

A STUDY OF  
GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE DIMENSIONALITY  
IN A NON-UNION SETTING

by

Suzanne Karsa Murrmann

Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

General Business

APPROVED:

Jerald F. Robinson, Chairman

Thirwall W. Bonham

John J. Hoover

Robert J. Litschert

Robert M. Madigan

May, 1985

Blacksburg, Virginia

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to the many people who have assisted me in the completion of this research.

Gratitude is extended to those specific members of my committee, Dr. Jerald F. Robinson, Dr. Thirwall W. Bonham, Dr. John J. Hoover, Dr. Robert J. Litschert, and Dr. Robert M. Madigan who provided guidance and help throughout this endeavor. In particular, I wish to thank my chairman, Dr. Robinson, for his time spent in accessing the research site, both Drs. Robinson and Madigan for their long hours spent in editing this manuscript, and Dr. Frederick S. Hills for his statistical assistance.

To \_\_\_\_\_, my spouse and colleague, I extend my thanks for his editorial assistance and support. To \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_, my staunchest supporters of this study, I apologize for my relative neglect, particularly during the last few months of the program.

Finally I wish to thank my parents and friends, particularly \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_, whose constant encouragement and harassment played a motivating role in the completion of this manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS		Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....		ii
LIST OF TABLES .....		vi
CHAPTER		
I. INTRODUCTION .....		1
Purpose of the Study .....		2
Significance of the Study .....		3
Limitations of the Study .....		6
Summary .....		7
II. GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES: THE LITERATURE .....		9
Non-Union Grievance Procedures .....		9
Employee Attitudes Concerning Unionization .....		21
The State Grievance Procedure in Virginia .....		30
Summary .....		39
III. DESIGN OF THE RESEARCH .....		41
Research Hypotheses .....		41
Summary .....		48
Methodology .....		49
Instrument Development .....		50
Grievance Procedure Dimensionality .....		50
Grievance Procedure Satisfaction .....		53
Job Satisfaction .....		58
Attitudes Toward Unions .....		60
Voting Intent .....		61
Personal Characteristics .....		63
Pretest of Complete Instrument .....		64

Pilot Test of the Instrument .....	64
Sample Selection .....	66
Results of the Pilot Test .....	69
Characteristics of the Respondents .....	70
Nonresponse Bias by Strata .....	73
Nonresponse of Select Items .....	76
Union Attitude Scale Reliability .....	77
Grievance Procedure Dimensionality Preliminary Factor Analysis .....	77
Design and Administration of Full Study .....	82
Summary .....	84
IV. RESEARCH FINDINGS .....	85
Survey Response .....	86
Characteristics of the Study Group .....	88
Study Findings .....	92
Grievance Procedure Dimensionality .....	104
Grievance Procedure Satisfaction and its Relationship to Voting Intention .....	110
Virginia Grievance Procedure Effectiveness .	124
Job Satisfaction and its Relationship to Voting Intention .....	131
Union Attitudes and their Relationship to Voting Intention .....	133
Multivariate Equation .....	137
Summary .....	144
V. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION .....	146
Implications .....	161
Future Research .....	167

BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	169
APPENDIX .....	173
VITA .....	186
ABSTRACT .....	190

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Demographic Characteristics of the Pilot Group ...	71
2. Distribution of Pilot Study Respondents by Secretariate .....	74
3. Distribution of Pilot Study Respondents by Job Classification .....	75
4. Union Attitudes - Matrix of Intercorrelations ....	78
5. Factor Analysis - Grievance Procedure Dimensionality Pilot Study .....	80
6. Comparision of Proposed Grievance Procedure Dimensions with Pilot Study Factor Scales .....	81
7. Final Questionnaire Response Rate .....	87
8. Demographic Characteristics of the Study Group ...	89
9. Distribution of Respondents by Secretariate .....	91
10. Principle Study Variables Matrix of Intercorrelations .....	93
11. Summary of Descriptive Statistics .....	94
12. Percentage Distribution of Responses on Satisfaction Measures .....	96
13. Percentage Distribution of Responses on Unionization Questions .....	97
14. Summary of Descriptive Statistics - Comparision between Nongrievants and Grievants .....	101
15. Summary of Descriptive Statistics - Comparision between Grievants based on Decision .....	103
16. Factor Analysis Grievance Procedure Dimensionality .....	106
17. Correlation Coefficients for Grievance Procedure Satisfaction with Union Voting Intention .....	112
18. Correlation Coefficients for Grievance Procedure Fairness and Union Voting Intention .....	115

19.	Correlation Coefficients for Grievance Procedure Timeliness and Union Voting Intention .....	117
20.	Correlation Coefficients for Grievance Procedure Utilization Ease and Union Voting Intention .....	120
21.	Correlation Coefficients for Grievance Procedure Reprisal Protection and Union Voting Intention ...	123
22.	Matrix of Intecorrelations - Total Group .....	127
23.	Matrix of Intecorrelations - Non-Grievant Group ..	128
24.	Matrix of Intecorrelations - Grievant Group .....	129
25.	Correlation Coefficients for Grievance Procedure Effectiveness with General Grievance Procedure Satisfaction and Union Voting Intentions .....	130
26.	Correlation Coefficients for Work Satisfaction with Union Voting Intention .....	132
27.	Correlation Coefficients for Union Attitudes with Union Voting Intention .....	135
28.	Regression Results for Total Sample and Subgroups with Voting Intention as the Dependent Variable ..	138
29.	Regression Results for Total Sample and Subgroups by Occupation with Voting Intention as the Dependent Variable .....	141
30.	Regression Results for Total Sample and Subgroups by Secretariate with Voting Intention as the Dependent Variable .....	143

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Employee incentive to unionize is thought to be derived from three basic areas of job dissatisfaction: dissatisfaction with the economic aspects of the job including wages and fringe benefits; with non-economic job aspects such as safety, shop rules and supervision; and dissatisfaction with the level of influence exerted by the employee on the job.<sup>1</sup> Though many authors would agree that economic aspects are by far the more important 'dissatisfiers', it is generally agreed they are insufficient by themselves to spur on a drive for union representation. General dissatisfaction with supervision or the inability to make input into the organization must be present to create a situation in which the employee seeks support or redress from an outside entity. A viable system for employee appeal, such as a grievance procedure, can be seen as a means of effecting changes in these three areas. Depending upon the breadth of substantive issues allowable, a grievance procedure may be used to review management decisions concerning economic and non-economic aspects of the job. Likewise it may be seen by employees as an effective and legitimate route within the organization for

-----

1. Thomas A. Kochan, "How American Workers View Labor Unions," Monthly Labor Review 102(April 1979), pp.23-31.

influencing policy or strategy.

Grievance procedures also can be an essential element in management strategies formulated to maintain non-union status. It maybe alleged that employees are less likely to seek protection from outside sources if they have a functional avenue of redress against perceived arbitrary management decisions. The notion of "functional" assumes a structure much more formal in nature than 'open door' policies which can create more problems than they solve.<sup>2</sup> Practitioners in the area of union avoidance strategy have endorsed the use or formulation of good grievance procedures as initial tools in an effective antiunion campaign. Essentially, such strategy has recommended that organizations analyze their internal operations for methods of decreasing the threat of union intervention before they turn to active campaigns against the union. This invariably includes the grievance procedure.

#### Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to analyze a nonunion grievance procedure and its relationship to employee attitudes toward their jobs and toward unionization. The analysis had three main focuses of concern. First, an

-----

2.Cornelius Quinn, Thomas Hill, and James L. Nichols, Maintaining Nonunion Status (Boston:CBI Publishing Co., Inc., 1982),p.78.

investigation was made of the underlying dimensions of grievance procedures. Second, an assessment was made of employee satisfaction with a unique grievance procedure established for their use. Areas of inquiry were selected based on the concept of procedure multidimensionality. Third, the relationship between employee perceptions of the grievance procedure, job satisfaction, and employee attitudes toward union representation were investigated. This line of inquiry was based on the proposition that the availability of a grievance procedure in a nonunion setting reduces the likelihood that employees will perceive a need for union representation, and that the strength of this association depends on the procedure's acceptability to the employees.

#### Significance of the Study

The study was approached not only from the standpoint of its contribution to the growing body of research in grievance procedure effectiveness, attitudes towards unions, and voting intention or behavior in a union representation election, but also as a contribution to the knowledge and subsequent improvement of the specific grievance procedure studied. Based on an organizational behavior model, the study provides an initial attempt to measure satisfaction with a grievance procedure and its relationship to

intentions to join a union. Moreover, it is the first attempt empirically to analyze criteria of acceptability that have been discussed only in theory.

The non-union grievance procedure studied has incorporated many components identified in the literature as necessary to assurances of due-process in handling conflicts within the work setting. However, in twelve years of operations, the procedure had not been evaluated on its acceptability to employees as a fair, easily understood and easily used grievance process, or on its effectiveness and success as a procedure for the final resolution of disputes. Likewise, though higher usage rates were indicated in a number of agencies, the specific reasons for this have not been investigated. Reasons or factors affecting usage rates could include any of the following: the basic size and degree of decentralization with regard to the geographic location or locus of decision making of the employer, the employees' occupation, tenure on the job, personal characteristics such as age, sex, education, family background, and race, the types of problems that arise within the confines of the work environment, the presence of alternative, informal forms of dispute resolution, or restraint on employee usage placed by higher management for political reasons.

It must be recognized that higher usage rates may not necessarily be indicative of either an ineffective grievance procedure or of a poor employer-employee relationship or work climate. Very often a high rate of usage indicates that the process is one which provides acceptable levels of due process as well as one which provides for final decisions which are seen as reasonable, fair and consistent over time. Moreover, if such a procedure is, in fact, seen as a problem solving approach for dealing with work related disputes, employees are apt to be more highly motivated to use it over other less productive channels for settling problems.

Some of the pertinent reasons for a study of any non-union grievance procedure are:

1. To document the perceptions of satisfactoriness of the procedure from the groups of employees having access to its use including, not only those having already used the system, but also those having no prior experience with the system.

2. To gain a greater insight into employees' perceptions of the role of a surrogate, absentee "steward", if present, in providing information concerning employee rights and privileges under the system as well as identifying general employee needs concerning advocacy.

3. To offer a critique of the ability of a non-union based procedure to deal effectively with and efficiently resolve grievances that arise within a typical work environment.

4. To determine whether employee dissatisfaction with a given grievance procedure is associated with a more positive interest in unionization.

#### Limitations of the Study

Due to the uniqueness of grievance procedures in general and to the instant grievance procedure in particular, employee perceptions of acceptability of various steps within the process may not be generalizable to other grievance systems. This is a limitation of any type of investigation dealing with a specific grievance system. However, it may be assumed that some general assumptions can be made concerning the overall satisfaction level of a grievance procedure and behavioral intentions relative to union voting. Moreover, any generalization that may be made must be limited by the sample to be used in this study. The grievance system to be investigated here confines its use to a specific subgroup of state public employees. No generalization can be made, therefore, to different subgroups of public employees or to non-union employees in the private sector.

The study was limited by restricted access to employees who had specific experience with the grievance procedure in question. Early in the study, access to these individuals was requested through a number of large agencies within the public system. Though supported by the executive branch of the system, no support was received at the agency level. Therefore, only 17 percent of the total response group indicated prior experience with the grievance procedure. This number was sufficient to perform the statistical analysis on grievance procedure satisfaction; however, a larger number would have allowed further exploratory analysis on grievance issues.

#### Summary

This study can be viewed as an extension of the growing body of literature on worker attitudes and opinions associated with favoring the formation of a union. It is unique in that it is the first to include perceptions of an employee due process procedure. This was accomplished by first investigating the salient dimensions of a grievance procedure and subsequently looking at the relationship between employee satisfaction with the procedure and other job related components, union attitudes, and voting intention. As such, the study not only contributes to an understanding of employee attitude determinants, but also to the growing body of literature on non-union grievance

procedures and whether these types of systems function as vehicles for maintaining non-union status.

## CHAPTER II

### GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES: THE LITERATURE

#### Non-Union Grievance Procedures

Non-union grievance procedures or complaint procedures, as they are often called, exist in a relatively large percentage of non-union and partially unionized organizations. Where they are found, they are usually diverse in structure, and established to meet a number of organization specific goals. The most comprehensive study to date uses information on grievance procedures from 778 companies in the United States.<sup>3</sup> Sources of this information came from mail surveys and interviews with company representatives. The author suggests that the group is indeed representative of U.S. corporations. Of the companies surveyed, 48.4 percent had established some form of procedure for their non-union employees.<sup>4</sup> Organizations indicating non-union status were much more likely to have a procedure, 68.8 percent, than those partially unionized, 45.4 percent. This appears to be a recent phenomena. Studies conducted during the mid 1950's showed that only 21.5 percent of non-union and partially unionized companies had established formal grievance procedures for non-union

-----

3. Ronald Berenbeim, Nonunion Complaint Systems: A Corporate Appraisal, Conference Board Report 770 (New York: The Conference Board, 1980) p.ii.

