72 developed this "resource theory" into a social exchange model, thus explaining how wives's employment affects family power and the division of labor: the income an employed wife brings in meets certain of her husband's needs and helps him attain some of his goals—his perception of this needed resource affords his wife power, since she has control over some resources he needs. Thus, the employed wife gains in "external power" by providing economic resources, while she must forego part of her contribution of resources to the "internal" family needs (household), and may herself lose some power in that sphere.

Hoffman and Nye73 have summarized this model of social exchange in the family. First, the altered division of labor within the family (wife's decreased contribution) generally indicates these needs must be filled through other sources. Secondly, Hoffman and Nye suggest


the employed wife generally has opportunities and alternatives that the housewife does not have. The third key aspect is closely related: employment may induce change in the wife's perception of her own needs.

Hoffman and Nye's summary provides a framework for organizing the literature pertaining to working women and their activities. The essential concern here is to shed light upon those factors which facilitate women's work force attachment, and those which motivate women to work commitment. Work commitment is the key link between mere labor force participation and extended work-related activities such as union participation.

First, women's public employment leads to the wife's decreased contribution to household needs, meaning, generally, that the husband, children, and other relatives, or some outside service must take up tasks which would otherwise be performed by the wife. The extent to which the wife has help within the household or from outside may influence her labor force attachment, her work commitment, and her participation in work-related activities. The data show that the husbands and the teen-aged children of working women help more with housework than do those of nonemployed women. Even with little or no household help, the working woman who is a wife and mother may employ other means of adjustment—she may become more efficient, relax standards,

etc. Although child-care arrangements tend to vary across the country, most children of working mothers are cared for in their own homes or homes of relatives (see TABLE III).  

On the other hand, the working wife and mother may experience role strain in carrying out her dual roles of worker and mother. One aspect of this role strain may be difficulty experienced in performing the expected tasks of both roles. The other fundamental aspect is the emotional effects of the working woman's employment on her. The notion that the prevailing norms influencing maternal employment fluctuate, but generally discourage work commitment on the part of the employed mother, was introduced in a previous section. The role literature has been quite consistent in regard to the factor of ambiguity in the female role and its probable limiting effect on labor force attachment and job commitment. Parsons emphasized this ambiguity in the woman's role and the likelihood of role strain and neurotic behavior when sex-role differentiation is broken down. Komarovsky reported conflicting ideas of the female role among young college women in the late 40's.  

---

75A 1971 survey of child-care arrangements of working mothers in New York City found that up to 18 percent of all child-care was undertaken by public group day-care centers or nursery schools (Employer Personnel Practices and Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers in New York City, U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, 1973, 1-19) but such facilities seem to be much less available and less used in other parts of the country.


### TABLE III

Child-care Arrangements of Working Women Aged 30-44; 1967:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Arrangement</th>
<th>Percent Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In home:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By relative</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By nonrelative</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In other private home:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By relative</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By nonrelative</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In group center</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Detail may not add to totals because of rounding

Wallin replicated Komarovsky's study in 1950, with essentially the same results.\textsuperscript{78} Arnold Rose\textsuperscript{79} has compared male and female roles over the past one hundred years and concluded, also, that women have experienced extreme role ambiguity throughout this period, while men's roles have remained quite clear in definition. Although the role theorists generally agree that the woman's role (especially the working woman's role) is often unclear, resulting in stress, and these theorists most often concentrate on the intrafamilial relationship patterns of the nuclear family, and they have yet to reveal what mechanisms of adjustment working women actually employ.

Several studies have suggested that working mothers tend to be concerned about the effects of their employment on their children, and that anxiety, guilt, and over-compensation often emerge.\textsuperscript{80} There is no reliable data on the actual effects of maternal employment on infant and pre-school children. Studies of school-aged children actually show no support for the idea of maternal deprivation accompanying maternal employment.\textsuperscript{81} Inquiries into the effects of maternal employment on children's academic achievement, and maternal employment on super-

\textsuperscript{78}Wallin, Paul, "Cultural Contradictions and Sex Roles: A Repeat Study." \textit{American Sociological Review}, XV (April 1950), 288-293.


vision of children are somewhat inconclusive, because the studies are methodologically incomparable and class differences produce considerable variations.\textsuperscript{82} The only real differences that have been found in the child rearing practices between working and non-working mothers are that working mothers seem to stress independence training more than non-working mothers,\textsuperscript{83} give children more household responsibilities than non-working mothers,\textsuperscript{84} and seem to plan more specific leisure time activities with their children.\textsuperscript{85} The data suggest that the single most important factor facilitating the working woman's adjustment to her dual role is her own job satisfaction. However, in research where family size has been used as a test variable, it proved significant.\textsuperscript{86} Employed mothers with large families generally experience role strain regardless of their own positive work orientation.\textsuperscript{87}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{84}Yarrow, Marvin, op. cit.
\item \textsuperscript{86}Nye, Francis I., Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior, New York: Wiley, 1958, 121-328.
\item \textsuperscript{87}ibid.
\end{itemize}
Secondly, as Hoffman and Nye have pointed out, the employed wife generally has opportunities and alternatives that the housewife does not have. She may participate in various activities and social relationships outside the family—which may have the effect of reducing the relative power and influence of her husband over her. The empirical data do suggest that the employed wife has greater power within the conjugal relationship than nonemployed wives have. Still, women are very much affected by their husbands' attitudes regarding women's employment. Women are more likely to accept a job (or even anticipate accepting work) where husbands approve, and work experience since marriage is a very important variable facilitating future work commitment.

The work experience itself appears to positively affect work commitment. One study found a high proportion of working women "wishing" and "expecting" to continue working for nonfinancial reasons. This


89____________}  "Working Women and Their Family Responsibilities." op. cit.


may be a function of the working woman's socialization outside the family—inducing change in her perceived needs (the third central aspect of Hoffman and Nye's summary). This outside socialization may lead to a decrease in satisfaction with previous patterns of marital exchange. There is a gap in the literature as to the forms and processes of this socialization, but there is some evidence that this socialization reduces role strain. Women who report a high level of work commitment tend also to report a higher level of marital satisfaction than non-working women and women not committed to their work. Moreover, women with children show higher levels of work commitment than those without. This phenomenon may result from the traditional tendency to idealize motherhood—once women actually achieve motherhood, they are likely to find that they want to work. Another possibility may be that women whose families are grown expect no further interferences in their careers and therefore express higher work commitment.

A final note must be added regarding one more factor facilitating and motivating the workforce participation (and commitment to work): education has always been a tremendously selective variable in getting women into the workforce. Expected (small) family size is another


significant variable related to labor-force attachment, although it is unclear whether this holds true for all socio-economic groups.

Summary of the Literature

The central concerns of this research—women's union activism and their failure to be active, union women's viewpoints and behavior regarding women's liberation, are inextricably connected with all of the most basic aspects of women's work force participation, as was indicated in the previous chapter.

The absence of data on the relationship between union activism and women's liberation ideology—in spite of a widespread assumption that such a relationship naturally exists—is one of the indicators of the need for this research. Unfortunately, no relevant measures of women's liberation ideology have been previously produced. Wertheimer and Nelson's research has provided some bases for measuring women's union participation, but their methodology for measuring participation was unavailable for replication at the inception of this study, and also not adaptable in a number of respects. Thus, the indexes of union participation and women's liberation ideology used in this research have been, out of necessity, developed with little example of antecedent empirical work.

Wertheimer and Nelson's work is the central empirical guide for this study (despite important differences in the methodologies

---

employed). A number of comparisons of the Wertheimer-Nelson findings with the results of this research will be presented in following sections.

The theoretical and empirical works cited in this chapter suggest the following predictions about women's changing work role and work behavior, and about women's union participation and attitudes:

1. Women union members are very interested in their unions, and would like more information about their unions (Wertheimer and Nelson);

2. Women view themselves as less capable of participation fully in their unions than their male counterparts, due to their lack of information, experience, and training (Wertheimer and Nelson);

3. Women members who are active in their unions tend to hold low-level positions—based on New York metropolitan locals (Wertheimer and Nelson);

4. Women will participate in their union to the extent that they feel a "sense of belonging" to it (Walker and Guest);

5. Women members who tend toward a "social activist orientation" are more likely to participate in union affairs (Form and Dansereau), as are those who hold a generally favorable attitude unionism (University of California's Institute of Industrial Relations), while members who claim a simple economic interest in the union tend to be less involved (Form and Dansereau);
6. Older members, members of long standing, and members of low educational background are more likely to be active in the union than the women who are younger, newer, and more educated (University of California's Institute of Industrial Relations);

7. Women union members who perform as leaders in the work situation, or who already possess leadership skills, are likely to be activists in the union and also, possibly, other voluntary associations (Hagedorn and Labovitz, Raphael);

8. Women who enter into union affairs along with close co-workers over particular issues are often drawn into further participation (Sayles and Strauss);

9. Women who like their jobs or have high status jobs tend toward union activism—unless they are promoted to jobs which separate them from other workers (Spinrad, Wertheimer and Nelson);

10. Women who work within a small, intimate, homogeneous workforce are most likely to be union activists (Spinrad);

11. Women have difficulty getting information from their elected officials (Rosen and Rosen, Wertheimer and Nelson); and, finally,

12. The average woman worker may have a more egalitarian relationship with her mate, but a more ambiguous role within her family than does her non-working counterpart (Goode, Komarovsky, Rose). She may be committed to work and work-related activities to the extent that she overcomes stress resulting from performing dual roles and becomes socialized into her work role (Hoffman...
Nye). Her working is closely related to past work experience since marriage (Sobol) and husband's approval (U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau), but the work experience itself may lead to changes in the patterns of marital exchange and power (Bahr et al., Blood and Wolfe, Glueck and Glueck, Heer, Kligler, Scanzoni and McMurry). Her relative satisfaction with her job is closely related to both satisfaction in marital and family relations and further job commitment.

This review of the pertinent theoretical rationales and the empirical research in this area of concern reveals wide gaps in the work that has been done. The concerns of this research reflect, to some extent, that low level of development in the empirical research in this area. Some of the more "basic" research questions examined here stem directly from previous research (and need to be re-examined). The others embody possible relationships not formulated in any past research.
Chapter III
THE STUDY

The Research Objectives
And Research Propositions

This research examines the extent to which the attitudes of selected blue collar women who are union members in the Kalamazoo and outstate Michigan areas support the tenets of "women's liberation" ideology (see APPENDIX A). It is believed that women in these areas, like their counterparts in other areas, are undergoing a gradual attitude transformation (pp. 22-23) commensurate with changing norms throughout society regarding women's work. Because of unevenness in this normative change (p. 21), contradictory views are expected to appear in many of the individual's work-value outlooks. Yet, on the whole, the subjects are expected to exhibit, to varying degrees, well-integrated sets of attitudes concerning "women's liberation" ideology.

The subjects who are determined to be active unionists (see APPENDIX B) are expected to exhibit more "liberated" views concerning the position of women—at work, and in family relationships—than are those who are not active in their unions. This positive difference expected in the attitudes of active unionists regarding "women's liberation" issues is based on: (1) their greater probable acceptance of employment as an unalterable feature of their lives—union participation is linked with immediate and long-term goals, i.e., "Since I must work, I may as well work within the union to get the best pay and benefits possible;" (2) their comparatively greater grasp of women's
place in the overall advance of labor, i.e., "Why shouldn't women take as much interest as men in problems that affect their work and future?" and (3) their probable acceptance of the tradition of struggle and "independence" attributed to women unionists.

The other major purpose of this research is to explore and evaluate the other attitudinal dimensions, and the structural dimensions, of the various levels of women's participation in their union locals.

The research goals summarized above suggest the following subproblems and related propositions:

The first subproblem is to determine whether women who actively participate in their union locals are more likely to evidence "women's liberation" ideology than are women of the same locals who do not actively participate in the affairs of their union locals.

Research Proposition 1: Women who actively participate in their union locals evidence "women's liberation" ideology to a greater extent than do women members of the same locals who do not actively participate in the union locals.

The second subproblem is to identify those objective social characteristics and the objective social phenomena which influence the levels of union participation of the women union members.

Research Proposition 2a: Older women union members are more likely to actively participate in union affairs than are younger women members.

Research Proposition 2b: Union women of longer membership are more likely to actively participate in union affairs than are women of shorter membership duration.

Research Proposition 2c: Women union members who actively participate in their union locals are more likely to be active in (other) voluntary associations than are women who are not active in their union locals.
Research Proposition 2d: Among women union members, those who have long histories of employment are more likely to actively participate in their union locals than those who have short histories of employment.

Research Proposition 2e: Women union members whose parents were union members are more likely to actively participate in their union locals than are those union members whose parents were not union members.

Research Proposition 2f: Women union members whose husbands are union members are more likely to actively participate in their union locals than are those whose husbands are not union members.

The third subproblem is to uncover the attitudinal and perceptual dimension of women's trade union participation.

Research Proposition 3a: Women union members who view the present union leadership favorably or in friendly terms, are more likely to participate actively in the union than are those who do not view the union leadership in friendly terms.

Research Proposition 3b: Women union members who hold a generally favorable view of unions are more likely to actively participate in their union locals than are those who view unions as a "necessary evil"—or worse.

Research Proposition 3c: Women union members who perceive other women in their locals as being supportive of or interested in the local are more likely to actively participate in their union locals than are those who see other women members as non-supportive of, or lacking interest in, their locals.

The fourth subproblem is to identify the union-structural phenomena which influence the levels of union participation of the women union members.

Research Proposition 4a: Women union members employed in a "closed shop" are more likely to actively participate in their union locals than are those members who are employed in "union shop."

96In a "closed shop" all employees covered by the negotiated contract must be union members.

97In a "union shop" union membership is optional—no one may be compelled to be a union member, and it is not a condition of employment under the contract.
Research Proposition 4b: Women union members who belong to locals that have taken steps to encourage the participation of women members are more likely to actively participate in their union locals than are members who belong to locals that have not taken steps to encourage the participation of women members.