4. Ibid., p.4.

employees.<sup>5</sup> The 1980 figures show that this percentage had more than doubled.

The procedures were most prevalent among larger companies and those engaged in manufacturing. They were least often found in construction and retail trade, both sectors having a large number of smaller firms. Such procedures were likewise most often found where a specialized staff in charge of labor relations existed. When asked what the major reasons were for the establishment of grievance procedures for their non-union employees, the answer most often given by these employers was the maintenance of their non-union status or as a barrier to the spread of further unionization within the organization.<sup>6</sup> Additionally, some managers felt that the existence of an employee complaint mechanism, by reducing worker frustration and discontent, would contribute to greater productivity.

Four types of systems have emerged as those most prominent in the non-union setting. The most common is that of the "open door" concept. A variety of procedures, some formal and elaborate to others very informal are subsumed under the label of "open door". While some policies simply state that employees have access to some authority figure when attempting to resolve job related problems, the study

-----

5. Philip Selznick, Law, Society, and Industrial Justice (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1979) p. 91.

6. Ibid., p.3.

found several open door processes that were highly structured with various steps along the way requiring written answers within time limits. In general, however, open door procedures place emphasis on resolution at the initial stage or step of the process and appear to convey an image of flexibility and informality.

The second most common type of procedure combines a multistep process with final appeal to or final decision making authority resting with management, usually the highest ranking person in the line of command in the employee's plant or office. These procedures tend to be highly structured with respect to time limits for filing complaints, and, in certain cases, there is the requirement that a complaint be reduced to writing at some stage.<sup>7</sup>

The third type of procedure usually parallels that of the previous type with one exception. The critical distinguishing characteristic of this approach is that the final review is conducted by company employees who are not in any way a party to the dispute.<sup>8</sup> This third party is normally the Chief Officer of the Personnel or Labor Relations Department.

The fourth type of procedure, found most infrequently in the non-unionized area involves arbitration. In general, these procedures tend to be more formally structured than

-----

7. Ibid., p.15.

8. Ibid., p.16.

procedures not providing for decision making by an outside neutral party and clearly resemble union grievance procedures. When asked why such procedures were infrequently established, employers indicated that arbitration curbed the authority of management and created a climate of insecurity and uncertainty for supervisory personnel.<sup>9</sup>

Miller, in a study similar to that of the Conference Board investigated the grievance procedures of 100 private and public non-union organizations. Finding a similar pattern in terms of grievance structure, he formulated five models based upon the following criteria: (1) issues that may be grieved, (2) internal appeal and review, (3) external review, and (4) terminal point of the procedure. Based on these criteria, the most widely used grievance procedure within Miller's sample was one in which few restrictions were placed on issues that could be processed through the system. The procedure encompassed a multi-step internal review process, and ended with a decision being made by the chief administrative officer within the organization.<sup>10</sup> Procedures culminating in arbitration were most infrequently used, a finding similar to that of the Conference Board.

-----  
9. Ibid., p.21.

10. Ronald Miller "Grievance Procedures for Nonunion Employees." Public Personnel Management, 3, 1978, p.303.

Many investigators looking at non-union grievance procedures have attempted to define the major elements necessary to an effective grievance system. These models vary in accordance with differences in each author's concept of effectiveness. Agreement is reached on the following point: if a grievance procedure secures its intended goal(s), it is judged to be an effective system. Both Drought and Yenney suggest that the goal of a non-union procedure is to contribute toward the establishment of a company atmosphere in which "employees will not feel it urgent to be represented by what employers euphemistically refer to as a third party".<sup>11</sup> Moreover, the procedure should be structured to provide a reliable mechanism to learn of individual employee dissatisfactions so that appropriate changes or resolutions can be considered by management.<sup>12</sup> In short an effective procedure appears to be more of an information conduit to be used to defuse problems that may indeed lead to third party intervention. As such, the authors do not suggest that decision making be placed in the hands of an outside third party and suggest more informal procedures be established such as suggestion boxes, employee meetings and open door policies. Yenney suggests that the

-----

11. Neal E. Drought "Grievances in the Non-Union Situation." Personnel Journal, 1967, p.332.

12. Sharon L. Yenney "In Defense of the Grievance Procedure in a Non-Union Setting." Employee Relations Law Journal 2, 1977, p.437.

creation of a department or staff to carry out information and counseling functions could facilitate the creation of an open or problem solving atmosphere and eliminate the need for a more structured procedure.<sup>13</sup>

Other authors have suggested that although the maintenance of non-union status may indeed be an important goal of a grievance procedure, the protection of the employee from arbitrary and capricious employer actions is an equally important goal.<sup>14</sup> This goal has been the basis for indentifying certain elements within a non-union grievance procedure thought to protect the worker's right to due process. Michael identified four such elements;

1. ESTABLISHED STANDARDS AND RULES OF BEHAVIOR: Individuals should be disciplined only for infractions of known standards and rules.
2. PROVISION FOR HEARINGS: Individuals must be charged with specific offenses and given an opportunity to plead their side of the case.
3. IMPARTIAL JUDGEMENT: The person rendering a judgement must not himself be directly involved in the conflict.
4. EQUAL TREATMENT: All persons, to whom the system applies, must be treated equally.<sup>15</sup>

-----

13. Ibid., p.442.

14. Richard L. Epstein "The Grievance Procedure in the Non-Union Setting: Caveat Employer." Employee Relations Law Journal 1, 1975, p.123.

15. Stephen R. Michael "Due Process in Non-Union Grievance Systems." Employee Relations Law Journal 3, 1978, pp.517-518.

His study, involving an investigation of ten companies with grievance procedures, found the most common element missing to be equal treatment, most often directed at supervisory and managerial employees.<sup>16</sup> The second most common missing element was impartial judgement.

Even among those authors suggesting that due process is an important goal of any grievance procedure, and that impartial judgement is a critical determinant of due process, the notion of impartial judgement may differ widely. Michael suggests that an impartial adjudicator may be a member of management but must be in some way removed from the immediate conflict.<sup>17</sup> Both Stieber and Epstein state that for the process to insure fair treatment, the adjudicator should be an outside third party having no connection between the employee and the employer.<sup>18</sup> Moreover, in some instances, it is suggested that the employee have the right to bypass his/her supervisor to protect due process.

Though not confined to the non-union sector, the work by Aram and Salipante provides an indepth assessment into the nature and effectiveness of procedures of due process.

-----

16. Ibid., p.520.

17. Ibid., p.519.

18. Jack Stieber "The Case for Protection of Unorganized Employees Against Unjust Discharge." Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association, 1979. (Madison: IRRRA, 1980) p.162 and Richard Epstein, p.125.

The authors make a distinction between substantive and procedural due process, noting that, indeed, this is a long-standing distinction within the U.S. system of jurisprudence and has been adopted into its system of industrial justice;

"Substantive due process treats of the rationale or purpose of laws, ensuring that a persons life, liberty, or property is not arbitrarily taken away. Procedural due process concerns the fairness of procedures in applying the law, rather than the fairness of the substance of the law itself. Procedural standards are not fixed, but are often relatively well defined."<sup>19</sup>

Using this concept of due process, the authors define an effective grievance procedure as one which encompasses the two components of due process. They further set forth four evaluative criteria: fairness of settlement, timeliness of settlement, ease of utilizing the system, and protection from loss of future benefits. If these four criteria are present, the authors state that employees will indeed judge the procedure to be acceptable for use.<sup>20</sup>

Fairness refers to the employee's perception that the disputed situation has a reasonable chance of being corrected or resolved through the internal appeal system.<sup>21</sup> This does not necessarily imply that the decision must favor

-----

19. John D. Aram, and Paul F. Salipante, Jr., "An Evaluation of Organizational Due Process in the Resolution of Employee/Employer Conflict." Academy of Management Review, 6, 1981, p.198.

20. John Aram, p.200.

21. Ibid., p.200.

the employee, but that valid criteria are used by the individual(s) making the final decision and are fully communicated to the grieving employee. This concept coincides with the criteria stated by Michael. That is, fairness also depends on the presence and quality of employee representation, and the qualifications/impartiality of the final decision maker(s).<sup>22</sup>

Michael states that the timeliness of a grievance procedure should be evaluated in terms of work time lost due to attendance requirements of all participants in the grievance proceedings, as well as work benefits lost or jeopardized by delays in the system. A timely procedure reduces the period of uncertainty and loss of benefits for both employee and management, particularly if the employee is on disciplinary suspension for the incident being grieved. The length of time required to traverse a grievance procedure may be affected by numerous variables including the formality of the system, the number of oral and written steps included and the nature of the grievances handled through it.<sup>23</sup> Timeliness, therefore, may be influenced to the better, by the ability of the parties to resolve grievances at early steps. This may be more easily done with grievances not involving severe disciplinary

-----

22. Stephen Michael, p.518.

23. A.W.J. Thomson, and V.V.Murray, Grievance Procedures, (Westmead, England: Saxon House, 1976) p.116-17 and Ronald Miller, pp. 306-307.

actions (suspension and discharge).

Closely related to time and effort required to file and follow through on an appeal is the ease of utilization, understandability, predictability, and availability or access of the grievance procedure to employees.<sup>24</sup> An effective system provides steps and procedures easily understandable from both management's and employees' standpoint and is set up and communicated in such a way that all qualified employees have sufficient access to it. Similarly, it requires a minimum of expertise and time in completing and filing necessary paperwork and making appearances at both formal and informal hearings. A procedure which is vague, poorly understood or communicated to employees, or highly technical and formal may tend to be used infrequently by employees, particularly if there does not exist established representation, such as a union, with expertise in the procedure. Therefore, a decreased or low usage rate may not be a valid indication of a good working climate but of a poorly designed, implemented, or understood grievance procedure. The use of objective measures, such as grievance rates categorized by the last step used, as well as subjective measures (by both employees and supervisors) of ease regarding use, are necessary to a thorough analysis of the system.

-----  
24. John Aram, op.cit., p.200.

Regardless of whether the grievance procedure under consideration is clearly structured and communicated, timely and acceptable in terms of affording a fair settlement for the immediate problem, employees will not use it as a means of resolving disputes if they perceive future reprisals by management for its use.<sup>25</sup> Such fears may relate to the withholding of future benefits such as raises or promotional opportunities, or day to day problems in the employee-supervisor work relationship.<sup>26</sup> Though the organization may truly possess an explicit policy of employee protection, employees still may fear potential reprisals, particularly from those immediate supervisors involved in the problem being grieved. Those perceptions consequently are much more important to an analysis of the grievance procedure than the existence of a written and maybe vaguely known organizational policy.

In addition to assessing the salient dimensions of the grievance procedure to employees, it is also necessary to determine how important it is to employees to have an acceptable grievance procedure. The necessity of determining the value of a grievance procedure to employees is based on the fact that a grievance procedure is a type of job condition, and researchers have shown that the value that workers place on existing job conditions are important

-----

25. Ronald Miller, p.20.

26. John Aram, p.200.

in predicting the intentions that workers have to remain with the organization, function within the job, or join a union.<sup>27</sup> Consequently, a worker may be highly dissatisfied with the grievance procedure, through lack of access, or representation, but may not be motivated to change his/her present situation if little value is placed on that outcome.

In summary, present research suggests that grievance procedures for non-union workers may be established to meet the needs of two separate groups. First, they may serve the interests of the employers as systems for promoting non-union status. As noted in the Conference Board study, virtually all executives saw the complaint procedure as an important part of union avoidance. Second, they may serve the interests of workers as systems for protecting individual rights and assuring industrial justice. Employee protection is also a major function of unionized procedures.<sup>28</sup> These two functions do not appear to be exclusionary. As summarized by one company representative in the 1980 Conference Board study;

"We did not develop this (grievance) procedure because we are nice, but because we want the nonunion employees to stay that way. We put the system in

-----

27. Chester A. Schreisheim, "Job Satisfaction, Attitudes Toward Unions, and Voting in a Union Representation Election," Journal of Applied Psychology, 63, 1978, pp.548-47. and Thomas Kochan, op.cit., p.27.

28. Thomas A. Kochan, Collective Bargaining and Industrial Relations, from Theory to Policy and Practice (Homewood IL: Richard D. Irwin, 1980) p. 385.

under the threat of a union organizing drive. We know that we have provided employees with a (fair) vehicle because the union organizer says the system is good."<sup>29</sup>

The question that remains unanswered by current research is whether there exists an association between employee perceptions of grievance procedure due process and employee attitudes with regard to unionization. This instant study adds to the growing body of literature on employee satisfaction with job conditions and perceptions of the need for union representation by investigating this connection.

#### Employee Attitudes Concerning Unionization

A number of studies have looked at the relationship between psychological variables and decisions to join a union. This body of research indicates that the best predictors of union membership (either actual voting or the intention to vote) are attitudes about the job, attitudes towards unions, and specific beliefs that unions could be instrumental in obtaining valued outcomes for the worker.<sup>30</sup> The behavioral literature predicts that a person's attitude

-----

29. Ronald Berenbeim, p.5.

30. Stuart A. Youngblood, Angelo S. DeNisi, and William H. Mobley, "Attitudes, Perceptions, and Intentions to Vote in a Union Certification Election: An Empirical Investigation." Proceedings of the 34th Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association, 1981. (Madison, Wis:IRRA,1982)p.244.

toward any object is a function of his beliefs about the object as well as the evaluation of, or strength of those beliefs.<sup>31</sup> Attitudes are further defined as learned predispositions to respond to an object in a consistently favorable or unfavorable manner.<sup>32</sup> Individuals possess certain attitudes toward specific job outcomes such as pay and supervision, as well as attitudes pertaining to unions. An attitude that a person has about a specific object is generally defined as the sum total of his beliefs about these objects.<sup>33</sup>

The attitudes workers hold toward the job have typically focused on satisfaction or dissatisfaction with a variety of extrinsic and intrinsic job components. Extrinsic job components refer to the job context or work environment and include both economic and non-economic rewards or satisfiers directly related to the job. Examples of economic job components, labeled by Kochan as "bread and butter" issues include wages and fringe benefits (health and dental plans, pension benefits, cost-of-living allowances). Non-economic aspects are considered such items as working conditions, quality of technical supervision, and quality of interpersonal relations with supervisors and co-workers.

-----  
31. Martin Fishbein, and Icek Ajzen, Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research (Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1975), p.30.

32. Ibid., p.336.

33. Ibid., p.31.

Intrinsic job conditions refer to the content of the job with examples including opportunities for achievement, responsibility associated with the job, recognition, advancement, and personal growth and development.<sup>34</sup>

Research in this area has used a variety of scales to assess both extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction. Schriesheim, in his study of production employees measured satisfaction with the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire which includes items pertaining to both areas.<sup>35</sup> In order to look at the same job satisfaction aspects Youngblood et al. included the Job Diagnostic Survey in their study.<sup>36</sup> In short, no agreement exists regarding measures of job satisfaction.

Researchers investigating attitudes towards unions have looked at workers perceptions of a "union image" which are thought to be influenced by social norms existing both in the workplace and the community environment of the worker. Kochan's survey of workers' attitudes towards "labor image" analyzes worker beliefs about unions including the influence of unions over laws passed and individuals elected to public office, perceived union power over employees and union members, and union leader self-interest.<sup>37</sup> Youngblood et al. used a similar type of scale in their national survey to

-----

34. Thomas Kochan, p.166.

35. Chester Schriesheim, p. 549.

36. Stuart Youngblood et al., p.248.

37. Thomas A. Kochan, pp.23-31

measure union image. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with statements describing unions as corrupt, too strong, not adequately representing women, and unnecessary given current laws.<sup>38</sup>

Closely associated with union image perceptions are those of union instrumentality. Existing psychological theory suggests that union membership is significantly tied to the worker's perception of how instrumental a union is or will be in obtaining valued outcomes, such as pay and job security for the worker. If a union is seen as having the ability to obtain increases in wages or increased employee influence on management, then voting intention will increase, provided that these are valued outcomes to the employee, and that he/she presently lacks these outcomes. Furthermore, even though a worker may possess a "good" image of a union, if it is not perceived as being able to deliver valued outcomes, a worker's intention to vote for or join a union will be lower than if perceived instrumentality is present.

A four-item scale was developed by Kochan to investigate this relationship. In it, individuals were asked if they saw unions as protecting their members against unfair practices of employers, improving members' job security, improving wages of their members, and giving their

-----

38. Stuart Youngblood et al., p.248.

members their money's (dues) worth.<sup>39</sup> Similarly respondents in Youngblood's survey were asked for their perceptions of union instrumentality as it related to twelve economic outcomes; increased wages, increased benefits, protection from being fired, creation of new jobs, being charged excess dues, increased work disruptions, strikes, employer moving, increased work stoppages, fewer promotions, improved work hours, improved productivity; and eight non-economic outcomes; improving working conditions, fairness of treatment, employee-management friction, fewer accidents, more interesting work, easier handling of grievances, improved health environment, and increased number of grievances.<sup>40</sup> It should be noted that several studies investigating the relationship between unionization and union image and instrumentality were done before the two above mentioned studies. They differ in that image and instrumentality were subsumed under the general category of union attitudes.<sup>41</sup>

In a review of studies investigating the relationship between attitudes and behavioral intention to join, or vote for, a union, Brett and Hammer concluded that there is growing evidence to support attitude theory within the

-----

39. Thomas Kochan, p.24.

40. Stuart Youngblood et al., p.247.

41. Julius G. Getman, Stephen B. Goldberg, and Jeanne B. Herman Union Representation Elections: Law and Reality (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1976) p.58-60 and Chester Schriemsheim, p.550.

industrial relations context.<sup>42</sup>

The strongest correlations found in these studies are those between actual union voting behavior and/or voting intention and union image and instrumentality. Youngblood has reported significant correlations of .63 and .57 between economic and non-economic instrumentality respectively and an individual's intention to vote for a union. Similarly the correlation between union image and voting intent at .52 indicated a strong relationship.<sup>43</sup> Though these correlations were not as strong as those found by Youngblood et al., Kochan's research produces similar results.<sup>44</sup> In looking at the general concept of union attitudes, Schriesheim reported a significant correlation of .57 when employees were asked about the voting behavior the morning after a union election was held in the plant.<sup>45</sup> This result is remarkably close to that found by Getman (.60 for general union attitude and voting behavior).<sup>46</sup> This relationship appears to hold true for blue- and white-collar workers, and demographic subgroups when defined by race and sex.<sup>47</sup> In one study, specifically dealing with union attitudes, however, data showed that employees who were well paid relative to other

-----

42. Jeanne M. Brett, and Tove H. Hammer, "Organizational Behavior and Industrial Relations, in Industrial Relations Research in the 1970's. (Madison:IRRA,1982), p.243.

43. Stuart Youngblood et al., p.249.

44. Thomas Kochan, p.26.

45. Chester Schriesheim, p.550.

46. Julius Getman et al., p.60.

47. Thomas Kochan, p.26.

co-workers exhibited negative union attitudes.<sup>48</sup>

Only one study to date has looked at both voting intent and voting behavior and their relationship with union attitudes. DeCotiis and LeLouarn looked at these relationships among a group of nurses who had participated in a representation election using union instrumentality measures similar to those devised by Kochan. The single largest correlate of both voting intent and actual vote was instrumentality ( $r=.76$  and  $-.67$  respectively).<sup>49</sup> More significant in this study was the relatively high correlation found between behavioral intention to vote and actual voting behavior ( $r=.47$ ). These findings lend support to attitudinal theory that behavioral intention is indeed a salient precursor to actual behavior in a union election.<sup>50</sup>

Research investigating working conditions and unionization have found significant relationships among economic job satisfaction, non-economic job satisfaction, voting behavior, and voting intentions. In general, the strongest relationship exists between actual voting behavior and dissatisfaction with wages and other extrinsic working

-----

48. Henry S. Farber, and Daniel H. Saks, "Why Workers Want Unions: The Role of Relative Wages and Job Characteristics," Journal of Political Economy, 88, 1980, p.365.

49. Thomas A. DeCotiis, and Jean-Yves LeLouarn, "A Predictive Study of Voting Behavior in a Representative Election Using Union Instrumentality and Work Perceptions," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1981, p.109.

50. Ibid., p.111.

conditions.<sup>51</sup> A similar relationship, though not as strong, was found between dissatisfaction with intrinsic working conditions and voting intention.<sup>52</sup>

In summary, it has been found that those individuals who express positive attitudes towards unions are more apt either to be union members or express a positive intention of voting for a union if the opportunity was available to them.

Studies on exclusively white-collar workers have shown, however, that intrinsic job components, including employee influence and job content, do influence voting intent.<sup>53</sup> There also appears to be a significant but moderate correlation between attitudes toward unions and attitudes toward working conditions. It has been suggested by Brett that attitudes toward working conditions may be a causal factor influencing attitudes toward unions, that is, as an employee becomes more dissatisfied (satisfied) with the job, he becomes more positive (negative) toward unions.<sup>54</sup>

In summary, the research to date shows a significant but moderate correlation between attitudes toward working conditions and voting intention or actual voting behavior. This relationship, however, does not appear to be as strong

-----

51. Julius Getman et al., p.56, and Chester Schriesheim, p. 550.

52. Thomas Kochan, p.26.

Stuart Youngblood et al., p.249.

53. Jeanne M. Brett et al., p.245.

54. Ibid., p.244

as that between union attitudes and union vote. Moreover, when regression was employed to reveal the underlying structure of relationships among several independent variables and the dependent variable of voting intent, job satisfaction exerted only a minor influence on the prediction of voting intent. In their 1982 study, Youngblood et al. used three dimensions of voting intention; (1) willingness to sign a union authorization card, (2) willingness to vote for a union, and (3) willingness to de-certify a union. They hypothesized that major predictors, that is, the independent variables that would account for a major proportion of the variance of the dependent variable(s) would be union image, union instrumentality, economic and non-economic satisfaction and instrumentality x satisfaction interactions. Their results showed that although some economic variables were significant, the major predictors of union activity, i.e. pro-union action, were image, instrumentality and those interactions including instrumentality.<sup>55</sup>

There has been no research to date examining the relationships between the presence of a grievance procedure in a nonunion setting, employee satisfaction with it and other job conditions, and employee intentions to join a union.

---

55. Stuart Youngblood et al., p.250.

The State Grievance Procedure in Virginia

The Virginia state public system was chosen as the site of this study. It was selected for two reasons. First it was necessary to identify an organization that had an established and functioning grievance procedure. Such a procedure has been in place for Virginia state classified employees since the early 1970's. Records indicate that the procedure is used frequently to resolve a variety of work complaints. In 1984, 633 written grievances were filed through the procedure. This a grievance rate of approximately one percent. It appears to be somewhat lower than others reported in public sector organizations. One study has found grievance rates in government agencies in medium-sized Mid-western cities to range between 1.3 and 10.0 percent.<sup>56</sup> These procedures were within unionized settings, a factor which may account for higher grievance rates. The presence of a steward who affords easier access and/or use of a grievance procedure may have a positive affect on the grievance rate.

Second, since the study is based on the premise that such procedures are set up to maintain non-union status, a major goal in this selection process was to study a system established for this reason. This goal is in line with the

-----

56. James P. Begin, "The Private Grievance Model in the Public Sector", Industrial Relations, 1971, p.27.

basic philosophy of the Commonwealth of Virginia. The Commonwealth has been judged by many as an extremely conservative state with regard to its views on collective bargaining. It is a right to work state, with first passage of the statute in 1947. Virginia has never had a statute which either permits or forbids collective bargaining between public employee representatives and state or local governments; however at the present time, collective bargaining rights are denied to state employees.<sup>57</sup> It should not be inferred, however, that the absence of specific legislation dealing with public sector collective bargaining comes from lack of legislative activity in the area. Between 1970 and 1979 alone, fifty-four bills promoting public employee organized representation were considered and dismissed. The two "successful" legislative efforts within this time period were those that established and revised the present state grievance procedure. Based on comments from individuals responsible for this legislation, as well as others having expert knowledge of it, it is evident that the state grievance procedure was established as a further measure to retard unionization of public sector employees. The comments of one individual particularly knowledgeable on

-----

57. Opinions of the Attorney General and Report to the Governor of Virginia: From July 1, 1969 to June 30, 1970 (Richmond: Department of Purchases and Supplies, 1970). Commonwealth of Virginia v. County Board of Arlington County, (Va. S. Ct. 1977) 232 S.E. 2d 30.

this subject sums up the philosophy of legislative proponents of the procedure:

"Aside from salary and wage considerations, grievance procedures generally constitute one of the most important benefits which employees secure through formally organizing themselves into unions. If an employer is reasonably responsive to the real economic needs of employees, is it also possible for an employer to grant reasonable job security via a workable grievance procedure in order to offset any material benefit which would accrue to employees through unionization? Or restated more succinctly, is 'making unions unnecessary' among Virginia public employers a realistic goal? Certainly these questions and many other concerns as well were commonplace among members of the Virginia General Assembly when they adopted House Bill 1893 in 1973 which included in part a requirement for (A)n employee grievance procedure ..."<sup>58</sup>

The Virginia grievance system afforded a unique opportunity to investigate a non-union procedure that has several characteristics normally found only in the unionized setting. These include binding arbitration as the final step of the process and the presence of a surrogate "steward" in the form of an ombudsperson. Virginia was the first state that, by law, required arbitration as a last step in resolving grievances for non-union employees. It is also the only state which provides for a tripartite panel to

-----

58. E Allen Culverhouse, "Shadows Larger Than ...reality" (unpublished manuscript) 1982, pp.11-12.

make these binding decisions. Because of these unique characteristics, it provided what has been theorized over time to be appropriate elements for providing employee due process. Taking these factors into account the system was selected for this study.