Research Proposition 4c: Women union members belonging to locals with a high proportion of women members in their total memberships are more likely to actively participate in their union locals than are those women members who belong to locals with low proportions of women members.

Research Proposition 4d: Women union members who belong to locals with several women officers are more likely to actively participate in their union locals than are women members whose locals have few or no women officers.

The final task and research goal is to analyze and interpret the treated data so as to evaluate the inter-relatedness of the items which are identified as influencing the levels of participation of the women union members.

Factors in the Method of Sampling

The methods employed in selecting the sample population reflect the difficulty in obtaining information from labor unions. The original goal of the research was to survey all major labor unions in the Kalamazoo area that had women members in the interest of uncovering the structural role of women members, as well as determining the relationship between "women's liberation" ideology and union activism. The main labor organization in the area, the Kalamazoo County Central Labor Council (AFL-CIO), was approached, but refused to take part in a study of this type or assist in any way, except to supply a list of the chief officers of all AFL-CIO locals. These officials and the chief officers of two Teamsters locals were contacted by telephone, and asked
to support the research project by (1) publicly supporting the research efforts, especially in their newspapers and among their members; (2) supplying mailing lists of their female members; and (3) allowing themselves to be interviewed. Six of the chief officers agreed to support the research, supply the necessary information, and be interviewed. Of these, four later changed their minds and permitted only the interview phase.

At this point, the proposed scope of the research was reconsidered. Of seventy-three union locals in the Kalamazoo area (approximately fifty of which had some women in their membership), two had been found willing to participate fully in the study! A representative sample of unions was impossible under those conditions. A meaningful examination of the union structural aspects of women member's participation seemed unlikely. However, given that labor unions are typically cautious in dispensing statistical and membership information, expectations of measurement precision between any likely sample population and the general population (women union members) could not be high. Moreover, this conservatism on the part of unions as to information as sensitive as how they treat their women members, and how the women members feel toward the union, made the accessibility of (only) two union locals worth considering an adequate research possibility. Also, the diversity of characteristics between the two union locals was viewed as significantly contributing to the possibility of desired variability within a sample population. During this early phase of pre-research exploration, a national organization of women unionists (CLUW) formed a chapter in Kalamazoo, and the membership agreed to
take part in this proposed study. Finally, access was gained to the mailing list of a statewide conference of women members of a vast number of different union locals. With the support of the latter two groups, this project was launched with confidence that a sample could be obtained which would be heterogeneous enough to represent women union members in Kalamazoo and other areas in Michigan.

Characteristics of the Units Sampled

The first union local was that of a public hospital located in a central area of the city. The local will not be identified here (or any of the others that took part in the study), but permission was received to identify the international: the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), a fast-growing union of public employees. At the time of the sampling, the ten-year-old local had a membership of 598. Of these, 294 (49 per cent) were women (a proportion which generally reflects the sex composition of the international). This local was a "union shop," and there was a dues check-off system for those who were union members. Six hundred and ninety-three employees of the hospital were, at this time, eligible for membership in the union, and union members constituted 86 per cent of the eligible employees. In its ten-year history, the local had not had a strike, although rather dramatic picketing had taken place for thirty-three days at the time the local formed. At the time the sample was drawn, women held eight of the fourteen offices in the local (elected positions), and the vice-president of the local was a woman. The largest portion of jobs held by women in the hospital were semi-skilled (clerks, food workers, housekeeping personnel),
while nurses and dieticians filled the remainder of the "women's" jobs. Apparently, no women, or few, worked in "men's" departments (maintenance, grounds crews, etc.). The majority of the women employees who were not members of the union (an undeterminable number) were part-time workers. This AFSCME hospital local will be referred to as "Group A" throughout the remainder of this report.

Second was a United Steel Workers local in a medium-sized, small plastic parts producing factory located between the central business district of the city and the Negro national minority community. The local was 27 years old, at the time of sampling, and had a membership of 719, of which 538 (78 per cent) were women (the ratio of men to women in the Steelworkers international is approximately four to one). This is a "closed shop"—all non-management and non-clerical employees in the plant were required to become union members at the time their probationary period ended. The local had not gone on strike in over 25 years. Of the ten officer positions, three were held by women (Secretary, Treasurer, and a Trustee). Virtually all of the women worked as machine operators (a combination of semiskilled and unskilled jobs). Two women worked as inspectors (of twelve inspectors), but there were no other women in the traditionally "male" jobs (machine set-up and maintenance, line lead person, etc.), nor was a single man employed as a machine operator. This United Steel Workers local will hereafter be referred to as "Group B."

"Group C" was made up of sixty-four participants in the annual Michigan Summer School for Women Workers, a four-day seminar held in Ann Arbor (this sample was drawn from the mailing list of the August, 1974 session). The School brought together women members of industrial,
clerical, and service unions—women who ranged from seasoned union activists to new members. One-third of the participants were sent or sponsored by their locals, while all others came on their own expense to learn labor history, collective bargaining, and communication skills. The School was operated by the University of Michigan's Department of Industrial and Labor Relations, but was inspired and planned by a group of independent women unionists who are militants in their own labor organizations.

"Group D" was made up of the twenty-nine members of the Kalamazoo area chapter of the Coalition of Labor Union Women, formed locally in December, 1974.

The Sampling Procedure

The principal instrument of data collection for the study was a mailed questionnaire (see p. 62 and APPENDIX C).

Five hundred and nine women union members were selected from the original mailing lists to be included in the sample, and received the questionnaire in January, 1975. (TABLE IV, p. 61 provides a complete description of the mailing size for each group, and the return rate at each stage of the data gathering process.) Budgetary considerations dictated that no more than fifty per cent of the two largest groups ("A" and "B") be sampled. Fifty per cent samples of Groups A (N=147) and B (N=269) were obtained randomly. Because groups "C" and "D" were small in comparison to "A" and "B," the mailing to "C" and "D" was comprehensive (100 per cent). This was done to somewhat equalize the sizes of the returns among the four groups, which were equal in
### TABLE IV

The Mailing and Return of the Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
<th>Total (all groups)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of women on original list</strong></td>
<td>294</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of women the questionnaire was mailed to Jan., 1975</strong></td>
<td>147 (50% of original list selected randomly)</td>
<td>269 (50% of original list selected randomly)</td>
<td>64 (100% of original list)</td>
<td>29 (100% of original list)</td>
<td>509 (41 returned by Post Office, total delivered= 468)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of first return (March, 1975)</strong></td>
<td>27 (20% return rate)</td>
<td>59 (23% return rate)</td>
<td>24 (36% return rate)</td>
<td>14 (48% return rate)</td>
<td>124 (26% return rate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total return after second mailing</strong></td>
<td>30 (23% return rate)</td>
<td>65 (26% return rate)</td>
<td>28 (44% return rate)</td>
<td>17 (58% return rate)</td>
<td>140 (30% return rate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of questionnaires rejected from final composite sample</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of responses included in final statistical manipulations</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
relation to the study.

By mid-March, 1975, a 20 per cent return (N=27) had been received from Group A, a 23 per cent return (N=59) had been received from Group B, a 36 per cent return (N=24) had been received from Group C, and a 48 per cent return (N=14) had been received from Group D. A second mailing (consisting of a second copy of the questionnaire, a second business-reply envelope, and an appropriate cover letter (APPENDIX D) was sent to non-respondents of the first mailing in early April, 1975, and was slightly successful in raising the return rates.

The final return was as follows: Group A, 23 per cent (N=30); Group B, 26 per cent (N=65); Group C, 44 per cent (N=28); and Group D, 58 per cent (N=17). The total return for all four groups was 140, or 28 per cent of the original mailing of 509. Forty-one of the original mailing of 509 were not delivered due to problems such as incorrect address, no forwarding address, etc.—so 468 of the women may be assumed to have received the questionnaire, and the adjusted overall return rate was 30 per cent. Of the final return, seven questionnaires had large sections incomplete, and could not be included in the working sample. The final composite sample for statistical manipulation totaled 133.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire was constructed with the advice of several labor leaders in the area, and was modified according to the criticisms and advice of women workers (associates of the researcher) and experienced researchers.
A pre-test of the final draft was carried out with the cooperation of a United Rubber Workers local in a nearby city (the President of the local administered the questionnaire to as many members as she had contact with during a two-day period). The method of distribution of the questionnaire—personal administration by the union leader, rather than by mail—was thought to be an important factor in the extremely positive response (those responding were reported to have said that the cover letter gave them an understanding of the purpose of the study and a willingness to co-operate). Moreover, union activists were probably over-represented because of that method of distribution, and the verbal responses about the questionnaire gathered and reported by the "administrator" may have reflected a tendency to make the local "look good." Finally, the small size of the pre-test sample (N=16) did not allow any conclusions about the internal consistency of the crucial sets of items on the questionnaire. However, the pre-test did indicate that the questionnaire was likely to be well-received, and that the cover letter was clear and appropriate.

The questionnaire (APPENDIX C) had several identifiable parts. Items 1-4 and item 11 pertained to basic identifying characteristics of the respondent, such as age, marital status, health, and also provided for classifying the respondent according to the structure of the household she lived in, and the type and amount of household help she received. Items 5-6 made possible a complete picture of the respondent's work history and history of job advancement at the present place of employment. Items 7-8 explored child care arrangements and the levels of difficulty and satisfaction with child care arrangements while
working. Items 9-10 explored the union affiliations of significant others in the respondent's life (mother, father, spouse), and the occupations of these persons. Item 12 provided for a complete examination of the respondent's involvement in voluntary organizations, while 13-14 explored the social tie with fellow workers. Items 15-24 pertained to actual union activities, while items 26-32 got-at the respondent's opinions about her local and her relationship to it. The final section, items 33-57 (analyzed in APPENDIX B) measured the respondent's women's liberation ideology.

The Interviews

The interviews (interview form: APPENDIX E) were with the chief officers of six area locals (three were male presidents of locals, two were female presidents of locals, and one was a female recording secretary of a local which had a male president). These interviews were conducted around the same time (in some cases just before) the first mailing of the questionnaire. The interviews were intended to obtain basic information about the structures and practices of the locals (size, meeting place, proportion of women committee structure, etc.), and at the same time reveal these officers' attitudes toward their women members.

The Locale

The Kalamazoo area, the site of the samples of groups A, B, and D appeared to be unspectacular in its labor history and recent extent
of unionization. The only well known strike by women workers occurred around the turn of the century, involving women textile workers. That uprising is probably known only to the labor activists. The actual extent of unionization of this area was not possible to determine, since the Bureau of Labor Statistics does not provide union statistics by county. Nor did local sources such as the Chamber of Commerce and the Upjohn Institute for Employment Research have such information. John Whitman, President of the Kalamazoo County AFL-CIO unit (the Central Labor Council), was asked to give his view of the extent of unionization, and he suggested that the area is "average" in this regard. The Labor Council represented a total of 13,000 workers in the county (about one-half of the total AFL-CIO population in the county, according to Whitman), out of 123,800 employed persons in the SMSA (Kalamazoo and VanBuren county). In sum, the available information about the area gave no clues to the character of the response to be expected in research such as this. Responses from Group C varied in origin from Michigan's Upper Penninsula to the metropolitan Detroit area, so extreme variation was expected as regards the influence of the localities on the responses.

The Treatment of the Data

The procedure employed to measure the variable women's liberation ideology is detailed in APPENDIX A.

---


Eighteen items in the final section of the questionnaire provided the basis for a "feminism" scale. All items were weighted equally, with maximum scores of five points each item (indicating high "feminism"), or minimum scores of one point. Thus, because there are 18 items, the maximum possible summated score a respondent might have was 90 points, while the lowest summated score possible was 18 points.

Using a computer, a group of scores for each respondent were obtained which reflected women's liberation ideology of "feminism:" (1) eighteen scores representing responses to each item in the index; (2) three category scores representing the combined scores from items measuring three main areas of concern (conventional "feminist" ideas, conjugal relations, and women's view of the work world); and (3) a summated "feminism" score, based on all the items in the index.

Finally, a correlation matrix was produced of the items on the "feminism" scale in order to determine the extent of the interrelatedness of items on the scale (see APPENDIX F and "The Findings.")

The procedure employed to measure the variable of union participation is detailed in APPENDIX B. The determinants of union participation (based on estimates of time expenditure and the level of union commitment associated with selected items of the questionnaire) made up five categories. The categories (and the particular behaviors they represented) were weighted unequally, but purposefully, along the lines of the estimated time and union commitment they were expected to require (see p. 1 of APPENDIX B). A computer was used to obtain several category scores for each respondent which would reflect union participation: (1) office holding, with a maximum possible score of 30 points;
(2) participation in committees, with a maximum possible score of 20 points; (3) attending regular meetings, with a maximum possible score of 15 points; (4) election behavior, with a maximum possible score of 10 points; and, (5) time devoted to union work, with a maximum possible score of 24 points. In addition, each respondent was assigned an overall score for union participation, which was arrived at by combining the category scores. This total, summated, union participation score might have been as low as zero, or as high as ninety-nine for any given respondent.

In addition to the development of scales to measure the variables women's liberation ideology and union participation, the data were manipulated in several other ways. First, frequency and percentage distributions were obtained for all variables indicated on the questionnaire. Some of the data were next "recoded" so as to group them into fewer, but more meaningful, categories. For example, only a general representation of the age variable was desired, so the age categories were abbreviated into groups with scale values of roughly five years each. The scores on variables such as length of membership and union membership were grouped into categories, also, on bases rational and interesting for this research (rather than on an interval basis).

After the data had been reduced as much as possible, means were obtained for union participation responses by major independent variables, first for the entire composite sample (all respondents from all four sample groups), and then by selected respondent characteristics. The
mean was chosen as one of the major statistics in the analysis because it is a simple but meaningful measure, and because the mean has wide application to other statistics (in the event that more statistical manipulation becomes desirable in the future). Also, it was noted that there were no extreme scores in the actual range of scores to unduly affect the mean values.

The final manipulation of the data was the construction of tables to describe mean union participation scores for each group, in relation to key variables. Those tables are located in Chapter IV, THE FINDINGS.

Summary

The main purpose of the study was to determine the extent to which the attitudes of selected women union members supported the tenets of women's liberation ("feminist") ideology. Active unionists were expected to exhibit more "liberated" views on issues concerning the positions of women in the work world and family relationships than were those who were not active in their unions. Another major purpose of the research was to explore and evaluate other attitudinal and union-structural dimensions of women's participation in their locals.

The scope of the research was narrowed considerably during the early stages of work, due to exceptional difficulties in getting the cooperation of union locals. The final sample was not statistically representative of the population, but adequately representative—and potentially interesting—given the conditions faced.
The units sampled included a public hospital employee's union (Group A), an inner-city steelworker's union (Group B), a group of participants in an annual women unionist's school (Group C), and members of a local women unionist's organization (Group D). The sampling method was a mailed questionnaire, administered randomly to 50 percent of groups A and B, and to the entire populations (100 percent) of groups C and D. The overall adjusted return rate was 30 percent, and the final size of the composite sample was 133.

Additional descriptive information was gathered through interviews with the presidents of the two area locals included in the study, as well as interviews with the chief officers of four other area locals. The influence of the locale in which the study was conducted was viewed as inconclusive.

Scales were constructed to measure the variables of women's liberation ideology and union participation. Frequency and percentage distributions were obtained for all variables of interest. Some of the data were reduced, by computer "recoding." Mean scores were obtained for all important variables, and these were compared by groups and placed in tables.
Chapter IV

THE FINDINGS

The Format for Reporting the Findings

The research findings will be organized here in this manner: the research propositions will be repeated, and the corresponding findings reported. Various interpretations of the findings will be noted. Disclosure of additional data, the significance of the findings, the implications for further research and the limitations of the findings will not generally be considered here, but will be taken up in Chapter V, "CONCLUSIONS."

Union Activism and Women's Liberation Ideology

Research Proposition 1: Women who actively participate in their union locals evidence women's liberation ideology to a greater extent than do women members of the same locals who are not active in their union locals.

The data of this study indicated that there may be a positive relationship between women's liberation ideology (or feminism) and union participation. For all respondents, there was a somewhat significant correlation coefficient for the variables feminism and union participation (0.39).

TABLE V, pp. 71-72, shows mean union participation scores by feminism scores. First (version "A"), union participation mean scores are shown for respondents by quartile according to feminism scale scores. The second version ("B") demonstrates how the actual range of union participation scores fell in relation to four equal quarters of the feminism scale. TABLE VI, p. 73, shows the actual range of scale scores of all respondents on the variables feminism.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feminism Scores (A)</th>
<th>All Respondents Mean U.P. Score</th>
<th>Group A Mean U.P. Score</th>
<th>Group B Mean U.P. Score</th>
<th>Groups C &amp; D Mean U.P. Score</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-55</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>var=310.5</td>
<td>s.d.=17.6</td>
<td>var=171.1</td>
<td>var=514.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s.d.=13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-63</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>var=455.0</td>
<td>s.d.=21.3</td>
<td>var=729.1</td>
<td>var=217.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s.d.=27.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64-70</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>var=594.7</td>
<td>s.d.=24.3</td>
<td>var=651.2</td>
<td>var=572.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s.d.=25.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-89</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>var=584.7</td>
<td>s.d.=24.1</td>
<td>var=659.9</td>
<td>var=701.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s.d.=25.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s.d.=26.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*variances and standard deviations shown
**data not obtained

TABLE V: is continued next page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feminism Scores (B)</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Groups C &amp; D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean U.P. Score</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Mean U.P. Score</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>var=363.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>var=221.2</td>
<td>var=36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s.d.=19.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>s.d.=14.8</td>
<td>s.d.=6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>var=495.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>var=557.2</td>
<td>var=143.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s.d.=22.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>s.d.=23.6</td>
<td>s.d.=11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>var=306.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>var=578.0</td>
<td>var=200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s.d.=17.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>s.d.=24.0</td>
<td>s.d.=14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*variances and standard deviations shown
**data not obtained
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Range of Scores</th>
<th>Feminism</th>
<th>Union Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28-89 scale points (18-90 possible points)</td>
<td>1-70 scale points (0-99 possible points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Mean Score</td>
<td>65 scale points</td>
<td>21 scale points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Modal Score</td>
<td>70 scale points</td>
<td>12 scale points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Median Score</td>
<td>64 scale points</td>
<td>27 scale points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*measured in scale points according to the Feminism and Union Participation indexes (APPENDIX A and APPENDIX B).
and union participation.

When the scores for the individual respondents were examined, a consistent pattern appeared: the highest summated feminism scores were typically accompanied by at least moderately high union participation summated scores. Of all respondents, those whose scores fell in the upper one-quarter on feminism, also scored an average of twenty seven points higher on the union participation scale than those in the lower three-quarters. The 27-point jump in union participation scores might be considered significant, because there is only a 5-point spread in union participation between the two middle quarters on feminism.

The data do not conclusively show how the relationship between union participation and feminism is affected by membership in a particular union local or group, so it is not possible to state that any particular relationships hold within "the same locals" (as the proposition reads). It is interesting to note, however, that between the two Kalamazoo locals very different patterns occur on this dynamic. Of Group A, those who scored in the upper one-quarter in feminism averaged 36 points higher on the union participation scale than those in the next lower one-quarter. Those in Group B who fell in the upper one-quarter in feminism averaged only a 5-point jump over the next lower group.

None of the information about the Kalamazoo locals obtained through interviews with the chief executives or through the qualitative sections of the questionnaire (i.e., "open-ended" questions) shed much light on the apparent difference between the Kalamazoo
groups. The male president of Group A did seem to have a noticeably more favorable attitude toward his female members than did his counterpart in Group B, when interviews were compared. Yet, even if this were an actual difference, any possible effects on the women's feminism and union participation scores are obscure. Moreover, the small number of respondents of groups A and B who scored very high on both measures allows very little basis for indicating that real differences between the locals influenced the scores. The scores of members of groups C and D were of no use for comparative purposes, in this regard, since members of dozens of different locals comprised those groups, and since there was virtually no variation in average union participation scores between those scoring at different levels on feminism in groups C and D.

One of the most interesting findings of the study was the difference shown between the groups on the correlation between feminism and union participation. As noted above, for all respondents there was a correlation coefficient of 0.39 for the variables feminism and high union participation. Surprisingly, respondents in groups C and D, who had been regarded for the purposes of the study as representing active unionism, and whose members indeed scored high on the union participation measures, demonstrated no relationship in their responses between feminism and union participation (correlation: -0.04). On the other hand, the responses from the Kalamazoo locals (groups A and B) showed more of a relationship. The correlation coefficients of the variables feminism and union participation were 0.30 for Group A, and 0.29 for Group B. While the correlations for groups A and B were not particularly high, they fell at about the
level expected. The obvious question is, why was there no significant correlation between these variables for groups C and D?

The correlations did not suggest that union activism is related to high feminism in the manner suggested in Chapter II, and the research data do not suggest any theoretical groundwork for explaining the differences for the variables between the groups. Some research error or unknown intervening variables may account for the differences. However, few known differences between groups A and B and C and D did show up in the interviews and on the open-ended questionnaire items which pertain to the relationship between feminism and union participation.

First, it was noted that the women activists of groups A and B tended to accept union responsibilities in protest over the ways their male presidents handled union affairs, or to "stick up" for "the other girls" on their shop floors or their own departments. A few others were drafted by their peers for social reasons, such as being "easy to talk with," "helpful," or "full of spunk." In neither group A or B did the women who scored high in union participation view themselves as "unionists" (the correlations between the variables "high union participation" and "self-proclaimed union activist" were 0.02 for Group A, and 0.26 for Group B). In neither of the Kalamazoo locals was any "women's caucus," or even any kind of informal women's grouping, noted. However, the questionnaire responses and the remarks made by the male presidents in the interviews pointed to sharp divisions by sex within both locals (in the case of Group B, the local President expressed outright animosity toward his female
members, stating that they tended to "be hard to get along with," "expect too much," "act catty," etc.). We might expect that women members of both locals would have heard of, or themselves strongly felt, the adversity between men and women in their locals. This factor could have encouraged (or at least failed to restrain) strong "feminist" responses on a questionnaire concerned with the internal affairs of their own locals.

The women of groups C and D, in contrast, viewed themselves as "unionists" (the correlation coefficient for variables union participation and strongly favoring union was 0.40). In spite of the fact that respondents in these groups were women who had found in necessary to attend women's unionist's school (Group C), and to form an organization of women unionists in order to fight for their rights within the unions (Group D), these women tended to be quite defensive about their images as "unionists." The key factor to be considered is that many of the women of groups C and D had gained positions of authority within their unions, and had held those positions for considerable lengths of time. In doing so, they had learned to "tone down" or avoid women's issues in their union work. In Group D, the leadership members had a history of going to great lengths to minimize any admission of feminist influence on their group. In fact, when the organization was first formed, policy struggles occurred between the unionist and the feminist groupings, with the most vocal of those representing the feminist viewpoint eventually being driven out of the organization (this information is based on the direct experience of the researcher and others as members of the organization). The union
activists of groups C and D might for these reasons have taken care not to seem "feminist" in their responses to the questionnaire—especially since their perception may have been that they were "speaking for" women unionists.

Age and Union Participation

Research Proposition 2a: Older women union members are more likely to actively participate in union affairs than are younger women members.

The age percentages and frequencies for all the women sampled were: ages 20-25, 25% of the total (N=33); ages 26-30, 14% of total (N=18); ages 31-35, 10% of total (N=10); ages 36-40, 12% of total (N=16); ages 41-45, 7% of total (N=9); ages 46-50, 11% of total (N=14); and ages 56-65, 11% of total (N=15). The average age was 38, while the median was 36. The oldest respondent was 65, while the (three) youngest were 20. The modal age was 22 years.

As might be expected, age was found to be quite highly correlated with length of membership (0.65). No correlation was found between age and union participation (0.08). However, this finding could be attributed to small sample size rather than the relationship indicated by the correlation coefficient. Although each age category was represented in the sample groups, the modal age was only 22. Therefore, any relationship between maturity and union activism may have been obscured by the lopsided age representation.

When mean participation scores were compared by age categories, however, a more complete picture emerged (see TABLE VII, p.79). Union participation showed up as lowest at the youngest and oldest
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Number in Age Group</th>
<th>Mean Union Participation Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on summated union participation score
extremes on the age continuum. Union participation peaked at ages 31-35, dropped off significantly, and then rose again through age 55. Some support for the proposition was seen in these figures: union activism reached its highest point among those in the second oldest age category. It is entirely reasonable to expect that actual participation would drop off in the 56-65 age group due to health problems, spouse health problems, approaching retirement, etc. The comments made in response to certain qualitative sections of the questionnaire revealed, however, that the values of union commitment and militancy do not necessarily decline with advancing age.

Length of Membership and Union Participation

Research Proposition 2b: Union women of longer membership are more likely to actively participate in union affairs than are women of shorter membership duration.

These research results showed no support for the proposition that long membership itself is conducive to active participation (correlation between the two variables: 0.05). Moreover, when the effects of length of membership on mean scores were compared by group, no meaningful patterns emerged (TABLE VIII, p.81, shows mean scores on union participation by length of union membership, for each union group).

For all respondents, union participation peaked at ten through fifteen years of membership (mean participation score: 36.5). Among the activists (groups C and D), participation peaked in sixteen through twenty years of membership, and leveled off, but remained high, among the members of longest duration. In both the Kalamazoo locals, union participation dropped off after the first year, and then rose again, but
### TABLE VIII
Mean Union Participation Scores by Length of Union Membership, for Each Union Group

| Length of Union Membership | All Respondents | | | Group A | | | | Group B | | | | Groups C & D | | |
|----------------------------|----------------|---|---|---------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                            | Mean U.P. Score | No. | Mean U.P. Score | No. | Mean U.P. Score | No. | Mean U.P. Score | No. |
| less than 1 year           | 21.9 * var=236.9 s.d.=15.3 | 18 | 33.0 var=849.0 s.d.=29.1 | 1 | 16.8 var=128.8 s.d.=11.3 | 7 | 29.6 var=72.3 s.d.=8.5 |
| 1-4 years                  | 28.1 var=669.5 s.d.=25.8 | 41 | 22.2 var=748.5 s.d.=27.3 | 5 | 10.0 var=103.0 s.d.=10.1 | 20 | 57.0 var=138.0 s.d.=11.7 |
| 5-9 years                  | 23.3 var=523.7 s.d.=22.0 | 28 | 19.6 var=640.7 s.d.=25.3 | 7 | 14.1 var=174.7 s.d.=13.2 | 15 | 56.0 var=26.0 s.d.=5.0 |
| 10-15 years                | 36.5 var=668.7 s.d.=26.2 | 13 | 22.1 var=670.4 s.d.=25.8 | 5 | 34.0 var=162.7 s.d.=12.7 | 1 | 57.2 var=64.0 s.d.=5.2 |
| 16-20 years                | 28.0 var=807.6 s.d.=28.4 | 12 | 13.5 var=183.1 s.d.=13.5 | 6 | 13.0 var=84.0 s.d.=9.1 | 4 | 72.0 var=28.0 s.d.=5.2 |
| 21-29 years                | 28.8 var=567.5 s.d=23.8 | 11 | 28.0 var=1458.0 s.d=38.1 | 2 | 19.0 var=174.6 s.d=13.2 | 9 | 64.0 var=18.0 s.d=4.2 |

*TABLE is continued next page*
TABLE VIII (continued)

Mean Union Participation Scores by Length of Union Membership, for Each Union Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Union Membership</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Groups C &amp; D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean U.P. Score</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Mean U.P. Score</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 and up</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>var=40.5</td>
<td>s.d.=6.3</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>var=40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>var=303.6</td>
<td>s.d.=17.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>var=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*variances and standard deviations shown
**data not obtained
not steadily. In Group A, union participation was never as great after the first year of membership, although those who fell into the longest membership category nearly approached the one-year mean score. Among respondents in Group B, union participation peaked strongly at the ten through fifteen years of membership point.