On December 1, 1972, the first formal grievance mechanism for state classified employees was established through Executive Order. Shortly after, House Bill 1893 required implementation of grievance procedures for local public employees by July 1, 1974. If such procedures were not established by local governments, the bill empowered the Governor to establish and maintain;

"An employee grievance procedure to afford an immediate and fair method for the resolution of disputes which may arise between an agency and its employees..."<sup>59</sup>

The procedure initially established provided representation for the grievant by a person of his/her own choosing in all steps beyond a preliminary oral discussion of the grievance between the grievant and immediate supervisor. The procedure contained four basic steps; (1) an oral discussion between the employee and the first level of supervision; (2) a reduction of the grievance by the employee to writing and submission to the supervisor for

-----

59. The Commonwealth of Virginia, Senate Bill 1893 Section 2.1-114 (7).

review; if not resolved at step 1, (3) a meeting with the next level of supervision or agency head; and if not resolved at step 2, (4) a panel hearing, such panel to be comprised of an employee appointee, a management appointee, and a third impartial member appointed by the other panel members.<sup>60</sup> With the exception of this last step, it is similar to other state grievance procedures established for non-union employees.<sup>61</sup> All panel members were to be selected from a list provided by the employing agency.

Grievable issues appealable through this early procedure were limited to concerns regarding the application, meaning or interpretation of personnel policies and excluded disciplinary actions involving dismissals, demotions and suspension. Other areas remaining exempt from the grievance procedure included;

"negotiation of wages, or salaries, position classifications or general employee benefits; work activity accepted by the employee as a condition of employment; the contents of ordinances, statutes, or established personnel policies, procedures, and rules or regulations; the failure to promote except where the employee can show established promotional policies or procedures were not followed or applied fairly; the methods, means and personnel by which operations are to be carried

-----

60. Commonwealth of Virginia, Department of Personnel and Training, The Grievance Procedure for State Employees, (Richmond: Office of Communications, Department of Personnel and Training, 1983)

61. Robert N. White "State Grievance and Appeals System: A Survey" Public Personnel Management Journal 1981, pp.313-323.

on; or discharge, layoff or suspension from duties because of lack of work, reduction in work force, or job abolition.<sup>62</sup>

Decisions regarding grievability were made by an agency head with the option of requesting a ruling from the Director of Personnel during the third step of the procedure. The rulings made by the Director of Personnel were advisory in nature.

During the interim time period between the passage of House Bill 1893 in 1973 and a subsequent amendment in 1978, the Joint Senate and House Subcommittee to Study Grievance Procedures was created. Chief among the activities of this body was the conduction of public hearings in five locations within the state. These hearings were held to solicit comments and criticism of the grievance procedure from managerial and supervisory employees, and separately, from non-supervisory employees. Chief concerns from these groups included the following;

(1) The definition of a grievable issue; employees were concerned over its narrowness, particularly regarding the exclusion of disciplinary actions as grievable issues, while employers were concerned that the definition was too broad.

-----

62. The Joint Senate and House General Laws Committee, Study on Grievance Procedures, The Report to the General Assembly of Virginia, Senate Document No.23 , (Richmond: Commonwealth of Virginia, Department of Purchases and Supply, 1978) p.7-8.

(2) Dismissals, demotions and suspensions could be appealed using a separate appeals procedure; however, redress of an agency decision went to the Governor/ Director of Personnel with no access to an impartial review.

(3) Employees expressed the concern that the third panel member was not truly neutral since selection was to be made from a list provided by the State Department of Personnel and Training.

(4) The final decision regarding the grievability of an issue was likewise not a neutral decision since it was made by the Director of Personnel.

(5) Employees expressed a need for some sort of neutral entity to provide information on their rights and responsibilities. Employees often were not familiar with the circumstances or conditions under which they may utilize the procedure, how to initiate a grievance and expressed fear of approaching their superiors, with whom they had a dispute, to obtain the necessary forms for instituting a grievance. General recommendations by the Joint Committee were the bases of Senate Bill 135 enacted in 1978.

Senate Bill 135 made several notable changes to the grievance procedure. The definition of a grievance was broadened to include disciplinary actions involving dismissals, demotion and suspension. Moreover, while the original procedure included a statement assuring employees

freedom from reprisal for submission of a grievance, the formal definition of a grievance included in the language of Senate Bill 135 was broadened to include reprisal as a result of utilization of the grievance procedure as well as complaints of discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, political affiliation, age, handicap, national origin, or sex. The full text of the current grievance procedure appears in Appendix A.

A major criticism made by many Virginia state employees to the Joint Subcommittee was that the employee often did not have effective representation throughout the grievance process.<sup>63</sup> The most unique contribution made by Senate Bill 135 was the creation of the Office of Employee Relations Counselors (OERC). Its purpose is four-fold; (1) investigating threats or actions of reprisal against employees attempting to use the grievance procedure; (2) providing information, upon request of employees, on the use of the grievance procedure as well as general information on personnel statutes, policies, rules and regulations and providing the necessary forms for such use; (3) collecting data and preparing annual reports for the Governor and the General Assembly on the use of the grievance procedure; and (4) making recommendations to the Governor and General

-----

63. William H. Warren "Ombudsman Plus Arbitration: A Proposal for Effective Grievance Administration Without Public Employee Unions." Labor Law Journal, 1978, p.563.

Assembly for improvements in the grievance procedure and management/employee relations processes

The OERC was structured to operate as an advisory office, with no enforcement authority of its own. It is not technically a part of the state employee grievance procedure; however, a large percentage of grievants contact this office for information and assistance typically via its toll free telephone number. Estimates out of the OERC suggest that nearly half of all employees who make use of the grievance procedure contact the OERC for information and/or assistance. In order to insure a semblance of autonomy from agency control, this office, though administratively slotted within the Secretariate of Administration and Finance, reports directly to the Governor's office. As such, it is within the unique situation of being able to exert its influence on all agencies of the state system while not being under the direct chain of command of any one of them.

Concerns were also voiced as the neutrality of certain aspects of the procedure. The revised bill provided for a new method of determining grievability. That decision, previously made by the chief administrative officer of the department, could now also be determined by the OERC and was appealable to the Circuit Court having jurisdiction in the locality where the grievance occurred.

With regard to the neutrality of panel members, provision in the procedure was made so that the members could be selected from the citizenry of the State at large and not from an agency's approved list. If the third member cannot be agreed upon within a certain time frame, 10 days following receipt of a decision by the agency head or Circuit Court that the grievance is qualified for a panel hearing, the Circuit Court judge of the jurisdiction in which the dispute arose is empowered to select the third member.

#### Summary

This chapter contains a review of the literature compiled to date in the areas of non-union grievance procedures and workers' attitudes toward unionization. Relative to the first area, it provides data on the scope of non-union grievance procedures presently in U.S. organizations as well as the structures most commonly found. Included is a review of what writers generally consider to be essential elements for grievance procedures effectiveness based upon the goals of the individual procedures. Secondly, it reviews the work done on employee attitudes towards their jobs and towards unions, and how those attitudes are related to unionization. The attitudes of major interest in the area have been job satisfaction, union image, and union instrumentality. Finally, a review of the

Virginia State grievance procedure is presented. The Virginia public system was chosen as the site for this study. Reasons for this choice are given as well as a review of the grievance procedure presently used within the system for resolving the work related problems of state non-union employees.

## CHAPTER III

### DESIGN OF THE RESEARCH

#### Research Hypotheses

Ten hypotheses were formulated to investigate the three basic areas of inquiry discussed above. Hypothesis I addresses the underlying nature of grievance procedures. Hypotheses II thru VII addresses the relationship between work components, including the grievance procedure and union voting intention. Hypotheses VIII and IX look at the relationship between union image and instrumentality and union voting intention. Hypothesis X addresses the relationships among all major variables of interest. Grievance procedure acceptability was the first construct of interest in this study.

HI: Grievance procedures are composed of five critical sub-dimensions.

Several underlying dimensions are thought to make up an acceptable grievance procedure. The following were chosen based on a review of the literature; Procedural Fairness, Content (Substantive) Fairness, Timeliness, Utilization Ease, and Reprisal Protection. Though the work of Aram and Salipante suggests all are important to acceptability, other authors have suggested at least one or more of these dimensions. To test this hypothesis employee responses to

19 items related to these five dimensions were subjected to principal components factor analysis. The general purpose of this analytic technique was to define the fundamental dimensions and then to compare them with the hypothesized dimensions.

The second set of hypotheses was based on studies that incorporated the key variables of economic and noneconomic job satisfaction into a model of voting intentions. Research on worker attitudes toward the job has supported the accepted belief that dissatisfaction with various aspects of the job leads to pro-union behavior. These aspects include wages, hours, security, fringe benefits, and recognition of good work. Due process or fair treatment as provided by a grievance procedure was proposed to be an equally important job aspect.

Though behavior per se is not the dependent variable in this study, others have reported high correlations between actual voting behavior and the independent variables to be used here.<sup>64</sup> No causal inferences can be drawn here regarding the impact of behavioral intention on actual behavior, but it can be noted that numerous researchers have found behavioral intention to be a salient precursor to actual behavior.<sup>65</sup>

-----

64. Thomas A. DeCotiis, and Jean-Yves LeLouarn, p.109.

65. See, for example Fishbein, M., and Ajzen, I. Belief, Attitudes, Intention and Behavior (Reading of Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1975). Locke, E.A., "Toward a Theory of Task

HII: Employee satisfaction with the grievance procedure is negatively correlated with intentions to vote for a union.

The study makes the assumption that grievance procedures are indeed multidimensional constructs. Therefore, satisfaction with a procedure can likewise be based on the assumption of multidimensionality. Therefore, the following hypotheses were investigated.

HIII: Employee perceptions of grievance procedure fairness are negatively correlated with voting intentions.

Fairness refers to the employees perception that the disputed situation has a reasonable chance of being corrected or resolved through the internal appeal system and that rational and valid criteria are used by qualified decision makers in resolving the disputed situation. Moreover, a "fair" procedure will be set up in such a way as to afford employees who use it the right to look over and question employer evidence used against their claim, to present evidence in defense of the employee's actions, and be available for use to solve a variety of work related problems. It was, therefore, proposed that workers

-----

Motivation and Incentives," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 3, 1968, pp. 157-189. Mobley, W.H, "Intermediate Linkages in the Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Employee Turnover. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62, 1977, pp.237-240.

experiencing high levels of dissatisfaction with the system based on these criteria will be much more likely to exhibit pro-union voting intentions than those who judge the system to be fair and reasonable.

HIV: Employee perceptions of grievance procedure timeliness are negatively correlated with voting intentions.

A timely grievance procedure can be thought of as one in which there are minimal delays in receiving management responses at various grievance steps, scheduling prescribed meetings and hearings in the process and to an extent, a minimum of time away from work needed for hearing appearances. It has been theorized that, as the time increases between the date of grievance filing and final resolution of the dispute, employees experience higher levels of dissatisfaction stemming from the uncertainty of their grievance outcome and the potential loss of benefits during this period. It was, therefore, hypothesized that as workers become highly dissatisfied with the timeliness of the grievance procedure they will express a higher desire to bring in a union for the purpose of instigating improvements in the system.

HV: Employee perceptions of the ease of utilization of the grievance procedure are negatively correlated with voting intentions.