The Influence of Union Participation on Participation in Voluntary Associations

Research Proposition 2c: Women union members who actively participate in their union locals are more likely to be active in (other) voluntary associations than are women who are not active in their union locals.

The results gave some support for the proposition. Of all respondents who scored 53 points or more on the union participation scale (N=33), 61% belonged to at least one voluntary association, 20% belonged to two voluntary associations, and 19% belonged to at least three different groups. Most of those who scored highest in union participation belonged to at least two different groups. The responses demonstrated a wide range of community involvement and interests, the most popular being school or children-linked, church, and political organizations and committees (See APPENDIX G, p.143, for a partial listing of organizations for which respondents reported membership.). The results were not broken down by group on this variable, so the mean scores for the sample groups cannot be presented here. A perusal of this section of the returned questionnaires, however, demonstrated that the greatest number of organizational affiliations were reported by members of groups C and D.
Years Employed and Union Participation

**Research Proposition 2d:** Among women union members, those who have long histories of employment are more likely to actively participate in their union locals than are those who have short employment histories.

The results were inconclusive as to the relationship of years employed to union participation. TABLE IX, p. 85, suggests that, for all respondents and particularly for groups C and D, long employment histories led to greater average union participation, while the reverse was true for members of groups A and B. It should be noted, however, that the numbers of respondents in each group who clearly had either short or long histories of employment in relation to their ages were few. The vast majority of the respondents did not answer this questionnaire item, and the data were actually somewhat inadequate to work from.

Parent's Union Membership and Union Participation

**Research Proposition 2e:** Women union members whose parents were union members are more likely to actively participate in their union locals than are those women union members whose parents were not union members.

The findings were mixed in regard to this proposition. It was necessary to examine father's and mother's union membership separately.

When mean scores on union participation were compared by group on this variable (see TABLE X, p. 86), it appeared that fathers' union membership bore no real significance to respondent's participation scores. Among the activists (groups C and D) the mean scores were about even between those whose fathers were, and were not, union members.
### TABLE IX
Mean Union Participation Scores by Employment History, for Each Union Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment History:</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Groups C &amp; D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean U.P. Score</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent had a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>history in relation to age</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* var=420.5</td>
<td>var=325.9</td>
<td>s.d.=20.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.d.=20.5</td>
<td>s.d.=18.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent had a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>history in relation to age</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* var=936.6</td>
<td>var=264.5</td>
<td>s.d.=30.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.d.=16.2</td>
<td>s.d.=10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent's employ-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ment history not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>determined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* var=607.3</td>
<td>var=667.1</td>
<td>s.d.=24.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.d.=25.8</td>
<td>s.d.=25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*variances and standard deviations shown
**data not obtained
TABLE X.

Mean Union Participation Scores by Father's Union Membership, for Each Union Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's Union Membership</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Groups C &amp; D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean U.P. No. Score</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Mean U.P. Score</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father is/was a union member</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* var=558.0</td>
<td>s.d.=23.6</td>
<td>* var=549.0</td>
<td>s.d.=23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father not a union member</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>var=621.7</td>
<td>s.d.=24.9</td>
<td>var=391.3</td>
<td>s.d.=19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown to respondent, or no answer</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>var=350.7</td>
<td>s.d.=18.0</td>
<td>var=681.7</td>
<td>s.d.=26.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*variances and standard deviations shown
Among all respondents, there was little difference in average scores between those whose fathers were, and were not, union members. In groups A and B, fathers' union membership did seem to elevate respondents' union participation scores a few points, but the largest number of respondents occupied the "unknown or no answer" slot on this variable. It was a methodological error that the "unknowns" were lumped with the "no answer" responses when the computer work was done—it was originally intended that "unknown" responses could be meaningful in themselves (as to providing information about the respondents' awareness of "unionism" in their families).

Interestingly, there was a high correlation between father's union membership and mother's union membership (0.825). As to mother's union membership and union participation, the results showed no support for the proposition. TABLE XI, p. 88, shows that the mean scores for each group on union participation actually averaged a few points higher among those whose mothers were not union members (except for Group B), but, again, large numbers of responses fell into the "unknown or no answer" category. For that reason, the pattern of higher scores was probably meaningless.

Husband's Union Membership and Union Participation

Research Proposition 2f: Women union members whose husbands are union members are more likely to actively participate in their union locals than are those whose husbands are not union members.

Across the board, her husband's being a union member tended to elevate a respondent's union participation score somewhat (except for
TABLE XI:
Mean Union Participation Scores by Mother's Union Membership, for Each Union Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother's Union Membership</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Groups C &amp; D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean U.P. Score</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Mean U.P. Score</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother is/was a union member</td>
<td>27.9 * var=543.2 s.d.=23.3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17.7 * var=444.9 s.d.=21.9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother not a union member</td>
<td>33.5 var=792.6 s.d.=28.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.9 * var=496.7 s.d.=22.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown, or no answer</td>
<td>18.2 var=188.3 s.d.=17.2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30.8 * var=795.7 s.d.=28.2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*variances and standard deviations shown
members of groups C and D, where husband's union membership seemed to make very little difference. This pattern appeared consistent, even with small numbers reporting membership on their husbands' parts. Yet, for all respondents, the fact of husbands' union membership was linked only with a four-point union participation score advantage over those who did not know, or who (probably) did not think husband's union membership was significant enough to report (TABLE XII, p. 90).

A few of the responses to qualitative questions indicated that, at least for some women, husbands' union memberships or outlooks on unions were, clearly, important influences of their own unionism. Some of the comments were: "My husband encourages me to work within the union;" "We are both active in our locals, and proud of it;" "My husband encourages me to take part in the union;" and "My husband thinks my being a steward is neat. He's a big help to me." So, while the data did not definitively show that husband's union membership influences women's participation, for some of the respondents it was an important factor in their own union activities.

Attitude Toward Union Leaders and Union Participation

Research Proposition 3a: Women union members who view their present union leadership favorably, or in friendly terms, are more likely to participate actively in the union than are those who do not view the union in friendly terms.

The data for examining this proposition were taken from the responses to questionnaire item number 32: "What, if anything, could your local do to improve its services to members? Please explain." The response levels to this section of the questionnaire were quite good—approxi-
TABLE XII:
Mean Union Participation Scores by Husband's Union Membership, for Each Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Husband's Union Membership</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Groups C &amp; D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband is a union member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* var=575.5</td>
<td>s.d.=23.9</td>
<td>var=964.9</td>
<td>s.d.=31.0</td>
<td>var=132.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband is not a union member</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var=529.3</td>
<td>s.d.=23.0</td>
<td>var=341.6</td>
<td>s.d.=18.4</td>
<td>var=241.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown to respondent, or no answer</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>var=550.6</td>
<td>var=629.7</td>
<td>s.d.=25.0</td>
<td>var=265.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.d.=23.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>s.d.=25.0</td>
<td>s.d.=12.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*variances and standard deviations shown
mately 50 percent of the respondents (N=68) wrote some comment for item 32.

The intent of this item was that it might be used as an opportunity to respond concerning the local leaders—something which could not be asked directly, because it was too sensitive a question. Most who responded to this item did reveal their attitudes toward their local officers. In fact, it was noted that the vast majority of the women viewed "the local" as being synonymous with "the local leaders."

Of the 68 women who made some response to item 32, most (47 of them) tended to favor the local or the work of its officers. Some of the responses were: "Nothing. The local is as good as could be expected;" "Nothing—they are doing a good job;" "It is a good bunch of people and officers." Of the 47 who responded positively, 28 (about 69 percent) scored 40 points or higher in union participation (although mean scores, variances, and standard deviations were not obtained by computer for this variable, the tally was obtained by examining the original questionnaires).

The average union participation score among those who wrote favorable comments regarding the local leaders or the state of the local was 38 points (several points above average).

Among those who responded negatively regarding the local leadership (N=12), the average union participation score was 17 points (below average, and well below the average score of the "favorable" respondents). Viewed as a whole, these data tended to lend some credibility to the position that women who view their local leadership warmly are more active in their locals than those who do not.
Attitudes Toward Unions
and Union Participation

Research Proposition 3b: Women union members who hold a generally favorable view of unions are more likely to actively participate in their union locals than are those who view unions as a "necessary evil"—or worse.

First, it should be noted that the data were not adequate to speak to women's attitudes of unions being "necessary evils" or not. No mechanism was included in the questionnaire to elicit opinions on that question, and only one such opinion actually surfaced, i.e.: "I don't know if its worth the dues we pay, but I guess we would have less benefits if we didn't." The questionnaire item which was designated as the main test of the proposition (that women who hold a favorable view of unions are more active in the local than those who are not) was item number 56 in the final section: "Most workers really need a union to represent them and protect their interests."

The correlation of the variable attitude toward unions with union participation was 0.161. However, the mean scores (TABLE XIII, p.93), painted a slightly different picture, and tended more to support the proposition. Across the board, the mean scores were at least a few points higher among each group for those who held favorable outlooks toward unions.

The vast majority of the respondents generally favored unions, according to the measure used, but 13% did not favor unions according to the measure used. These figures are important, in that they give an indication of the character of the sample (composite of sample groups)—it had been expected that most of the women who would answer
### TABLE XIII

Mean Union Participation Scores by Respondent's Attitude Regarding Unions, for Each Union Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Toward Unions</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Groups C &amp; D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean U.P. Score</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Mean U.P. Score</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable toward</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* var=381.3</td>
<td>s.d.=19.5</td>
<td>var=628.9</td>
<td>s.d.=25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable toward</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* var=560.3</td>
<td>s.d.=23.6</td>
<td>var=577.0</td>
<td>s.d.=24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*variances and standard deviations shown
and return the questionnaire would be those who were interested in and supportive of unions. The 13% who apparently did not view unions favorably, but who responded, may have been interested in the questionnaire itself, or some aspect of it. There was nothing particularly unique about the questionnaires returned by those who did not "favor unions" according to the measure used.

Perception of Other Women's Interest in the Local and Union Participation

Research Proposition 3c: Women union members who perceive other women in their locals as being supportive of or interested in the locals are more likely to actively participate in their union locals than are those who see other women members as being non-supportive, or not interested in, the locals.

The questionnaire items which were designated as getting-at respondents' views of other women members' attitudes were item number 31, part "c" ("I have some problems with those other women who are not active in the union because of my support for the union."), and the "Comments" section of the same item. It was also expected that item number 27, which pertains to the preferences (male or female) for union officers, and which also had a "Comments" section, would reveal (any) negative viewpoints regarding other women's attitudes.

Of the 133 respondents, only 2 indicated that they "had problems" with other women members because of their own activism (in contrast, 41 felt they had problems with their male counterparts because they were active females). The two who felt opposition from other women members did not explain the nature of the difficulty in the "comments" section.
The vast majority of respondents (n=86) expressed "no preference" as to whether their union officers should be male or female (most who commented hoped only that those officers do a good job). Thirty-five said they would vote for men, if given a chance—of these, three cited reasons for preferring men: "Men make better leaders;" "It's too hard for a woman;" and "Women are too catty." Twelve indicated a preference for women officers. Of the women who indicated a preference for female representatives, a few who commented suggested that women were more supportive and listened better, but most commented that "more women should become involved," that "more women should run for office," etc.

A more direct question, i.e. "How interested are your women members in the union?" would have been more desirable, but was not included because it was too "sensitive" a question from the viewpoint of the union officers.

The "Closed Shop" and Union Participation

Research Proposition 4a: Women union members employed in a "closed shop" are more likely to actively participate in their union locals than are those who are employed in a "union shop."

The data showed no support for the proposition. In fact, members of Group A (which was merely a "union shop"), scored an average of seven points higher on the union participation scale than members of Group B (a "closed shop" for nearly a quarter of a century), as indicated in TABLE XIV. The questionnaire did not ask all respondents to indicate whether their locals were "union" or "closed," so members of Groups C and D could not be included in this analysis.

The numbers of women representing Group A (N=27) and Group B
## TABLE XIV

Mean Union Scores by "Closed" or "Union" Shop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A (a &quot;union shop&quot;)</th>
<th>Group B (a &quot;closed shop&quot;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Union Participation Score</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(N=61) were substantial enough to indicate that there may have been some real differences between the locals that led to the variance noted between the groups in the average union participation. However, there is no theoretical basis, nor anything indicated by the data of this study, to suggest that it was the characteristic of "closed shop" or "union shop" that led to differences in union participation.

Locals' Encouragement of Women's Participation and Union Participation

Research Proposition 4b: Women union members who belong to locals that have taken steps to encourage the participation of women members are more likely to actively participate in their locals than are women who belong to locals that have not taken steps to encourage the participation of women members.

First, it should be noted that the questionnaire did not ask the women's opinions as to whether or not their locals encouraged women's participation, although such information would have been quite interesting in relation to union participation. This was not included in the questionnaire so as to avoid offending the union officers.

The results of the study did show some support for the proposition. Group A, which appeared to be more supportive of and encouraging toward women members, had a higher average participation level than did Group B, which did not appear to particularly encourage women members.

The President of Group A reported (in the interview) that numerous discussions had been held at local meetings regarding the importance of women taking part in union affairs, and that women were regularly nominated for and voted-into committees and offices. In addition, he said that women were frequently urged to write for and help...
produce the local's newsletter. These claims were confirmed by an associate of the researcher who was a member of the local. The President of Group A also stated that his local had taken a stand on the issue of equal job opportunities for women to the extent that the local was "now being affected by problems where women are required to lift heavy things, and so on." This chief executive of Group A also seemed aware of equal rights resolutions passed at conventions of his international, and that the union had a "formal unit working for equal rights and opportunities" at the international level.

The President of Group B, in contrast, did not mention or seem aware of any efforts in his local to encourage the women members. He reported that "the question never came up." He stated that he "didn't think" the international had any "quotas for women to hold offices." This chief executive was unaware of any convention resolutions or efforts at the international level to integrate women members into responsible offices and active participation.

Proportion of Women in the Local and Union Participation

Research Proposition 4c: Women union members belonging to locals with a high proportion of women members in their total memberships are more likely to actively participate in their union locals than are those women union members who belong to locals which have low proportions of women members.

Based only on the results from Groups A and B, the proposition was contradicted. Group A, which had a female membership of 294, out of a total union membership of 598 (49% female) had a higher average union participation level than did Group B, which was 78 per cent female (538 women, out of 719 total local membership).
However, without data from a number of locals regarding proportion of female membership and female activism, no generalization can be made.

Women Officers in the Local and Union Participation

Research Proposition 4d: Women union members who belong to locals with several women officers are more likely to actively participate in their union locals than are women members whose locals have few or no women officers.

The results of this study bore some support for the proposition. The interview data revealed that the local Group A represented was 54% female among the office holders, while only 27% of the officers of Group B were women (see TABLE XV, p.100). The women members of Group A scored an average of seven points higher in union participation than members of Group B.

Summary on the Propositions

A definite relationship appeared to exist between union activism and women's liberation ideology. "High feminism" was consistently accompanied by at least moderately high union participation, but union participation far from guaranteed high "feminism." It was noted that some activists tended to view themselves as "unionists," and that certain features of "unionism" might typically repress expressions of "feminism."

No correlation was found to exist between age and union participation, but such a relationship may have been obscured by the lopsided age representation, since the modal age was only 22. However, comparison of mean scores by age category showed definite patterns: union participation was lowest at the youngest and oldest ages,
TABLE XV

Total Numbers of Women in Local Offices and Responsible Positions; Groups A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Total no. of Positions</th>
<th>Group A Total no. of women in Positions</th>
<th>Total no. of Positions</th>
<th>Group B Total no. of women in Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary, Treasurer, Recording-Secretary or Finance-Secretary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Board Member or Trustee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer, Union Rep. or Business Agent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Chief, Sergeant-at-Arms, Newspaper Editor or Committee Head</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Women 54% of total positions) (Women 27% of total positions)
peaked at 31-35, dropped off significantly, and then rose again through age 55.

The data did not indicate that long membership in itself was conducive to high union participation. When mean union participation scores were compared by group, no meaningful patterns emerged, except that participation typically fell off after the first year of membership among the Kalamazoo locals.

The respondents listed a tremendous variety of memberships in voluntary associations, and there was some support in the data for the idea that union activists are generally also active in voluntary associations. Most of those who scored highest in union participation belonged to some voluntary organization, while a few belonged to two, three or more.

The respondents who clearly had either long or short histories of employment were few, so the data were inconclusive as to the relationship of work history to union participation.

Parent's union membership bore no significance to union activism, according to the findings. Women whose husbands were union members tended to have higher average union participation scores, except among the activists, for whom husband's union membership seemed to make very little difference.

The results were inadequate to draw any inferences regarding the effects of marital role upon union participation. The comments written on the returned questionnaires indicated that, for at least some, spouse's attitudes positively influenced their union behavior.

Considerable support was shown for the proposition that women who generally favored the local officers and their work tended to
participate more actively in their locals than those who did not. The vast majority of all respondents generally favored unions. Opposition to leaders or their policies did not typically emerge as a basis for union activism.

The effects of women union members' perceptions of other women members' and union officers' attitudes (and union behaviors—especially their levels of supportiveness) on the women's own union behavior was not uncovered. This information was lost due to methodological errors.

Membership in a "closed shop" was not linked with active participation. In fact, members of the "union shop" group actually averaged a few points higher on union participation. It was doubted that the characteristic of "union shop" actually led to the higher scores of that group—it was likely something else about the local led to greater average participation (such as encouragement of women members, women holding local offices, etc.).

The encouragement of women members to participate in the local appeared to lead to their greater participation.

A high proportion of women members in the total local membership was not linked with greater average participation on the part of women members, based (only) on the data of the Kalamazoo locals. The reverse seemed to occur: the local with the smaller proportion of women members had a higher average participation level.

Of the Kalamazoo locals, the one with the greater proportion of women office holders was also characterized by greater average union participation.
Summary of Findings for the Units

Group A was a ten-year-old hospital local of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees. The women members (N=294) constituted 49 percent of the membership. Although Group A had a significantly smaller proportion of women members than the other local sampled, this group had a higher average participation level than the other.

The majority of jobs held by women in this hospital—and in the union—were semi-skilled (clerks, food workers, nurse aids, and housekeepers), but a small number of nurses were also members of the union.

The number of responses from nurses (as opposed to their semi-skilled counterparts within the local) was disproportionately large. This suggests that the nurses who chose to join the local may have tended toward militancy, and were therefore interested in returning the questionnaire. The return for all the women members of this local (N=147) was 30, which equalled a 23 percent return rate—the poorest among the groups sampled. It was not certain why Group A had the poorest return rate, except that the local submitted a mailing list on which a number of addresses seemed incomplete—it appeared to have been hastily put together, and it might have also been somewhat out-of-date.

Group A was a "union shop," that is, membership in the union was not a requirement for employees. It is not clear that the factor of voluntary membership led to a greater level of union militancy among those who chose to join than, for example, might be found among the total membership of a "closed shop," but union participation did average seven points higher for this group than for Group B, which was a "closed shop."
The local Group A was sampled from was considerably smaller than the other local sampled (just over half as large as Group B). Still, compared with most other union locals, Group A was average, or larger than average in size.

Group A had a significantly greater number of women in leadership positions than did the other local sampled (women in 54 percent of total positions, as compared with 27 percent). The greater number of women officers in this local, together with the greater overall participation level, is probably closely related to the local's encouragement of women's involvement, and also the positive attitude of the union leaders toward the female members.

The President (of the local sampled for Group A) reported that women's participation was a continuing topic of concern within the local, and that he and others frequently urged women's participation on many levels. His claim was confirmed. Despite his, and other officers'—some of whom were women—efforts, many women did not seem to feel that it was their "place" or their responsibility to work actively in the local. A "little resentment" toward women members from the men was noted, and it was suggested that women were often viewed as not willing to fight on economic issues.

As noted in Chapter IV, the majority of the women of Group A who scored high in union participation did not seem to view themselves as "unionists" in the traditional sense—unlike the activists of groups C and D.

The other Kalamazoo sample, Group B, was a 27-year-old local of the United Steel Workers. The women members (N=538) were 78 percent of the
total membership. Despite the large proportion of female membership, women of this group generally scored lower in union participation than did the other local sampled.

Most of the women in this local—and most of the respondents for this group—were machine operators. Jobs in the workplace were particularly segregated by sex. Generally, the only men to appear in the women's work areas were supervisors and janitors.

The response rate from Group B was 26 percent (better than Group A, but still rather low). The mailing list provided by the Group B local appeared carefully prepared, and carried the current date. The primary reason for the poor return from Group B may have been the extensive "lay-off" which affected many members around the time of the first mailing. Many women might have been understandably reluctant to respond to the questionnaire at a time when their jobs were in question and their confidence in the union was rather low.

The Group B sample was drawn from a "closed shop." The ramifications of this factor for participation were not clear (see Chapter IV), but compared with Group A, the overall participation rate was lower.

Women members of Group B were not generally encouraged to participate in the affairs of the local, according to the evidence from the interview with the President. Considerable antipathy between male and female members was revealed. It was not clear whether this was a function of isolation between the sexes at the work site, and different jobs performed, or the result of difficulties within the local.

The Group B local had few women officers, despite their majority of women within the local.
As in Group A, the women activists of Group B did not typically consider themselves to be "unionists."

The respondents included in groups C and D came from a large number and variety of union locals. Unlike the Kalamazoo locals, these groups contained a number of women in "professional" positions (i.e., college teachers, etc.).

The returns from groups C and D were 44 and 53 percent—considerably higher than the Kalamazoo locals.

Although the scoring patterns for groups C and D were analyzed in Chapter IV, a few contrasts within the results for the Kalamazoo locals were noteworthy: The respondents from groups C and D scored generally high in both union participation and feminism, but no correlation was found to exist between the variables (unlike the Kalamazoo respondents).

Secondly, the C and D respondents seemed generally less influenced by the union membership of significant others (father, mother, husband) than did the Kalamazoo locals. No theoretical basis for this difference was known, except that the activists of C and D tended more to fit the traditional union militant mode than did the Kalamazoo activists, and that this traditional "unionism" appeared to have a particular pattern of development and certain shared values. Perhaps, strong values of traditional unionism are not particularly linked with family experiences, but are more closely related to other social phenomena.

Given all the characteristics of the Kalamazoo locals, it appeared that Group A was more "favored" to have union activists than Group B. The Group A local was smaller, membership was voluntary, the participation of females was actively encouraged, and it had more women officers.
If the mailing list obtained from the Group A local had been better, the return from Group A might also have been considerably (rather than slightly) higher than for Group B.
The Significance of the Findings

The single finding of moment was the relationship between women's liberation ideology and union participation. A positive correlation appeared between those two variables, despite the new, untested, and somewhat crudely devised scales of measurement used. The popular assumption that feminism and union activism are linked was supported, but these results showed that the relationship was more complicated than expected: some union activists seemed clearly to be feminists, while for another distinct category of activists (most of those organized into "unionists" groups and/or those who identified themselves as union activists) feminism was less evident.

That many who were high in participation were not high in feminism is something of a puzzle. It is not clear, first of all, whether they were inhibited in expressing feminism, or rather, simply less feminist than those activists who did emphasize their "feminism." It is equally unclear why a relatively large group of activists (high scorers on the participation scale) would avoid emphasizing "unionism."

The question is if there is something about self-proclaimed "unionism" which inhibits women's liberation ideology, or denies the expression of it? As suggested above, most of the activists who did not choose to call themselves "unionists" were found in groups A and B. These activists typically had been drawn into union affairs somewhat spontaneously—in protest over particular issues, or as the result of their popularity. In both of the Kalamazoo locals (especially
in Group B) there was a tradition of adversity between the sexes within the local. The conditions within these groups might have encouraged, at least to some degree, women's rights thinking and "solidarity" among the women members.

As noted above, the women of groups C and D were more typically involved in the role of defending positions with the structures of their unions. Not only did they generally hold more important union offices than their counterparts in groups A and B, but they (and others like them) had come to hold somewhat clearly defined positions within the trade union movement—they were defenders, to some extent, of women's interests within their unions, but above all they were defenders of the unions.

The tendency of the self-described "unionsits" to value union solidarity over "women's interests" is not surprising, in the light of Lipset, Trow, and Coleman's findings on how power is acquired and concentrated within the unions. Union officials keep control over the means of communication, keeping the opinions of rank and file members from interfering with their power. Lipset, et. al. found that opposition and discontent are seldom effectively expressed within locals. Further, members who express differences with the status quo rarely gain access to the principal source of leadership training within the union—the union administrative and political structure itself. There is no reason to think that women unionists function outside of the processes of bureaucratic control described by Lipset. In fact, we might expect that women, particularly, would be expected to "play
by the rules" in order to gain leadership positions—with some exceptions, such as cases where women overpower male leadership, have wide backing on issues, fill vacancies, gain the support of male leaders, etc.

Because women in leadership positions within the unions are still rare, we must conclude that the majority of them have climbed to those positions with the blessings of male incumbents. We might also conclude that these women were willing to stick to conventional union issues, rather than viewing themselves as proponents of minority rights within the union bureaucracy. When these women began to share union leadership with their male counterparts, they became part of the system of bureaucratic control, and we should expect that they also internalized the traditional system to some degree.

Among groups A and B, the activists tended to be (1) women who had not yet become part of the bureaucratic system of control (we may recall that activists in these two groups tended to hold lower-level offices than those in groups C and D, and that activism for many of Group A peaked in the first year of membership), and/or (2) women who had rejected participation in the bureaucratic system of control.

It is important to keep in mind that the majority of both men and women union members either think that union leaders should be men (in this study, the majority of those who had a preference preferred male officers), or think that women union members generally need skill-training or extra encouragement to attain the level of effectiveness of male union leaders (Wertheimer). Union members
who would like to see women attain more leadership positions are up against the powerful ideology of male supremacy, slow-changing union traditions, and the insecurities of women members themselves.

The responses did not support the possibility that opposition to the policies of local leaders might be a typical basis for union activism. Only one respondent stated a specific policy difference with local leaders. She wrote: "The local should have fought tooth and nail against the E.N.A. when the Internationale (sic) tried to push it down our throats" (this respondent was a member of Group B—Steel Workers—and the Experimental Negotiating Agreement was a controversial no-strike clause accepted by the International). This respondent scored 33 points (high average) on the union participation index. On the other hand, the evidence that these Michigan women tended to participate more fully when they liked and felt encouraged by the local leadership, supported Walker and Guest's proposition that members participate in their unions to the extent that they feel a "sense of belonging" to it.

The findings of this study were consistent with those of Wertheimer and Nelson, in that these Michigan women were interested in the affairs of their locals, wanted to participate, and wanted other women to participate (as evidenced by their claims that they would like to be able to vote women into union offices, and their comments that they would like to see more women become involved). The comments of women activists particularly expressed concern for more women to become involved in the unions.

These results supplied no evidence either for or against the
idea that women are drawn into labor union activities as members of social groupings (as Sayles and Strauss and Wertheimer found). The item: "Are any of your fellow workers also neighbors?" had a very low response rate, and was also generally inadequate to get at any sociometric patterns of participation. While the possibility existed to examine participation differences along the lines of job classification, time spent interacting with others in the department or on the shop floor—the sorts of correlates Sprinrad, and Sayles and Strauss, arrived at—such data was not gathered. The primary research question was viewed to be why more women do not become involved in their union locals, rather than how some do become involved.