Ease of utilization can be regarded as the workers perceptions of the relative effort required to file and carry through a grievance in the system. Moreover, this dimension may also be affected by the knowledge that the workers possess concerning the system: what it entails: where grievance forms may be obtained: and to an extent the presence of a resource having expertise in grievance handling that may be available to the worker. It was, therefore, presumed that if workers are relatively knowledgable about the grievance procedure and feel there are the necessary expert resources or advocacy available to assist them in its use, even if they choose not to use it, they will be much less likely to seek outside intervention or advocacy and if asked will not exhibit the tendency to vote for unionization.

HVI: Employee perceptions of management reprisal for use of the grievance procedure is positively correlated with voting intentions.

Protection from discrimination or reprisal for use of the grievance procedure is presumed to be an extremely important dimension of acceptability as well as a needed factor for continued use. If employees fear discrimination in terms of future treatment by supervisors or the jeopardy of further raises or promotions they will discontinue their use of the system and, moreover, seek outside protection

from these arbitrary actions. It was hypothesized, therefore, that the more highly dissatisfied a worker is with his/her freedom to employ the grievance procedure without fear of harassment, the higher will be his/her voting intentions.

The next hypothesis dealt with job satisfaction as a variable. The relationship between the dependant variable of behavioral intention and the independant variable was stated using the following hypotheses;

HVII: Employee perceptions of job satisfaction are negatively correlated with voting intention.

It has been reported in a variety of studies linking job satisfaction with unionization, that workers who exhibit high levels of dissatisfaction with various job aspects exhibit 'pro-union' attitudes and are more likely to state that they would sign union authorization cards or vote for a union in an election if given the opportunity.<sup>66</sup> Work in this area has focused on a variety of job components including wages and fringe benefits, i.e. economic components; working conditions and the quality of supervision, i.e. non-economic components; and intrinsic job components such as personal growth and development. In general, the research has shown a stronger relationship between job dissatisfaction with economic factors and a

-----

66. Henry S. Farber, p.365.

global concept of satisfaction and positive voting intention than with intrinsic job satisfaction and voting intention.

Dissatisfaction with job aspects is not sufficient in itself to induce workers to vote for unions. Union instrumentality plays an important role in inducing dissatisfied workers to unionize. Prior research findings imply that a dissatisfied worker must perceive that a union will be able or instrumental in improving aspects of the job in which they are dissatisfied before they will exhibit the intention to join or vote for a union. Therefore:

HVIII: Employee perceptions of union instrumentality are positively correlated with voting intention.

The notion of instrumentality refers to the ability of a union to effect changes in the work setting that impact directly on the individual worker. Such changes would include improvements in wages, job safety, and worker protection against unfair management practices such as reprisals for grievance procedure usage.

HIX: Employee beliefs about of unions (union image) are positively correlated with voting intention.

Union image has generally been measured in studies dealing with the instrumentality model, using questions related to the influence respondents perceive unions as having in various aspects of society. As such, image is a

much different construct than instrumentality. These studies support the notion that workers will not exhibit a pro-union voting intention if they perceive unions to be overly powerful, and corrupt.

A final hypothesis proposed that satisfaction with the grievance procedure is a major factor in influencing intentions to vote either for or against union intervention.

HX: The major predictors of union voting intentions are perceived union instrumentality, labor union image, job satisfaction, and grievance procedure satisfaction.

This hypothesis was very similar to that proposed in the studies done by Youngblood et al, and Kochan.<sup>67</sup> It differs in that grievance procedure satisfaction was proposed here to be an equally important variable and will be responsible for a significant portion of the variance in voting intention, accounted for in a regression model that incorporates independent variables traditionally examined in the literature.

#### Summary

In this section the major hypotheses to be tested have been presented. Included was a brief discussion of the reasons for proposing each along with additional supporting literature in the area. The hypotheses can be divided into

-----

67. Stuart Youngblood et al., p.250 and Thomas Kochan, p.26.

three general categories. The first category included those building directly upon previous research. These include hypotheses HVII through HIX which deal with the relationships between job satisfaction, union image, union instrumentality and voting intention. The second category included those that provide the first empirical testing of grievance procedure dimensionality and satisfaction, and are dealt with in hypotheses HI through HVI. These hypotheses are based on theories reviewed in the literature section. The third and final category included hypothesis HX which attempts to combine previous work on attitudes and voting intention with grievance procedure satisfaction as an equally important work perception in the unionization process.

### Methodology

The hypotheses of concern were tested using questionnaire responses from a stratified sample of Virginia state employees. A questionnaire containing attitudinal and demographic items was developed and mailed in August, 1984. The survey was pre-tested on a smaller sample of individuals from the same population. The survey was mailed to the work location of the respondents. Survey responses were analyzed by means of factor analysis, Pearson product-moment correlations and multiple regression.

### Instrument Development

The instrument had four primary divisions. Part A consisted of 19 items measuring the importance respondents placed on the proposed dimensions of a grievance procedure. Part B included 12 items measuring satisfaction with specific elements of the Virginia State grievance procedure. Part C was divided into two subsections: Section A included items measuring satisfaction with certain job components; it also included items on union image, union instrumentality, and voting intention. The last part of the instrument was designed to collect a variety of demographic variables. The methods used to develop measures of the variables are described below.

#### Grievance Procedure Dimensionality

The major construct in the study was grievance procedure dimensionality. The dimensions have been thought of as factors whose presence are necessary before a procedure is to be judged acceptable to the employee and, therefore, useful for resolving work related problems. The instrumentation for examining grievance procedure acceptability in this study was developed in four steps.

First, the five dimensions of procedural fairness, content fairness, timeliness, reprisal protection, and utilization ease were taken from the literature as a starting point. Researchers have discussed these dimensions

in rather general terms or have used isolated examples to conceptualize them. Second, 25 items were constructed for the purpose of defining as closely as possible each of the five dimensions within the context of a grievance procedure. At least five items were constructed for each of the five dimensions, with several initially appearing to be extremely similar to each other. This was done with the expectation that the number of items could be reduced after being pretested and ultimately providing at least three items to measure each element.

Third, a five point summated scale was used to estimate the importance given by individuals to each of the 27 items (Extremely important to not at all important). Similar scales were used by Hammer and Berman to analyse the role of noneconomic factors in faculty union voting, and by Hills to look at pay equity.<sup>68</sup>

Finally, an initial pretest of the 27 items was performed for the purpose of identifying ambiguous items and/or terms within various items. Also, since the final form of the mail questionnaire precluded the use of more than twenty questions for the acceptability measure, a pretest was considered the best method for selecting the

-----

68. Tove H. Hammer and Michael Berman, "The Role of Noneconomic Factors in Faculty Union Voting, Journal of Applied Psychology, 66, 1981, p. 420, and Frederick S. Hills, "The Relevant Other in Pay Comparison", Industrial Relations, 19, 1980, p. 346.

items from the initial group. For the purposes of this pretest, a sixth option, "Do Not Understand The Question" was also included. The items were then pretested on 223 students enrolled in undergraduate or graduate management courses. Students were asked to read carefully each item and indicate the level of importance that they, as a present or future employee would place on each by indicating on an accompanying opscan sheet one of the six options. Demographics including age, race, sex, employment experience, union experience, and family member occupational status were also included in the instrument.

Administration of a pretest should be performed in the manner intended for the final study. Requiring the pretest sample to circle their preferred option on the instrument would have been closer to the final questionnaire procedure.<sup>69</sup> However, opscans were used because the data was then computer readable and the students were already familiar with opscan use and any errors produced from their use were assumed no larger than subsequent coding error.

The pretest group differed significantly in terms of age, education, and employment from classified state employees. Therefore, only the answers from those students indicating previous or present full time work experience or work experience of a part time nature (less than 40 hours

-----

69. Earl R. Babbie, Survey Research Methods (Belmont, CA: Wadworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1973) pp.206-208.

per week) but over an extended period of time, for more than six months, were used in the pretest analysis. These included 197 of the total group. Based on analysis of these data the questionnaire was reduced to the nineteen items. Items were ordered on the final questionnaire through the use of a random number table.

### Grievance Procedure Satisfaction

Prior research on employee satisfaction with grievance procedures has not yielded any standard measures of satisfaction. This may be due to the fact the non-union procedures are so diverse with respect to their structures. It is common in most unionized settings to have a four step process beginning with an informal, oral grievance and culminating in a final and binding decision made by an outside adjudicator or neutral third party. However, the size and autonomy of the organization, as well as the bargaining relationship it has with the union, will dictate the major actors at each step as well as the formality of the overall process. Kochan suggests that the two parties will take a much more formal or judicial approach to setting up grievance procedures and handling grievance in high-conflict, hostile-attitudes climates and a more problem solving-clinical approach in a low-conflict, cooperative-climate setting. Likewise, where similarly structured

procedures are in place, differences may occur in their use. A clinical, problem solving approach is most likely in the early stages of a bargaining relationship when the parties lack well developed formalized personnel policies or a body of precedents on which to rely, and when they are attempting to establish a consistent body of decisions and practices that can develop into the "common law of the shop".<sup>70</sup>

Thompson comes closest to providing an instrument for studying unique grievance procedures by providing a checklist of 28 questions for grievance procedure review and reform. Though several have primary relevance for unionized settings under British law, this list was used for devising items to assess the Virginia state grievance procedure.

In addition to the material found in the literature, documents and archival data pertaining to the Virginia procedure were researched and interviews were conducted with key individuals charged with procedure administration, as well as those responsible for policy changes and system review. Questions focused on;

1. Historical events surrounding policies for procedure formation including the specific goals and objectives of the procedure.
2. The efficiency of the procedure in resolving grievances.

-----

70. Thomas Kochan, 1980, p.389-392.

3. Observations on the ease of procedure utilization from the standpoint of both the grievant and the organization.

4. Problems encountered by agencies or offices in following the proscribed steps of the grievance procedure.

The individuals included in this interview process came from the following groups (See Appendix B for full list of names);

The Virginia Legislative Branch

The Virginia Executive Branch

Office of Employee Relations Counselors

Agency Heads or their representatives

Agency employee relations officials

Using this information, 17 items were constructed to assess employee perceptions of the grievance procedure. The first twelve items were devised to address the hypothesized underlying dimensions of fairness, timeliness, reprisal protection and utilization ease. Accompanying instructions asked the respondent to indicate their agreement or disagreement with these twelve statements by circling one option on a seven point Likert scale. Since it was assumed that some individuals may have little information on aspects of the grievance procedure the option "no opinion" was included for these items. The resulting items, categorized

according to their appropriate underlying dimensions are presented below;

#### Fairness

1. The reasons my agency gives for denying or supporting a grievance are usually fair.
2. I would be more likely to use the present grievance procedure if a person outside the Virginia state system was making the final decision about my complaint.
3. Employees have a good chance to look over and question agency evidence about their complaint at any grievance hearing.
4. The grievance procedure is too limited in terms of what problems I can take through it.

#### Timeliness

5. There are too many time delays in resolving grievances through the state grievance procedure.
6. My agency usually responds to grievances at the first steps of the procedure in a quick manner.

#### Reprisal Protection

7. My agency goes to great length to make sure that employees can file grievances without having to worry about how their supervisors will treat them later on.
8. Filing a grievance in this agency may have a bad effect on chances for promotions and pay raises.
9. I would not call the Office of Employee Relations Counselors because I might get into trouble with my supervisor.

#### Ease of Utilization

10. The Office of Employee Relations Counselors in Richmond does a good job of answering questions about the grievance procedure.
11. Many employees do not use the grievance procedure because they do not know how it works.

12. More employees would use the grievance procedure if there was an employee representative at the work site.

Items were ordered on the final questionnaire through the use of a random number table with half of the items reverse (negatively) phrased to prevent a potentially bias format.

Five items were constructed to gather information from individuals who had previous experience with the procedure. Individuals were asked if they had filed a grievance during the last five years and if so to indicate the highest level they had taken their grievance by checking one of the following options;

- (1) 1st Step (your immediate supervisor)
- (2) 2nd Step (next direct level of Management)
- (3) 3rd Step (agency head or chief executive in unit)
- (4) 4th Step (panel hearing)

Those individuals who had experience with the 4th Step panel hearing were then asked the following four questions about their experiences;

1. Was there a fair opportunity at your hearing for you or your representative to present witnesses, documents, and other evidence in support of your case?
2. Was there a fair opportunity at your hearing for you or your representative to cross-examine witnesses presented by the employer?
3. In general did you understand the hearing procedure?
4. How satisfied are you in general with the fairness and impartiality of the hearing?