Still, some elements of the motivational dynamic of participation are central to the question of why women are generally so limited in union participation. This study did not suggest that it is a commitment to shared values which leads to union activism (recall the disparity among activists on matters of feminism, husbands' approval of union involvement, what they expected of the local, etc.). In fact, commitment to traditional unionism did not even seem to be a requisite for union participation (within Group A).

On this question, however, it is necessary to keep in mind that union participation dropped off among members of Group A after the first year—before those women became part of the bureaucratic structure of the union or internalized traditional unionism to any extent. If conditions within the Group A local were different, perhaps many more of its members would remain participants, and
eventually become "unionists." It is also important to remember that there were many consistencies in scoring patterns among the "unionists" that would suggest shared values (commitment to unionism, moderate feminism, husbands' approval low in importance, etc.). What this suggests is that strong values of support for the union structure and traditional unionism is not necessary to initial union participation—or even activism. Strong values of support for the union structure and traditional unionism is necessary to self-definition as a "unionist," and possibly also to long-term union activism.

In regard to the relationship of motivational factors to union participation or activism, it is important to examine a proposition which was advanced as part of the theoretical rationale for this study; that is, commitment to working outside the home and/or to the job is the key link between labor force involvement and extended work-related activities (such as union participation). As noted in Chapter IV, the data were insufficient to determine if long involvement in the workforce led to union involvement. Further, the relationship between long union membership and union activism was not clear.

A careful examination of those sections of the returned questionnaires, however, revealed that there may have been real differences between the Kalamazoo locals and groups C and D as to typical labor force attachment. While there were no apparent differences in the typical lengths of time spent in the labor force, between the Kalamazoo locals and groups C and D, members of C and D generally had fewer and better jobs in their work histories. Perhaps the quality of the work experience is as important, or more important than, length of time spent in the workforce to becoming involved in union activities.
It is fairly obvious that a woman who spends only a year or two at each job, or who is dissatisfied with the present job (and not expecting to stay long) might show little interest in union participation.

The finding that the union activists tended to participate in other voluntary associations corroborated Rafael's hypothesis that women active in their unions are often also active in their communities, as well as Form and Dansereau's discovery that those members tending toward a "social activist orientation" are most likely to participate in union affairs. As noted in Chapter II, Hagedorn and Labovitz found that leadership was a dominant variable for joining several voluntary organizations, and that skills acquired by performing as a leader in the work organization are extended to voluntary associations. An examination of the sorts and depths of involvements women in this sample showed that the most serious and active union participants tended toward a greater involvement in voluntary associations, heavier responsibilities within those associations, and an orientation more toward civic involvement than recreational or hobby groups (the list of organizations included in APPENDIX G provides an idea of the range of voluntary associations reported).

As mentioned above, these results suggested some support for Hagedorn and Labovitz's idea that incumbent union leaders tend to monopolize leadership skills. There was little direct evidence that the women sampled wanted greater democracy in their locals, and there was limited evidence of policy disputes. On the other hand, it is possible that many simply did not think that more democracy was
possible (and therefore worth mentioning) and it is also possible that those with serious policy differences simply did not return the questionnaires. Although few women commented on any communication problems within the locals, it was evident from the responses that many were misinformed about some of the affairs of their locals (a large number, for example, did not know whether or not their local published a newsletter or had a recent strike). Unlike Wertheimer's, this questionnaire did not include any items directly pertaining to democracy or communication within the local (for fear of alienating the union presidents).

The Research Limitations

The primary failure of the research was its overly-broad scope. In the interest of gathering relevant data in a largely unexplored area, a staggering number of questions were posed. By the time the questionnaire was developed, all sight had been lost of several manageable research possibilities. A major problem, for example, was that neither the individual union member nor the union local was focused on as the basic unit of analysis. The result was a collection of data which reached voluminous proportions, but which provided little definitive information on either the social-psychological (motivational) factors of participation, or the barriers within the union locals' structures against women's participation.

The research tools—mailed questionnaires, with interviews limited to chief executives—did not generally provide data of quantitative and qualitative proportions sufficient to reflect on some
important research questions. A serious evaluation of the questionnaire at some early date could have prevented some key questions from going unanswered. For example, almost no useful information was obtained concerning the family-role and family-obligations sorts of blocks to union participation, nor about the means of adjustment employed by those who were successful in balancing family responsibilities with union participation.

Some combination of mailed questionnaires and interviews with women rank and file might have been more effective in uncovering the real opinions of women members regarding their union locals, and their perceptions of any barriers to their participation. A great number of important questions simply could not be asked directly, in the questionnaire, for fear of offending the cooperating union officials—but such information could have been obtained rather easily by interviewing.

The rather low level of return was quite unexpected, given the extremely positive pre-test response to the questionnaire. Methods of assuring good levels of return in mailed questionnaire surveys have been devised, and perhaps one of those should have been used in this undertaking.

The research process was hindered at various points by the lack of a precise time schedule and budget.

The Implications for Further Research

Under certain conditions, the scales developed for this study might be of use in future research. The scale used to measure women's
liberation ideology proved to be fairly inter-correlated by item (see APPENDIX F). It also produced a range of scores close to the level expected. It is not clear, however, if the theoretical sub-categories of this feminism scale had any real meaning.

Generally, it appears that the feminism scale devised for this study might be at least as useful as some other feminism indexes which have been used elsewhere, but that it might require some additional manipulation and evaluation, depending upon how it is to be used.

The union participation scale, of course, is not directly applicable to any other population than this one. The process used to select the items to be incorporated into a scale (APPENDIX B) was quite effective, and might be used in similar research.

With the publication of Wertheimer's study (it was not yet complete at the outset of this research), and with these additional findings, a number of questions about the union participation problems of women have answers. However, related topics still require investigation. It would be interesting and useful to know how some women actually acquire the leadership skills necessary to become integrated into the union power structures. Further, what can women activists and their male counterparts do to bring more women into an active union role? Answers to these and similar questions might be of considerable value to those engaged in the struggle to halt the downward slump in labor organizing among women.
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The final section of the questionnaire is devoted to uncovering the respondent's attitudes regarding "women's liberation." This section (items 33-50, but excluding 51-56, which are for another purpose) covers three main areas of concern: (1) conventional "feminist" ideas about the general relationship of women to men (items 33-38); (2) conjugal relations (items 39-44); and (3) women's relationship to the work world (45-50). Half of these items are stated negatively, from a "feminist" point of view, and the other half are stated positively in a random alternating pattern intended to avoid prejudicing the responses (that is, having responses fit a pattern as a result of anticipation of the intent of the questionnaire). Thus, items 33, 34, 35, 39, 40, 41, 45 and 47 are stated negatively, from a "feminist" point of view, while items 36, 37, 38, 42, 43, 44, 48, 49 and 50 are stated positively from a 'feminist' point of view.

All items are weighted equally.

Scoring is straightforwardly linked with the original responses. Item 33, for example, which is negatively stated from a "feminist" point of view, is scored in this way: response 5, "strongly disagree," is scored 5 points (this is the highest possible "feminist" score for this item); response 4, "disagree," is scored 4 points; response 3, "not sure," is scored 3 points; response 2, "agree," is scored 2 points; and response 1, "strongly agree," is scored 1 point (the lowest "feminist" score which can be had for the item). Item 36, which is positively stated, from a "feminist" point of view, is scored in reverse: a choice of response 5,
"strongly disagree," is worth 1 point.

Thus, the highest "feminist" score for each item is 5 points, while the lowest possible "feminist" score for the same item is 1 point. Because there are 18 items in this section, the maximum possible summated score is 90 (18 x 5), and the lowest summated score possible is 18 (18 x 1).

Item 34 is borrowed from the Spence-Helmrich AWS (on that scale it was number 69, and it read: "A man should not allow himself to get as emotionally upset by disappointment and problems as women do."). All other items are original with this scale, and especially created to correspond with the three theoretical concerns stated above (conventional "feminism," conjugal relations, and work). No pre-test for internal consistency was possible for this scale, but this scale has been critically examined by 15-20 women workers (associates of the researcher), and has undergone considerable modification with an eye to both meaning and wording.
APPENDIX B: The Measurement of Union Participation

The scheme of the measurement of union participation is based on possible union-related activities. Interviews with the chief officers of six Kalamazoo-area locals reveal that the differences between the locals in structure and history provide wide variations in the sorts of "participation" an individual member might be motivated to. One local produces a newspaper, for example, while another has no newspaper, but sponsors several social events. In order to measure and to make generalizations about union participation, then, only those activities a woman might undertake within any of the local unions studied are included in the scaling. The "possible union activities" are, first of all, sorted-out in the following manner, as a method of determining which sorts of activities occur universally in the union structures examined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>ONE OR MORE</th>
<th>NONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office holding</td>
<td>Helping on the newspaper</td>
<td>Participating in activities for former members or for wives of members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending regular meetings</td>
<td>Participating in strikes, wildcats, or demonstrations</td>
<td>Participating in recreation teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding steward position</td>
<td>Attending union social functions (benefits, picnics, etc.)</td>
<td>Participating in union education programs (stewardship school, labor history series, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in a union election</td>
<td>Joining union-operated credit union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizing the grievance procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding a committee membership or committee chair</td>
<td>Utilizing union-negotiated upgrading program and/or classification advancement procedure specified in contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B (continued):

Column two contains activities possible in one or more of the locals, but not all of the locals. Column three contains possible activities found in some labor union locals, but not in any of those included in this study. The items in columns two and three ('One or More' and 'None') are, for that reason, eliminated from consideration for the participation index.

Column one contains activities possible in all of the locals included in the sampling. Of the items in column one, the sixth (utilizing the grievance procedure) is discarded from consideration for the index—not because it is not a valid measure of union participation, but because there is no way of knowing the extent to which it is a universally 'possible' action, due to the differences between the sites.

Several viable possibilities for an index of participation remain in the first column: office holding; attending regular meetings; holding the position of steward; participating in an election campaign; voting in an election campaign; and holding a committee membership or chair. These activities become the major determinants of union participation to be used, and they are next evaluated on the bases of probable time expenditure and the level of commitment to the union associated with each.

The time expenditures expected for each sort of activity are derived from the estimates made by the union leaders interviewed, and also from the actual range of time expenditures indicated in the data. The level of union commitment associated with each sort of activity is based on average time expenditures, and the extent of union militancy, hard work, and dedication required in a given activity or task (as indicated in the comments of the union leaders interviewed, as well as others who were consulted, but not formally interviewed). These determinants of participation make up five categories, shown below with scores assigned to each activity:
APPENDIX E (continued):

ITEM NUMBER IN QUESTIONNAIRE

24  (1) Office holding
    Presidency..................20
    Executive board.............10
  30 maximum score for the category

24  (2) Participation in committees
    Key position...............8
    Committee chair..............8
    Committee member.............4
  20 maximum score for the category

15  (3) Attending meetings (of last six)
    None........................0
    One..........................5
    Two...........................10
    Three or more...............15
  15 maximum score for the category

20  (4) Election behavior
    Participating in election (s)
    Running for office.........4
    Working in a campaign......4
    Voting in election(s)......2
  10 maximum score for the category

24  (5) Devoting time to union work
    Average hours per month
    low (1-5)......................
    moderate (6-15)............... 
    high (16+).....................
  24 maximum score for the category

99 maximum summated score

Any given respondent may score as low as zero, if she did not take part in any of the activities specified as determinants. To receive the maximum summated score (ninety-nine), the respondent must have taken part in at least one specified activity in each category of participation.
APPENDIX C: The Questionnaire Form

With the following questions we are trying to learn a few things about your life - how much work you have to do, and how much time you spend at activities other than your job - as well as a little about your history.

1. What is your age?: ______________

2. What is your marital status? (Please check one):
   Married _____  Widowed _____  Separated _____
   Unmarried _____  Divorced _____

3. Do you have any special health problems which limit your ability to participate in other activities besides work (health or other problems)? (Please check one):
   __________ Yes  __________ No
   If "yes", please explain: ___________________________________________________

4. Do you receive any help with housework?: _______ Yes _______ No
   If "yes" who helps you with household chores, and what type of assistance do they give you?:
   WHO HELPS WITH HOUSEWORK?  WHAT DOES THIS PERSON (OR PERSONS) DO TO HELP?
   __________________________________________  __________________________________

5. We would like to know a little about your work history. Please start with your present place of employment and work back through your six past employers (if any). Please be as exact as possible about the type of work you did:

   NAME OF EMPLOYER (present)  TYPE OF WORK  NAME OF UNION IF ANY  WERE/ARE YOU A UNION MEMBER (YES or NO)  LENGTH OF TIME EMPLOYED THERE
   ____________________________________________________________  ____________________________  ____________________________  ____________________________  ____________________________
   ____________________________________________________________  ____________________________  ____________________________  ____________________________  ____________________________
   ____________________________________________________________  ____________________________  ____________________________  ____________________________  ____________________________
   ____________________________________________________________  ____________________________  ____________________________  ____________________________  ____________________________
   ____________________________________________________________  ____________________________  ____________________________  ____________________________  ____________________________
   ____________________________________________________________  ____________________________  ____________________________  ____________________________  ____________________________

GO TO NEXT PAGE PLEASE.
6. Have you ever advanced to a higher or better job title (or classification) during the time you have worked at your present employment? (Please check one):
    YES               NO

7. If you have young children, what arrangements do you have for their care while you are at work? (Please check one):
    I take them to a babysitter's home.
    A babysitter comes to our house.
    I take them to a child care center.
    They stay at home with my husband (or another relative).
    I have other arrangements. (Please explain): __________________________
    I have no children.
    My children are all old enough to take care of themselves.

8. If you have a child, or children, are the child-care arrangements that you have while you are at work working out well, or not? (Please check one):
    A. I am satisfied with the child-care arrangements I have for my children while I'm at work.
    B. I am not satisfied with the child-care arrangements I have for my children while I'm at work.

If you checked "B," will you please explain what the problem or difficulty is with your child-care arrangements?: __________________________________________________

9. If you are married, what is your spouse's regular job or occupation? (Please be as exact as possible): __________________________
    If he is a member of a union, please give the name of the union: ________________

10. What are (or were) your parents' main occupations? If either of them is (or was) a union member, please indicate which union:
    Father's occupation: _______________________________________________________
    Name of his union, if any: _________________________________________________
    Mother's occupation: _____________________________________________________
    Name of her union, if any: _______________________________________________
APPENDIX C (continued):

11. Please list all of the people who regularly live in your household, other than yourself. Please don't give their names, but rather their relationship to you (example: "husband," "daughter," "mother-in-law," etc.). If any one of these persons have special health problems which require special care from you, please write in the name of the disease or ailment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP TO YOU</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>IF EMPLOYED, TYPE OF OCCUPATION</th>
<th>SPECIAL HEALTH PROBLEM (please specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Are you presently a member of any church or civic organizations, or any hobby clubs? (please check one):

_______YES  _______NO

If "yes," please list them and note the approximate number of hours per week you devote to each organization. How long have you been a member of each group?:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE OF ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF HOURS PER WEEK</th>
<th>LENGTH OF MEMBERSHIP (Years, Months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Are any of the persons that you work with close friends of yours? (Please check one):

_______YES  _______NO

14. Are any of the people that you work with neighbors of yours? (Please check one):

_______YES  _______NO

GO TO NEXT PAGE PLEASE.
THANK YOU FOR THE ANSWERS YOU HAVE GIVEN SO FAR. THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS DEAL WITH YOUR UNION ACTIVITIES.

15. How many of the last six meetings of your union local you have attended (please circle one):
   
   A. None
   B. One or Two
   C. Three or Four
   D. Five or Six

16. Have you attended any of the social or recreational activities of your union during the past year (activities such as picnics, benefit dances, etc.). (Please check one):
   
   YES
   NO

   If "yes," what were the activities?: ________________________________

17. How often do you discuss the union, or union affairs, with other workers? (Please check one):
   
   A. Never
   B. Occasionally (example: one a month)
   C. Often (example: at least once a week)

18. Have you ever filed a grievance since you have been a member of your present union?:
   
   YES
   NO

   If "yes," how many times have you used the grievance procedure? (Please give the approximate number of times): ______________

19. Has your union had a strike, or more than one strike, since you have been a member of it?:
   
   YES
   NO

   If "yes," did you support the most recent strike?: YES NO

   If you did support the strike, did you picket?: YES NO

   Did you support the strike in other ways? (Please explain): ____________________________

20. Have there been any elections (for union officers) held since you have been a member of the union? (Please check one):
    
    YES
    NO

    If "yes," did you vote? (Please check one):
    
    A. I have never voted in an election.
    B. I have voted in some, but not all elections for union officers.
    C. I have voted in all the elections for officers that I have known about.

GO TO NEXT PAGE PLEASE.
APPENDIX C (continued):

21. Have you ever actively "run," or worked to get yourself elected in a campaign for union offices? (Please check one):
   _______YES _______NO

22. Have you ever worked to help get another person elected to a union office? (Please check one):
   _______YES _______NO

23. Have you ever voted for a woman running for a union office? (Please check one):
   _______YES _______NO

   If "no," please check one below:
   A. _____ No woman has ever run for office since I have been a voting member of the union.
   B. _____ I have had the choice of voting for a woman candidate for a union office, but just didn't want to vote for her.
   C. _____ I usually don't vote in union elections.

24. Are you presently serving in a union office or committee, or have you ever served in a union office or committee? (Please check one):
   _______YES _______NO

   If "no," please go on to Question Number 25.

   If "yes," please list each position, how you got the job or office, length of time you served, and the average number of hours of your time per month this activity requires or required. Please note the examples written in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF OFFICE OR COMMITTEE.</th>
<th>PLEASE NOTE IF YOU WERE A MEMBER OR A CHAIRPERSON OF A COMMITTEE. PLEASE INCLUDE STEWARDSHIP POSITIONS.</th>
<th>HOW DID YOU GET THIS OFFICE OR POSITION? Volun- Elec- Appoin- teered ted ted</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>AVERAGE HOURS PER MONTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

GO TO NEXT PAGE PLEASE.
25. Does your union local publish a newspaper or newsletter?: _______YES _______NO

If "yes," do you read this union newspaper?: _______YES _______NO

If "yes," have you ever contributed an article to the newspaper or sent news into it?: _______YES _______NO

WE ARE INTERESTED IN YOUR OPINION ABOUT THE FOLLOWING:

26. If a man and a woman were both running for the same union office, and both seemed well qualified for the position, which one would you vote for? (please check one):

A. _____the man       B. _____the woman       C. _____No preference

27. Do you think most of the women you work with prefer to have men represent them as elected union officers, or prefer to have women represent them as elected union officials? (Please check one):

A. _____Most prefer men as union officers.
B. _____Most prefer women as union officers.
C. _____I don't think the majority of women prefer one over the other.
D. _____I don't know, (or) I'm not sure.

COMMENTS: ____________________________________________________________

28. Do you think that women workers generally prefer another woman as a boss or supervisor, or a man as a boss or supervisor? (Please check one):

A. _____Most women workers would rather "take orders" from a woman "boss," if they had the choice.
B. _____Most women workers would rather "take orders" from a man "boss," if they had the choice.
C. _____I don't think that most women workers care whether they have a woman or a man as their boss.

COMMENTS: ____________________________________________________________

29. Have you ever had a woman "boss"? (Please check one):

________YES _______NO

30. If you had a choice, would you prefer a woman boss, a man boss, or no difference? (Please check one):

_____woman boss or _____man boss or _____no

supervisor     supervisor     preference

COMMENTS: ____________________________________________________________

GO TO NEXT PAGE PLEASE.
APPENDIX C (continued):

31. Would you say that you were quite active in your union local? (Please check one):

______YES  ______NO

If "yes," do you think that women who actively support the union have any special
problems in getting along with any of the people at your place of work? (Please
check any below that apply):

A. _____ I have some problems with supervisors or foremen because I actively support
   the union;
B. _____ I have some problems with those men who are not active in the union because
   of my support for the union;
C. _____ I have some problems with those other women who are not active in the union
   because of my support for the union;
D. _____ Being an active woman unionist creates no special problems at all where I
   work.

COMMENTS: ____________________________________________________________

32. What, if anything, could your union local do to improve its services to members?
Please explain: ____________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

TO ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS, PLEASE CIRCLE THE RESPONSE WHICH BEST FITS YOUR OPINION

DO YOU AGREE, OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING IDEAS? (PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH "OPINION"):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33. &quot;Men should</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continue to show</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courtesies to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women such as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standing up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when a woman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comes into the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>room or giving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>her a seat on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the bus.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 34. "Men generally do not allow themselves to get as emotionally upset by problems as women do." | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|                                                                                                     |

| 35. "Most men could never take care of a child properly for any length of time." | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|                                                                                     |   |   |   |   |   |

GO TO NEXT PAGE PLEASE.
36. "Women have as much potential for leadership as men do."

37. "In our society, women are generally not allowed to make as much of themselves as they could."

38. "In her social life, a woman has as much a right to freedom as a man has."

39. "Because the man is basically the head of the household he should have more 'say' in the financial plans of the family than the woman."

40. "Men should usually get the better paying jobs, since they are the ones who support their families."

41. "Women who have young children shouldn't work outside the home at all except in cases of serious financial disaster."

42. "A woman who works outside the home has a right to expect her mate to share the responsibility for kitchen chores."

43. "A man has no right to discourage his wife from working outside the home, if that is what she wants to do."

44. "It is bad for young children when their mother works outside the home."

45. "It is psychologically more important to a man that he has a job to go to everyday than it is to a woman."

46. "A woman who works all her life and never has a baby is missing the most important thing in life."

47. "It would be better for their marriages and their families if fewer women worked outside the home."

GO TO NEXT PAGE PLEASE.
APPENDIX C (continued):

48. "If she is properly trained, a woman can do nearly every job that a man can do." 

49. "Most men have dumb ideas about the kind of work that women are capable of doing."

50. "It is generally more difficult for a woman to get a responsible job than it is for a man."

51. "Women tend to be more likely to file grievances over 'petty' things than men."

52. "It is natural for women to be less interested in union affairs than their male co-workers are."

53. "Men usually make the best union stewards because they are naturally better at talking to and 'handling' management than women are."

54. "Women union stewards understand the particular problems of women workers better than male stewards do."

55. "It is difficult for women who have children to be very active in the activities of their union locals."

56. "Most workers really need a union to represent them and protect their interests."

57. Are you at all familiar with the "Equal Rights Amendment"?: _______YES _______NO

Do you think the Equal Rights Amendment is a good thing for women workers?: _______YES _______NO

WE ARE HOPEFUL THAT THE RESULTS OF THIS SURVEY WILL BE HELPFUL TO WORKING WOMEN. WITHOUT WOMEN - LIKE YOU - WHO ARE THOUGHTFUL ENOUGH TO SPARE A FEW MINUTES, THE STUDY COULD NOT BE COMPLETED.

PLEASE RETURN THIS ENTIRE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENVELOPE WE HAVE PROVIDED.

WE HOPE THAT YOU WILL BE INTERESTED IN RECEIVING A SUMMARY OF THIS STUDY. IF SO, PLEASE WRITE YOUR ADDRESS ON THE ENCLOSED POST-CARD AND MAIL IT TO US - SEPARATELY FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE - SO THAT WE MAY PROTECT YOUR PRIVACY.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP!
November, 1974

Dear Friend:

I am a woman who supports herself as a factory worker. I am also a student at Western Michigan University, and I need your help. With the assistance of the Center for Sociological Research at Western Michigan University, I am conducting a scientific survey among women workers throughout this area.

Here are the basic reasons that I have undertaken this project: Considerable research has been done on the subject of working women and women trade unionists. Yet, most of these studies have gotten their information from "experts," or from high union officials. These reports don't tell us much about the real opinions and needs of women workers on the local level. My goal is to collect accurate information from women workers themselves.

Your union, ___________________________________________________ has been very helpful in the making of arrangements for this study, but I will not be able to finish it without YOUR help. Won't you please take a few minutes to answer the enclosed questionnaire? I am interested in you — as a woman, as a worker, and as a union member — so please don't let anyone else in your household fill in the questionnaire. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW YOUR OPINIONS, EVEN IF YOU ARE NOT ACTIVE IN YOUR UNION. I realize that, by the time this reaches you, you may have been "laid-off" or changed to some other employment. We are asking you to please complete the questionnaire and return it to us, even if your employment situation has changed.*

You have my assurance that the information you provide will be treated in a completely confidential manner. In order to protect your privacy, I am asking that you not write your name on this questionnaire. Please feel free to contact me at 345-0961 (Kalamazoo) if you have any questions about the questionnaire or the survey.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Boyd

*The questions in the following pages apply to the job you have (or had) as a member of the union named above.
Dear Sister:

I am a woman who supports herself as a factory worker. I am also a student at Western Michigan University, and I need your help. With the assistance of the Center for Sociological Research at Western Michigan University, I am conducting a special survey—a survey which you are uniquely qualified to take part in.

As you probably know, TIME, NEWSWEEK, and a number of other publications and people who have been watching the trends in trade and industrial unions have noticed that women seem to be taking a greater interest than ever before in their trade union locals. Yet, most of the reports on this subject have been based on interviews with national union officials. These reports don't tell us much about the real opinions and beliefs of women workers on the local level.

I am trying to collect accurate and useful information about the opinions and needs of working women who are union members. Because you were a participant in the Michigan Summer School for Women Workers in August (which I also attended), I am hoping that you will share this goal. Won't you please take a few minutes to answer the enclosed questionnaire?

You have my assurance that the information you provide will be treated in a completely confidential manner. In order to protect your privacy, I am asking that you not write your name on the questionnaire. Please feel free to contact me at 345-0961 (Kalamazoo), or at the Center for Sociological Research, Western Michigan University, if you have any questions about the questionnaire or the survey.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Boyd

*P.S.: I obtained your address from the original mailing list of participants in the Michigan Summer School for Women Workers. Even if you did not actually attend the school, I hope that you will take part in this study and return the completed questionnaire to us.
March, 1975

Dear Friend:

A few weeks ago, you received a letter from me—concerning a special research project I am conducting in the Kalamazoo area—and a questionnaire. I realize how easy it is to misplace or forget such items, so I am sending you another copy of the questionnaire. I still need YOUR response to make the study worthwhile and successful. Will you please help me by filling-out the questionnaire and returning it in the postage-paid envelope?

As I mentioned in my earlier letter, any opinions you express in the questionnaire will be kept strictly confidential. Your response and opinions will be tabulated along with the response of over 500 other working women in this area who are taking part in the study. I want to know what problems and opinions working women share, and where differences occur.

I read every questionnaire myself, and I am most interested in anything you might have to say. Some of the women who have returned the questionnaire to date have written letters and notes expressing their particular concerns or problems with work, or relations with their unions, or how working affects their family lives. I appreciate this very much, as it will improve the overall quality of the study. If you have any comments, please feel free to dash them off on the back of the questionnaire, or call me at 345-0961 (Kalamazoo). Criticisms of the questionnaire are also welcome.

I realize that, in these uncertain times, you may have been "laid-off" (I was laid-off my factory job some time ago). I hope very sincerely that you have not been this unfortunate, but I urge you to fill-out the questionnaire and return it in any case...Simply answer the questions as they pertain to your most recent employment.

Your opinions are badly needed...Please let me hear from you!