## Job Satisfaction

Three items were used to assess respondent satisfaction. The first item was a global measure; "How satisfied are you in general with your job?" In their studies of union representation elections, Getman, Goldberg, and Herman used a similar index of job satisfaction with working conditions and union vote.<sup>71</sup> The investigators constructed questions pertaining to seven specific working conditions plus a global measure of general job satisfaction and solicited responses to the items from employees in a pre-election interview. Four items were repeated in a post-election interview, so that attitude change could be measured. An employee's responses to the eight items were summed to form an index of his/her satisfaction with working conditions. The four attitude items in the pre-election wave that were repeated in the post-election wave, including the global measure were summed separately to make short form indices. Both the long and short form indices exhibited good reliabilities ( $r=.78$ ,  $.68$  respectively) while the correlation between the global satisfaction items and the long form index,  $.65$ , was significant at  $p < .01$ .

-----

71. Julius Getman et al., pp.54-56.

The second item used in this study was a measure of supervisory satisfaction: "How satisfied are you in general with your immediate supervisor?" It has been demonstrated that though pro-union voting behavior is most strongly associated with dissatisfaction with economic issues such as pay, it is also strongly related to supervisory satisfaction. Moreover, supervisory satisfaction would appear to be more highly linked with the grievance process since most procedures indeed are initiated at the level of the immediate supervisor.

The third item is that of general grievance procedure satisfaction; "How satisfied are you in general with the Virginia state grievance procedure?" This item had not been included in the studies done by Kochan and Youngblood because their research focused on job satisfaction prior to unionization; grievance procedures were not in place.

All three items were measured on a six-point Likert scale with response categories from Very Dissatisfied to Very Satisfied.

## Attitudes Toward Unions

To measure attitudes toward unions, Getman's short form, four-item union attitudes indice was adopted for use in this study.<sup>72</sup> The short form union attitude indices, similar to their job satisfaction indices, were shown by the author to be acceptably reliable ( $r=.72, .74$ ). The union attitude questions focused on what researchers feel to be two distinct predictors of union joining or union image, and specific beliefs that unions are/could be instrumental in obtaining valued outcomes for employees or union instrumentality.

### Union Image

1. Unions are becoming too strong.
2. Unions interfere with good relations between employers and workers.

### Union Instrumentality

3. Unions make sure that employees are treated fairly by supervisors.
4. Unions help working men and women to get better wages and hours.

-----

72. Julius Getman, et al., pp.58-60

Similar to the grievance procedure satisfaction scale, two items were reverse (negatively) worded to prevent a potentially bias format. All union attitude items were measured on a six-point Likert scale with response categories from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree.

#### Voting Intent

"Behavioral Intention" within the context of unionization has been measured using the following three areas of inquiry. Survey respondents were asked (1) if they would be willing to sign a union authorization card to allow a certification election; (2) if they would vote for a union, if given the opportunity to do so; or (3) if they would vote to de-certify a union if given the chance to do so. In work by Youngblood all three of these questions were included, most likely due to the diverse nature of the respondents which came from the members of a consumer panel. Though not reported, it can be assumed that some proportion of the sample consisted of unionized individuals who may indeed have knowledge of or experience with decertification elections. Kochan's national survey on both union and nonunion members asked respondents the second item. In the former study, all three statements appear to produce similar results.

The question regarding specific voting intention was deemed most appropriate for use in this study. Voting for a union, if given the opportunity to do so was seen as a much more generic activity and, therefore, more likely to be understood by the group of interest than either signing authorization cards or de-certifying a union present at the work place. Such a generic activity is considered more appropriate due to the nature of public sector unionization in Virginia. Although public sector employees have the legal right to unionize, there presently exists no enabling legislation and subsequently no agency, as in most other states, for authorizing and carrying out union elections. Therefore, incorporating an item dealing with authorization cards or a decertification election could indeed lead to confusion among respondents. Also, the question regarding authorization cards may evoke misleading responses since there often exists, particularly among nonunion workers, a misunderstanding of the consequences of signing such cards. Literature concerning anti-union campaigns show that often such cards are misconstrued by management to employees as support for the union as opposed to support for an election. On the final questionnaire the following item was scored on the six-point Likert scale used for the preceding union attitude items; "If such were legal, I would vote for representation by a public employee labor union".

### Personal Characteristics

Though the data are not conclusive, research findings suggest a relationship among various personal characteristics and unionization, i.e. union membership and/or propensity to join unions. The questionnaire was, therefore, designed to collect data on six variables of interest: age, race, sex, marital status, education, and occupation.

1. To report age, respondents were asked to give their year of birth.
2. To report race, respondents were asked to check one of the following categories: "White", "Black", "Hispanic", "Asian", or "Other".
3. To report sex, respondents were asked to check either "Male" or "Female".
4. To report marital status, respondents were asked to check one of the following categories: "Single", "Married", "Separated/Divorced", or "Widowed".
5. Level of education attained was measured by asking respondents to check one of the following choices;
  - (1) less than Grade 12
  - (2) completed Grade 12
  - (3) Business or Technical School
  - (4) College/University but less than B.A./B.S. Degree
  - (5) B.A./B.S. Degree
  - (6) Advanced Degree
6. Occupational categories were obtained from an open ended question concerning the employee's present job title.

A number of items were included in the instrument for the purpose of identifying selected employment

characteristics of the respondents. These included: employing agency or department, job location, number of subordinates, total length of state classified employment, and experience as a management representative in the grievance process.

#### Pretest of Complete Instrument

To insure that all items on the questionnaire were readable by the sample of interest, it was administered to a group of full-time classified state employees. The pretest group, consisting of 25 employees, was asked to complete the questionnaire and also to comment on any items which they considered to be ambiguous or misleading. Clerical and custodial employees were used out of those available since this group was most representative of the majority of state employees. None of the pretest group had prior experience with grievance procedure usage, but all indicated an understanding of its structure. No problems other than questions relating to anonymity were found.

#### Pilot Test of the Questionnaire

The refined questionnaire was mailed to a randomly selected sample of 1000 state classified employees at their work location through the U.S. Postal System. Individuals were asked in an accompanying cover letter to complete the

four-page questionnaire and to return it to the researchers in the postage paid envelope provided. Follow-up contact with the sample group was not made. Answers to the following questions were of primary concern at this stage;

- 1) What can be the expected response rate of the final study, and will a follow-up be necessary to insure an adequate response?
- 2) Since the questionnaires were to be sent to the sample at their work location, are the available addresses sufficient for delivery? Are there identifiable state agencies or departments that are unwilling or unable to deliver the questionnaires to their employees?
- 3) Are there certain identifiable employee groups who are unable or unwilling to respond?
- 4) Is the method for selecting the sample group picking up an adequate number of individuals with grievance procedure experience?
- 5) Is there any evidence of systematic non-response to questions, i.e. is there a large number of respondents who refuse to answer the items pertaining to union attitudes or selected personal characteristics?

- 6) Is there any evidence of systematic, unusable response to questions, i.e. is there a large number of respondents providing the same answer to all acceptability items?
- 7) Do any items on the questionnaire lend themselves to a large number of qualified answers? If so this would indicate continued ambiguity in some items.
- 8) Does the questionnaire lend itself to a large number of unsolicited answers? If so this would indicate that the instrument may be incomplete for analysing the research questions.
- 9) How internally reliable are the established indices used to the population of interest?
- 10) Can an initial verification of the underlying dimensions of the grievance procedure be made using pilot test data?

#### Sample Selection

A random, proportionately stratified sampling method was used to select the pilot sample. The sampling frame from which individual names and addresses were selected included approximately 70,000 classified state employees. This information was contained on a magnetic tape procured from the Virginia State Office of Personnel and Training under the Freedom of Information Act. The method selected

provided for adequate representation of the relevant domains of the study (grievant and non-grievant) and took into account two variables thought to be relevant for use in the stratification scheme; salary and work location. Selznick indicates that the meaning of fair treatment is indeed correlated with occupational levels. As job levels change based on typical progression lines, i.e. from unskilled labor to supervisory levels, there is a gradual but marked shift from the meaning of due process as perceived by individuals. More specifically, this meaning changes from "equal" treatment for all concerned to due process based on "individual merits". A logical addition to this would be the assumption that certain job levels or duties may, by their very nature, stimulate more potential grievance situations, and therefore, an increase in a perceptive need or desire for protection. Selznick states, however, that "...organizational context, occupation, education, union membership, length of service, job anxiety, and orientation toward work show only modest differences among the various categories of employees with respect to the general desirability of protective rules.<sup>73</sup> Therefore, the sample was stratified by salary to account for differences in the meaning of fair treatment. Since certain job titles are not found in all agencies and the state classification system

-----

73. Philip Selznick, p.193.

does not include all positions at the two extremes of state employment, salary appeared to be the best proxy for Selznick's variable.

Regarding stratification by work location or agency, there was no reason to suspect that an individual working in a clerical position in one agency or department would have a different value system influencing their attitudes toward due process than would an individual at the same job in a different agency or department. However, if one agency consistently denies to employees, what they view as their fundamental rights to due process, such a variable may indeed influence those same attitudes. Therefore, both variables were seen as appropriate for stratification of the sample.

Moreover, since the assumption was made that the administration of the grievance procedure would indeed differ from agency to agency because of geographic location, personnel and the like, stratification using this variable appears to be more important for analysing the second set of questions dealing with the state grievance procedure.

Stratification of these two variables was based on the percentage of the total workforce found in each stratum. The variable, work place, was divided into nine strata based on six secretariate assignments and three government branches: Administration and Finance, Commerce and

Resources, Education, Human Resources, Public Safety, Transportation, plus the Executive, Judicial, and Legislative branches. The following six salary ranges were constructed as strata for the variable, salary;

\$00,000 --- \$10,000  
\$10,001 --- \$15,000  
\$15,001 --- \$20,000  
\$20,001 --- \$25,000  
\$25,001 --- \$30,000  
> \$30,000

Note: Salary was initially divided into eleven strata based on incremental increases of \$5,000. However, since only 2.4% of the total population was found within the five highest strata, these were collapsed into one stratum.

#### Results of the Pilot Test

Of the 1000 questionnaires mailed, 97 were returned for insufficient addresses. All returned surveys came from two educational institutions. Because of this, surveys sent to employees from these institutions selected in the final study were separated and readdressed using more precise work location addresses. Out of the remaining 903 surveys, 279 (32.34%) were returned. In addition five individuals to whom surveys were mailed contacted the researchers to

discuss the study but declined to return the questionnaire. Because of the relatively low response rate a follow-up postcard was sent to the final study groups two weeks after mailing of the survey instrument.

Surveys were returned from seventy agencies, departments and commissions. All major agencies were represented in the response group; therefore, it would appear that with the exception of the aforementioned state universities, most questionnaires were able to reach the sample group. It did appear, however, that the time it took for the instrument to reach individuals varied by agency. Responses were coded by number and date as they were returned and a pattern was noted. For instance, responses from employees within the Transportation secretariate did not start to return until two weeks after the questionnaires were sent out, while responses from employees of the Human Resources secretariate were received within four days of the mailing.

#### Characteristics of the Respondents

Comparing demographic characteristics with the population, the respondent group appears to be composed of more whites and more males (See Table 1). An analysis of the usable responses showed that 82.7% were white (n=230), 16.6% were black (n=46) and 0.4% were either hispanic or

**TABLE 1**  
**Demographic Characteristics of the Pilot Group**

	Pilot Group	Population <sup>1</sup>
<b>Age:</b>		
Mean	39	
Median	35	
<b>Race:</b>		
White	82.7%	74.3%
Black	16.6%	25.7%
<b>Sex:</b>		
Male	56.3%	47.7%
Female	43.7%	52.3%
<b>Education:</b>		
Less than Grade 12	5.7%	
Completed Grade 12	26.9%	
Business/Technical School	11.8%	
College/University but less than B.A./B.S. Degree	26.9%	
B.A./B.S. Degree	19.0%	
Advanced Degree	8.2%	
<b>Employment Tenure:</b>		
Mean	10.4 years	
Median	8.5 years	
<b>Supervisory Status:</b>		
Nonsupervisors	58.2%	
Supervisors	41.8%	

-----

1. Virginia Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Report to the Governor: Employment Trends and Complaints of Discrimination (Richmond: Virginia EEOC, 1984) pp.36.

asian (n=1 respectively). The respondent group was composed of 157 males (56.3%) and 122 females (43.7%). The medium age for the group was 35 ( $x=39$ ) with a medium length of total state employment of 8.5 years ( $x=10.37$ ).