Sincerely yours,

Marilyn Boyd

P.S. If, by chance, you have already returned the questionnaire when this reaches you, thank you very much! I will send you a final summary of the study in a few weeks.
APPENDIX E: The Interview Form

subject: OVERVIEW OF UNIONS IN THE KALAMAZOO AREA HAVING WOMEN MEMBERS: GENERAL INFORMATION
from: Project for the Study of Kalamazoo Area Women Unionists, Sociology Department, Western Michigan University

to: 

(1. What is the exact name of your union and local?:______________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

(2. Does your local have a union hall?: yes____ no____. If so, what is the address?:

___________________________________________________________________________

phone?: ___________________________

(3. What is the total number of members of your local?:___________

(4. What are the total numbers of men and women in your local? (Use approximate percentages, if exact numbers are not available):

number of men_______ number of women_______

(5. What is the total number of members of your (international) union?:

___________________________________________________________________________

(6. What are the total numbers of men and women members in your (international) union? (Use approximate percentages, if exact numbers are not available):

number of men_______ number of women_______

(7. How many women, if any, serve in the following positions within your local? Please give the number (Use approximate percentages, if exact numbers are not available):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>TOTAL POSITIONS</th>
<th>WOMEN IN POSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President..........................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President.....................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary, Treasurer, or Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other executive board members and trustees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Agent, Organizer, and Union Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Chief (Education, Pension Fund, or Credit Union Directors, Newspaper Editor, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E (continued):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Shop Steward or Chief Delegate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Steward, Delegate, Grievance Committee Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of a committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL POSITIONS | WOMEN IN POSITIONS

| | |

(7. Continued)

(8. Please list all committees within your local, and any auxiliary committees associated with your local:

(9. Are any of these committees specifically designated "for women," or any committees specifically designated "for men"? If so, what are they?

(10. Does your local have any organized recreational activities or groups? (For example, softball tournament or bowling team):

yes____ no____ If so, do the men and the women have separate teams?:

yes____ no____

Are the teams divided according to age brackets?: yes____ no____

(11. Does your international produce a newsletter or a newspaper?

yes____ no____ If so, is it free to all union members, or is it distributed on a subscription or some other basis? (Please explain):

Who, in your local, is responsible for sending in news (from the local) to the international's paper or newsletter? (President?, Secretary?, Newspaper Editor?, Whoever wants to?)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
(12. Does your local have a newsletter or a paper?: yes_______ no_______
   If so, how is it staffed? (Regular committee or staff? Occasional volunteers?—please explain):

   ________________________________________________________________

   How is your local's newsletter or paper distributed? (Is it mailed free to all members?, bought on a subscription basis?):

   ________________________________________________________________

(13. Does your union have a loan system (for emergency or regular loans?):
   yes_______ no_______

   Does your union have a credit union?: yes____ no_______

(14. How are dues collected within your union? (Please check one):
   Payroll deduction____  Other (Please explain)__________________________

(15. How many regular meetings does your local have yearly?:______________
   Monthly?:_________ What is the average number of members attending each meeting?:

(16. Has your (international) union ever taken any formal stand on encouraging the participation of women members? (For example, any special "task force," or, perhaps, a convention resolution?):

(17. Has your local ever taken a formal stand, or made any special efforts to encourage the participation of women members?:

(18. Has your local struck in the past five years?: yes_______ no_______
   If so, were there any restrictions on women's picketing?:

   ________________________________________________________________

   Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
(19. (If your local has struck in the past five years) did women members generally support the strike to the same degree as men?:

yes____ no____ Comments:__________________________________________________________

(20. Do you think women generally take as much interest in the union as men?: Please check one)

women are as interested as men____

women are less interested than men____

women are more interested than men____

(21. In your opinion, what are the reasons for this level of participation of your women members in the following union activities?:

Women's attendance at regular meetings tends to be...high____ low_____

BECAUSE--

Women's participation on committees tends to be......high____ low_____

BECAUSE--

Women's willingness to run for election tends to be..high____ low_____ 

BECAUSE--

Number of women in union staff positions tends to be..high____ low_____

BECAUSE--

(22. How would you describe the skills needed for the jobs held by most of the women members of your local? (Please check one):

unskilled____ semiskilled_____ skilled_____ some combination

(please describe)
(23. Are there upgrading or job advancement opportunities for women members in addition to regular contract increments? (please check all that apply):

_____ most jobs stop at entry level
_____ most jobs lead to at least one opportunity for advancement
_____ numerous opportunities for advancement
_____ union or company program for upgrading is available (please explain)

(24. Would you like to receive a summary of the findings of this study?

yes_______ no_______

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP. PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE TO: PROJECT FOR THE STUDY OF KALAMAZOO AREA WOMEN UNIONITS (ENVELOPE ENCLOSED). PLEASE ADDRESS ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS TO: MARILYN BOYD, C/O SOCIOLOGY DEPARTMENT, WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY, OR PHONE: 349-5908.
APPENDIX F: Correlation Matrix of Feminism Scale Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.17652</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.05846</td>
<td>0.19659</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.20758</td>
<td>-0.06153</td>
<td>0.25992</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.00356</td>
<td>0.06377</td>
<td>0.34517</td>
<td>0.03197</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.22314</td>
<td>0.20193</td>
<td>0.31093</td>
<td>0.15364</td>
<td>0.18892</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.22938</td>
<td>0.19309</td>
<td>0.42925</td>
<td>0.19467</td>
<td>0.20486</td>
<td>0.18892</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.24047</td>
<td>0.32771</td>
<td>0.30479</td>
<td>0.00755</td>
<td>0.24591</td>
<td>0.41463</td>
<td>0.42579</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.01660</td>
<td>0.10465</td>
<td>0.21982</td>
<td>0.31347</td>
<td>0.12580</td>
<td>0.30691</td>
<td>0.27390</td>
<td>0.11117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.03584</td>
<td>0.20529</td>
<td>0.30342</td>
<td>0.17697</td>
<td>0.28156</td>
<td>0.34982</td>
<td>0.34888</td>
<td>0.29948</td>
<td>0.29473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.22850</td>
<td>0.21032</td>
<td>0.30253</td>
<td>0.04418</td>
<td>0.22764</td>
<td>0.40813</td>
<td>0.41091</td>
<td>0.72316</td>
<td>0.01081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.26302</td>
<td>0.19795</td>
<td>0.34699</td>
<td>0.16137</td>
<td>0.25153</td>
<td>0.30018</td>
<td>0.42707</td>
<td>0.48882</td>
<td>0.21719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.09822</td>
<td>0.19360</td>
<td>0.22914</td>
<td>0.14708</td>
<td>0.1504</td>
<td>0.29655</td>
<td>0.30210</td>
<td>0.43151</td>
<td>0.15302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.23933</td>
<td>0.25651</td>
<td>0.44387</td>
<td>0.16960</td>
<td>0.24107</td>
<td>0.54603</td>
<td>0.46913</td>
<td>0.64853</td>
<td>0.13365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.18227</td>
<td>0.07565</td>
<td>0.38036</td>
<td>0.29578</td>
<td>0.06767</td>
<td>0.24366</td>
<td>0.29822</td>
<td>0.15555</td>
<td>0.16565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.02667</td>
<td>0.03832</td>
<td>0.23748</td>
<td>0.30594</td>
<td>0.08628</td>
<td>0.12001</td>
<td>0.28569</td>
<td>0.05448</td>
<td>0.14107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.13646</td>
<td>-0.01318</td>
<td>0.22059</td>
<td>0.52142</td>
<td>-0.04310</td>
<td>0.15347</td>
<td>0.20250</td>
<td>0.15191</td>
<td>0.20861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.26376</td>
<td>0.08750</td>
<td>0.30856</td>
<td>0.21643</td>
<td>0.08354</td>
<td>0.27340</td>
<td>0.26017</td>
<td>0.41555</td>
<td>-0.02690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* key next page
APPENDIX F (continued):

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{questionnaire item number} & \text{questionnaire item number} & \text{questionnaire item number} & \text{questionnaire item number} \\
\hline
10 & 1.00000 & 11 & 0.29444 \\
12 & 0.19515 & 42844 & 1.00000 \\
13 & 0.24249 & 46080 & 0.36394 & 1.00000 \\
14 & 0.30658 & 64722 & 0.51355 & 0.44993 & 1.00000 \\
15 & 0.24157 & 25053 & 0.24080 & 0.10855 & 0.35397 & 1.00000 \\
16 & 0.26925 & 07605 & 0.11690 & 0.10485 & 0.02126 & 0.41520 & 1.00000 \\
17 & 0.14730 & 34935 & 0.44693 & 0.11791 & 0.32871 & 0.40052 & 0.33754 & 1.00000 \\
18 & 0.17760 & 15447 & 0.22800 & 0.25360 & 0.25344 & 0.23472 & 0.20999 & 0.16778 & 1.00000 \\
\end{array}
\]

key:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>matrix variable no.</th>
<th>questionnaire item number</th>
<th>questionnaire item number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>&quot;Men should continue to show courtesies to women such as standing up when a woman comes into the room or giving her a seat on the bus.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>&quot;Men generally do not allow themselves to get as emotionally upset by problems as women do.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>&quot;Most men could never take care of a child properly for any length of time.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>&quot;Women have as much potential for leadership as men do.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>&quot;In our society, women are generally not allowed to make as much of themselves as they could.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matrix variable no.</td>
<td>questionnaire item number</td>
<td>questionnaire item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>&quot;In her social life, a woman has as much right to freedom as a man has.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>&quot;Because the man is basically the head of the household, he should have more 'say' in the financial plans of the family than the woman.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>&quot;Men should usually get the better paying jobs, since they are the ones who support their families.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>&quot;Women who have young children shouldn't work outside the home unless its a case of serious financial disaster.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>&quot;A woman who works outside the home has a right to expect her mate to share the responsibility for kitchen chores.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>&quot;A man has no right to discourage his wife from working outside the home, if that is what she wants to do.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>&quot;It is bad for young children when their mother works outside the home.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>&quot;It is psychologically more important to a man that he has a job to go to every day than it is to a woman.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>&quot;A woman who works all her life and never has a baby is missing the most important thing in her life.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>&quot;It would be better for their marriages and their families if fewer women worked outside the home.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>&quot;If a woman is properly trained, she can do almost any job a man can do.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>&quot;Most men have dumb ideas of the kind of work women are capable of.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>&quot;It is generally more difficult for a woman to get a responsible job than it is for a man.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G: Additional Findings

While there could be no assurance that the indexes developed to measure the main variables of concern (feminism and union participation), there was some evidence, at least, that union activism was measured as intended by the scale. The correlation of the variable "self-proclaimed as a union activist" with union participation was fairly high: 0.33.

Fifty-eight percent of the women who answered the questionnaire were married, 19 percent were divorced, 13 percent were single, 6 percent were widowed, and 4 percent reported being separated. Of the divorced women, 75 percent were mothers. Of all respondents who were mothers and not living with a spouse, 61 percent lived alone with their children. The remaining 39 percent of the mothers without husbands lived alone with (in order of frequency): a parent; parents; a sibling (most often sister); more than one sibling; a male friend; other friends; or, relatives.

Forty-five percent of the respondents reported having help with household tasks, but another 10 percent did not have any major responsibility for housework where they lived (these were largely single or widowed women living alone or with roommates). At least 45 percent of the respondents, according to the data, had responsibility within their households for daily upkeep, with little or no help. Thirty-six percent of the respondents noted that their children were old enough to be left alone, without sitters. Twelve percent took their children to baby sitters' houses, while 3 percent had sitters come in,
and another 3 percent used day care facilities. Those remaining reported some other arrangements, with "husband" or "close relative" holding prominent places. The data suggested that the respondents tended to rely on husbands and close relatives more for regular child care than for any kind of relief from housework. An inexplicably small number (4 percent) noted that they were dissatisfied with their child care arrangements. Neither household help nor child care arrangements were significantly correlated with union participation.

About 9 percent of the women reported health problems—a few of which seemed severe enough to limit employment, as well as union activities. On the other hand, only a few of the respondents cited poor health as keeping them from union participation.

Like the subjects of Wertheimer's study, these Kalamazoo and Michigan women showed considerable interest in the affairs of their unions. Nearly 90 percent reported that they discussed union affairs with others often or occasionally. Nearly a third had themselves been candidates for some union office. Only 2 percent had failed, for one or another reason, to support a strike on the part of their locals (the significance of the latter figure is unclear, however, since only a small group—8 percent—had had a chance to prove their loyalty in a strike). Most had voted, if a union election had been held during their membership. More than 35 percent were at the time of the study, or had at some time, served in a union office or committee. Only 9 percent reported that they usually did not read the union newspaper.

A majority of the respondents replied with a wide range of mem-
behips in voluntary associations, including the following:

Band member
Afterburners C B Club
Church choir
VFW
Sorority
Women of the Moose
Church youth group
Ceramics class
Holiday Honeys Bowling Club
Sunday school teacher
Workers Action Group
Church board of trustees
Neighborhood association
Women's Union Caucus
Knitting group
American Legion Auxiliary
Muzzle loaders club
Attend health spa
Gun club
Weight Watchers
Union Women's Committee
4-H leader
Shrine of the Black Madonna
Herself (feminist newspaper)
State Secretary of church
Free People's Clinic
Wounded Knee Legal Defense Fund
United Way board member
Legal Aid Society
Charitable Union
Philip Randolph Institute
United Black Trade Unionists
Labor school
International Student's Association
YWCA
PTA
League of Women Voters
Feminist study group
Committee to Study Portage
Elected Council's Compensation
Boy Scout leader
AFL-CIO County Board
UAW CAP Council newspaper
Committee for Children's TV
Democratic Party
CLUW
Eagles Auxiliary
Kalamazoo Labor Council

Gay Alliance
Photographer's club
Press Alliance
ACLU
NOW
Library Board of Trustees
Stich and Chatter
Association for Retarded Citizens
Citizens for Better Care