The respondents were somewhat evenly divided between supervisory and non-supervisory groupings. Non-supervisors represent 58.2% of the group ( $n=162$ ), individuals indicating supervisory responsibility for 10 or less employees represent 25.5% of the group ( $n=71$ ), and those having over 10 subordinates, ranging in some instances to over 1000, made up 16.2% of the group ( $n=45$ ).

Twenty-five individuals (9.0%) responding indicated previous experience with the grievance procedure. Though this appears to be relatively small number, it may indeed be an overly large sample of grievants based on a normal grievance rate of <1.0%. Based on this rate the expected grievant number is approximately 14 out of the respondent group of 279 (The figure is calculated for a five year period since the question concerning grievance use asked for experience in the last five years). However, it is assumed that grievants would be more willing to respond to this survey because they have more knowledge about the procedure, and they may have more interest in the subject based on their previous experiences.

Of the group indicating supervisory responsibility 31.0% (n=36) had had previous experience with the state grievance procedure. Within this group 18 indicated they had acted as an agency witness at some point within the process, 21 had had at least one grievance filed against them and 14 had been selected by their agency or department to be a panel member for a fourth step hearing.

#### Nonresponse bias by Strata

The number of usable surveys returned by respondents within each of the nine workplace strata are presented in Table 2. The proportion of surveys returned appear to be well within the expected range given the 30.9% response rate. At first glance, employees of the Education secretariate appear to be underrepresented in the response group. However, since all 97 surveys returned for insufficient addresses came from this strata, underrepresentation can be shown to be a technical problem with the pilot test and not the unwillingness of the employee group to respond to the study. This problem was corrected for the final study.

Since salary level was not included as an item on the questionnaire, the method for assessing nonresponse mentioned above could not be used. Instead a comparison was made with the population based on job occupation. Table 3 presents a list of job categories appropriate to the

**TABLE 2**  
**Distribution of Pilot Study Respondents by Secretariate**

<u>Secretariate</u>	<u>Surveys Sent</u>		<u>Surveys Returned</u>	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Administration and Finance	35	3.5	8	2.9
Commerce and Resources	55	5.5	20	7.2
Education	322	32.2	60	21.5
Human Resources	244	24.4	76	27.2
Public Safety	163	16.3	47	16.8
Transportation	170	17.0	55	19.7
Executive Branch	2	0.2	-	-
Judicial Branch	35	3.5	2	0.7
Legislative Branch	2	0.2	-	-

**TABLE 3**  
**Distribution of Pilot Study Responses by Job Classification**

<u>Job Categories</u>	Respondent Group		Population <sup>1</sup>	
	Number	Percent <sup>2</sup>	Number	Percent
Administrators	22	9.7	4480	6.2
Professionals	43	19.0	16590	23.1
Technicians	47	20.8	13606	19.0
Protective Services	27	11.9	6691	9.3
Clerical	41	18.1	16555	23.0
Skilled Trades	25	11.1	5240	7.3
Service Workers	21	9.3	8785	12.2

-----

1. Percentages based on a group of 226 individuals indicating a job within one of the seven categories.
2. Virginia Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Report to the Governor: Employment Trends and Complaints of Discrimination (Richmond: Virginia EEOC, 1984) pp.39-43.

population and respondent group, the number of respondents within each job group, and the percentage of the total group that number represents. When direct comparisons were made with population data it appeared that all strata were appropriately represented by the respondent group.

It can be, therefore, concluded that there were no employee groups, based on work location, and job classification that were either unable or unwilling to respond to the survey instruments.

#### Nonresponse of Select Items

Though all items were analysed for nonresponse or qualified responses, those dealing with grievance procedure acceptability, union attitudes, and voting intent, and work satisfaction were most critical to the pilot test. No problems were found. Five respondents indicated the same answer for all 19 acceptability items, and five respondents failed to indicate their choice on all union related questions. It was assumed that most nonresponse would appear in the items relating to union vote and job/supervisor satisfaction. Nonresponse appeared in six cases for each satisfaction item, and in seven cases for the union voting question. Moreover, nonresponse to all these questions came from ten individuals out of the total group.

Few qualified responses were found from reviewing the questionnaires.

#### Union Attitude Scale Reliability

In order to assess the internal consistency of the Getman union attitude index, as used on the pilot study of state classified employees, coefficient alpha was calculated using Cronbach's equation . Based on the correlation matrix (See Table 4) the coefficient alpha for the four-item scale is .72. Coefficient alpha is the generally accepted formula for determining internal consistency among scale items and sets an upper limit to the reliability.<sup>74</sup> Coefficient alpha provides a good estimate of reliability in most situations, since the major source of measurement error is due to the sampling of content, i.e. items used. Based on these results, the index was not altered for use in the final study.

#### Grievance Procedure Dimensionality - Preliminary Factor Analysis

To make a preliminary determination of the dimensionality of the grievance procedure, the 19 items dealing with the construct were subjected to principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation. As the

-----

74. Jum Nunnally, Psychometric Theory (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978) p.210

TABLE 4

## Union Attitudes

## Matrix of Intercorrelations

Variables	1	2	3	4
1 Union Image Question 1	-			
2 Union Image Question 2	.586 .0001 274	-		
3 Union Instrumentality Question 1	.311 .0001 274	.323 .0001 274	-	
4 Union Instrumentality Question 2	.240 .0001 274	.269 .0001 274	.614 .0001 274	-

factor analysis results presented in Table 5 indicate, five factors emerged with an eigenvalue of 1.0 or greater. An examination of the factor items with loadings over .30 revealed that the statistically derived factors closely paralleled the hypothesized sub-dimensions.<sup>75</sup> One item, "Ability to bypass the supervisor when filing a complaint" showed no significant loadings on any of the five factors. The proposed factors of Procedural Fairness, Content Fairness, Timeliness, and Utilization Ease are similar to Factors III, IV, II, and V respectively. A factor unique to the concept of Reprisal Protection was not found, with those items constructed for the factor either falling out of the analysis or loading on Factor I, Independence from Management Control. Factor I likewise contained items initially constructed for Procedural Fairness, Timeliness, and Utilization Ease (See Table 6 for a comparison of items within the proposed factors and pilot test factors).

As a final step in analysing the results from the pretest, internal consistency estimates for the factors (Cronbach's alpha) were computed (See Table 5). With the exception of Voice, these estimates of reliabilities were clearly within the acceptable standards in basic research. Moreover, Nunnally states that in the early stages of

-----

75. Joseph F. Hair, Rolph E. Anderson, Ronald L. Tatham, and Bernie J. Grablowsky, Multivariate Data Analysis (Tulsa, OK.: Petroleum Publishing Co., 1979) p. 234. Also see Jum Nunnally, op. cit.

TABLE 5

## Factor Analysis

## Grievance Procedure Dimensionality

## Pilot Study

Factor Name	Items	Variables	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV	Factor V	h <sup>2</sup>
I Independence from Management Control	2	Outside Protection	.32734	.05466	.15607	.29159	.05339	.22
	4	Outside Access	.42718	.11886	.15597	.15992	.13848	.27
	7	Outside Adjudicator	.52732	.08336	.17997	.11686	.04100	.33
	8	Employee Representative	.52220	.19215	.16365	.19083	.22306	.42
	9	Final Adjudicator	.67222	.07727	.14103	.12423	.14254	.51
10	Employee Advocate	.70874	.06631	.22830	.10832	.19375	.61	
II Timeliness	16	Prompt ER Response	.04834	.84145	.19610	.05592	.16735	.78
	17	Set Time Limits	.15889	.73408	.12375	.04434	.10024	.59
	19	Prompt Resolution	.13963	.56458	.18644	.09757	.16494	.41
III Procedural Due Process	11	Right to...	.39804	.08418	.58493	.10644	.12973	.54
	13	Question Evidence	.23810	.19720	.58287	.13470	.01456	.45
	14	Present Evidence	.22726	.21114	.54926	.19296	.19052	.47
	15	Use Procedure	.18417	.21575	.69109	.18926	.14391	.61
	15	Cross Examine						
IV Voice	1	Employee input ...	.10156	.04601	.19487	.78610	.09796	.68
	3	Procedure Format	.35873	.06214	.12378	.65004	.08720	.58
	5	Use and Issues	.15505	.10427	.10885	.35447	.25115	.24
V Utilization Ease	6	Employee Training	.14380	.26112	.19046	.16144	.69107	.63
	12	Employee Training	.19275	.15552	.08260	.11703	.73648	.62
		EIGENVALUE	1.78	1.31	5.91	1.03	1.19	8.97
		Variance Explained	9.89%	7.28%	28.83%	5.72%	6.61%	49.1%
	%Total Variance		20.1	14.8	58.7	11.6	13.5	
	Alpha Coefficients (Factor scales)		.77	.80	.80	.69	.77	

**TABLE 6**  
**Comparison of Proposed Grievance Procedure Dimensions**  
**with Pilot Study Factor Scales**

Proposed Factors	Variables	Pilot Factors	Variables
I Content Fairness	2: Outside Protection 7: Outside Adjudicator 9: Final Adjudicator Employee input... 1: Procedure Format 3: Use and Issues 5: Use and Issues	I Independence from Management Control	2: Outside Protection 4: Outside Access 7: Outside Adjudicator 8: Employee Representative 9: Final Adjudicator 10: Employee Advocate
II Procedural Fairness	Right to... 11: Question Evidence 13: Present Evidence 15: Cross Examine	II Voice	Employee input... 1: Procedure Format 3: Use and Issues 3: Use and Issues
III Timeliness	16: Prompt ER Response 17: Set Time Limits 19: Prompt Resolution	III Timeliness	16: Prompt ER Response 17: Set Time Limits 19: Prompt Resolution
IV Utilization Ease	6: Employee Training 8: Employee Representative 10: Employee Advocate 10: Employee Advocate 12: Employee Training	IV Utilization Ease	6: Employee Training 12: Employee Training
V Resprisal Protection	Right to... 4: Outside Access 14: Use Procedure 18: Bypass Supervisor	V Procedural Due Process	Right to... 11: Question Evidence 13: Present Evidence 14: Use Procedure 15: Cross Examine

research on hypothesized measures of a construct, reliabilities of .689 will more than suffice.

#### Design and Administration of the Full Study

Data from the pilot study suggested that a large proportion of those individuals indicating grievance experience did not carry their grievances to a final fourth step panel hearing. Therefore, the questions pertaining to the panel hearing were revised. The revised instrument was mailed to a selected sample of 2,000 state classified employees at their work location through the U.S. Postal Service. Individuals were asked in an accompanying coverletter to complete the four-page questionnaire and to return it to the researcher in the postage paid envelope provided. Two weeks following its mailing a postcard was sent to all 2,000 employees asking them to complete the survey if they had not done so already and thanking them for their cooperation if they had already returned it. Instruments were equally divided between two populations of interest, (1) the total state classified employee group and (2) a sub-group composed of employees within occupational groups demonstrating higher than average usage of the Virginia state grievance procedure. Selection of the first group employed the same random, proportionally stratified

method used for the pilot study. Once selected, the names were compared with those selected in the pilot study and those appearing on both lists were discarded and replaced with a new name. Since access to a list of employees with experience with the grievance procedure was not accessible from the state, the second group mentioned above was constructed and 1,000 names were randomly selected from this list. Information was available on the number of grievances filed by job classification for a five-year period beginning in fiscal year 1978. Thus, all employees within job classifications exhibiting a grievance rate higher than the overall state rate of 0.7% were included in the list. These individuals came from the following five job classifications;

Job Title	Total number of Employees	Grievance Rate
Corrections Officers	3,206	3.58
Corrections Sergeant	227	3.35
Developmental Aide Psychiatric Aide/Charge Aide	3,125	1.70
State Police Trooper	1,362	0.92

The final list of 1,000 names was then randomly selected, with the absolute number of individuals selected based on the proportion of that job in the total group. As in the nongrievant group, selected names were then compared to those of the pilot test and nongrievant list and replaced

with a new name if they appeared on more than one list. Since identical instruments were mailed to both groups, the return envelopes were coded in such a way as to identify the appropriate group from which each response originated.

### Summary

Included in this chapter is the methodology used in this research. It presents a detailed description of the development of the instrument used for collecting the data upon which the research hypotheses were tested. Included in it is a review of the methods used to define and operationalize the variables of interest, scaling of the measures, and pretesting and pilot-testing of the instrument. Since the instrument included scales that had been employed in previous work, this chapter includes a discussion of the characteristics of these scales including previously measured reliabilities. A discussion of the results of the pilot test are also included in this chapter. The chapter concludes with a review of the techniques used to select the final study group from the population of concern as well as the methods employed for administering the survey instrument to the study group.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESEARCH FINDINGS

The findings presented here are based on data obtained from the final survey described in the previous chapter. Actual mailing of the instrument took place in November of 1984. The instrument was accompanied by a cover letter asking employees for their cooperation in filling out and returning it using an accompanying postage paid envelope. All items appear in Appendix C. The final response rate was a major concern at this point in the study. All surveys were sent to the employees at their job locations. In order to increase the response rate from an expected rate of 32.4 percent, that obtained in the pilot study, each individual within the sample was sent a postcard reminder fourteen days after the instruments were sent out. This postcard included a telephone number that could be called if the individual had either misplaced or had not received the survey and was interested in obtaining an additional one. Twenty-five individuals telephoned requesting a survey; the majority indicating they had not received a survey but, had received the follow-up postcard. In addition, fifteen letters were received by individuals requesting that a survey be sent to them.

Survey Response

The results indicate that the follow-up postcard had a positive influence on the return rate.

Of the 2000 questionnaires mailed, fifty-two were returned undelivered. The majority of these had been sent to individuals who were no longer employed by the State. Of the remaining surveys, 789 (40.5 percent) were returned by respondents (See Table 7). Within this group 433 surveys came from the general population sample, those selected through the use of a random, stratified selection method of the total classified population. The response rate for this group was 44.6 percent. Out of these, thirty-two surveys were returned by employees who had previous experience with the grievance procedure. A total of 356 surveys were returned from the employee group sample exhibiting higher than average grievance procedure usage. Out of these surveys fifty were returned by individuals having grievance procedure experience with a final response rate of 36.7 percent.

For data analysis, only the 427 individuals responding in full from the randomly drawn sample plus those 50 individuals responding from the other sample who indicated experience with the grievance procedure were considered. Since surveys were mailed to the specifically selected grievant group for the purpose of increasing the number of

**TABLE 7**  
**Virginia State Grievance Study**  
**Final Questionnaire Response Rate**

	Random Sample	Grievant Sample
Surveys Sent Out	1000	1000
Surveys Returned as Undeliverable	30	20
Surveys Returned by Respondents	433	356
Grievants in Sample Groups	32	50
Response Rate: Grievants	44.6%	36.7%
Non-Grievants	7.4%	14.0%
	92.6%	86.0%

respondents with grievance procedure experience, all other surveys returned from this group from individuals indicating no procedural experience were discarded for use in this study. The assumption was made that if these respondents were added to the final study group spurious results could be found, particularly if occupation or agency location had a significant effect on the variables of interest in the study.

#### Characteristics of the Study Group

A breakdown of the usable responses indicates that 78.6 percent of the respondents were white (n=372), and 19.7 percent were black (n=93). The respondent group was composed of 221 males (46.4 percent) and 255 females (53.6 percent). The median age for the group was 39 (x=41) with a median length of total state employment of 9.5 years (x=10.5). Within the group, 58.9 percent were non-supervisors. Individuals indicating supervisory responsibility for 10 or fewer employees represented 28.9 percent of the group (n=138), and those having over 10 subordinates made up 12.2 percent of the group (n=58). These summary statistics are presented in Table 8.

Within the study group, 16.6 percent (n=71) of the individuals indicated supervisory experience with the grievance process. Within this group twenty-eight had acted as an agency witness at some point in the process, twenty-

**TABLE 8**  
**Virginia State Grievance Study**  
**Demographic Characteristics of the Study Group**

	Study Group	Grievant Group	Population <sup>1</sup>
<b>Age:</b>			
Mean	41	40	
Median	39	38	
<b>Race:</b>			
White	78.6%	77.9%	74.3%
Black	19.7%	20.9%	25.7%
<b>Sex:</b>			
Male	46.4%	60.9%	47.7%
Female	53.6%	39.1%	52.3%
<b>Education:</b>			
Less than Grade 12	10.1%	13.6%	
Completed Grade 12	21.8%	27.3%	
Business/Technical School	10.5%	6.8%	
College/University but less than B.A./B.S. Degree	22.9%	32.9%	
B.A./B.S. Degree	22.6%	17.0%	
Advanced Degree	11.5%	2.3%	
<b>Employment Tenure:</b>			
Mean	10.5 years	10.3 years	
Median	9.5 years	8.0 years	
<b>Supervisory Status:</b>			
Nonsupervisors	58.9%	62.5%	
Supervisors	41.4%	37.5%	

-----

1. Virginia Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Report to the Governor: Employment Trends and Complaints of Discrimination (Richmond:Virginia EEOC, 1984) p.36.

nine had had at least one grievance filed against them and thirty-one were selected by their agency or department to be a panel member for a fourth step hearing.

In general, there appears to be no significant differences in terms of demographic characteristics between the study group and the overall state classified employee group.<sup>76</sup> Furthermore, a breakout of those individuals in this group with grievance procedure experience suggests that, with the exception of sex, no obvious differences appear.

The number of usable surveys returned by respondents within each of the nine workplace strata are presented in Table 9. Employees of the Human Resources Secretariate appear to be overrepresented. All other strata are well within the expected range given the response rate (44.6 percent). This increase in survey responses in the above mentioned secretariate is caused by a larger than predicted return rate from the Technical/Professional employee group and the Aide/Technician employee group.

-----  
76. The Virginia Equal Employment Opportunity Committee Report to the Governor: Employment Trends and Complaints of Discrimination. (Richmond: Virginia EEOC, October 1984)

**TABLE 9**  
**Virginia State Grievance Study**  
**Distribution of Respondents by Secretariate**

<u>Secretariate</u>	<u>Surveys Sent</u>		<u>Surveys Returned</u>	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Administration and Finance	35	3.5	3	0.7
Commerce and Resources	55	5.5	14	3.3
Education	322	32.2	132	31.4
Human Resources	244	24.4	137	32.5
Public Safety	163	16.3	88	20.9
Transportation	170	17.0	46	10.9
Executive Branch	2	0.2	-	-
Judicial Branch	35	3.5	-	-
Legislative Branch	2	0.2	1	0.2

Survey Findings

Intercorrelation findings among the study's five key variables, grievance procedure satisfaction, job satisfaction, supervisor satisfaction, union image and instrumentality, and voting intention are presented in Table 10. There appear to be no problems with multicollinearity among the independent variables.

Table 11 provides a summary of the means and standard deviations for these variables. The standard deviations indicate the presence of substantial variability in most items and scales. The variable having the least variability were those measuring union instrumentality.

Based on these statistics, the study group appears to exhibit satisfaction with the present grievance procedure. Of the total group, 65.9 percent indicated some level of satisfaction with the procedure, with responses ranging from "somewhat satisfied" to "very satisfied". The element having the largest proportion of responses was "somewhat satisfied" (35.4 percent). Individuals reporting some level of satisfaction with their job and/or supervisor comprised 81.4 percent and 75.6 percent of the group respectively. The most common response for both item was "satisfied" (job=38.5 percent, supervisor=33.2 percent).

In summary, the group exhibits general satisfaction with the three work components of interest: grievance

TABLE 10  
Virginia State Grievance Study  
Matrix of Intercorrelations

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 Grievance Procedure Satisfaction	-						
2 Mean Grievance Procedure Satisfaction	.552 .0001 446	-					
3 Job Satisfaction	.280 .0001 447	.227 .0001 463	-				
4 Supervisor Satisfaction	.302 .0001 444	.273 .0001 459	.378 .0001 459	-			
5 Union Image	-.257 .0001 443	-.294 .0001 461	-.147 .001 459	-.139 .003 454	-		
6 Union Instrumentality	-.123 .009 443	-.251 .0001 461	-.093 .047 459	-.124 .008 454	.510 .0001 462	-	
7 Voting Intention	-.401 .0001 438	-.401 .0001 455	-.177 .0001 453	-.175 .0002 448	.643 .0001 456	.575 .0001 456	-

**TABLE 11**  
**Virginia State Grievance Study**  
**Summary of Descriptive Statistics**

Study Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number
Grievance Procedure Satisfaction	3.88	1.22	447
Job Satisfaction	4.58	1.22	464
Supervisor Satisfaction	4.43	1.47	460
Union Image	3.77	1.21	462
Union Instrumentality	4.26	0.97	462
Voting Intention	3.52	1.69	456

procedure satisfaction, general job satisfaction, and satisfaction with the immediate supervisor. Of these three, general job satisfaction is most apparent followed by satisfaction with the immediate supervisor and overall grievance procedure satisfaction (See Table 12).

To analyze attitudes toward unions, each individual's responses to two negative statements concerning union power and interference with employer/worker relations were reversed scored and averaged to obtain a mean score for union image. The potential range for responses for union image had a maximum of six, indicating strong positive union image and a minimum of one, indicating a strong negative union image. When a group mean for this two-item scale was calculated, the group indicated a somewhat neutral set of attitudes toward unions with its mean score falling between agreement and disagreement on the two-item scale. This is somewhat misleading. Group frequencies contained in Table 13 indicate that over half of the study group showed a negative union attitude with 63.2 percent by indicating some level of agreement with two statements concerning negative union image; 12.6 percent indicated some level of disagreement with these two statements; while 24.2 percent indicated responses that averaged to the mean point of the scale.

**TABLE 12**  
**Virginia State Grievance Study**  
**Percentage Distribution of Responses on Satisfaction Measures**

	Total Group				
	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Job in General	2.8	2.8	12.9	19.4	23.5
Immediate Supervisor	7.5	3.4	13.5	15.8	26.5
Grievance Procedure	5.6	8.6	16.4	35.4	4.0
	Non-Grievant Group				
Job in General	1.9	1.6	12.7	19.1	23.6
Immediate Supervisor	4.6	2.9	13.7	15.3	29.0
Grievance Procedure	2.8	6.1	15.3	36.7	5.3
	Grievant Group				
Job in General	7.4	6.1	12.3	21.0	23.5
Immediate Supervisor	17.3	8.6	10.0	18.5	19.7
Grievance Procedure	19.9	23.8	24.7	25.9	1.2

**TABLE 13**  
**Virginia State Grievance Study**  
**Percentage Distribution of Responses on Unionization Questions**

	Total Group				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Dissagree	Strongly Dissagree
Union Image	0.0	1.1	11.4	53.0	31.6
Union Instrumentality	5.2	29.2	41.5	17.9	5.2
Voting Intention	14.9	20.0	20.0	9.2	20.6
					3.0
					1.5
					15.4
					0.8
					1.0
					16.7
					2.5
					3.8
					10.3
					0.8
					1.0
					16.7
					2.5
					3.8
					10.3

Non-Grievants

Grievants

Similar calculations were performed on each individual's responses to two positively worded statements about union instrumentality. Again the average of the two responses for the statements indicating the union's ability to improve wages and working conditions was used to calculate the group's mean union instrumentality score. The potential range for individual responses had a maximum of six indicating strong positive union instrumentality and a minimum of one indicating strong negative instrumentality. Unlike the findings obtained for union image, 75.3 percent of the group demonstrated positive beliefs concerning union instrumentality. The mean score on this scale was 4.26, falling between the elements of agreement and some agreement with the beliefs that unions are useful in providing employees fair supervisory treatment and improving wages and hours. Less than one fourth (13.6 percent) of the respondents disagreed with these statements while 24.7 percent exhibited a response close to the group mean of the two-item scale.

Of the 456 individuals responding to the behavioral intention item, 250 individuals or 54.8 percent indicated some level of agreement with the following statement, "If such were legal, I would vote for representation by a public employee labor union". Sixty-eight respondents, 14.9 percent of the total indicated strong agreement, 91

indicated moderate agreement (20.0 percent), and 91 indicated some agreement with the statement (20.0 percent). Those disagreeing included 70 individuals (15.3 percent) strongly disagreeing, 94 (20.6 percent) expressing moderate disagreement, and 42 or 9.2 percent expressing some disagreement with voting intent.

In summary there appears to be somewhat general satisfaction with certain work aspects in the group, more so with supervisory and general job satisfaction than with grievance procedure satisfaction. The majority of the group exhibited positive attitudes about unions with respect to instrumentality as well as a positive intention of voting for a union if given the opportunity to do so. The attitudes the group possess regarding unions are in accord with those found by Kochan in a 1977 study of 1,515 workers representative of the U.S. labor force.<sup>77</sup> In that study, the author found that a full 80 percent of the respondents agreed that unions improve the wages and job security of their members and represent their members against unfair labor practices of employers. Data within the current study show that 75.3 percent of the group hold these same instrumental beliefs. Kochan also reported that 70 to 80 percent of those individuals appear to hold a "big-labor" image. This image is often equated with a somewhat negative

-----  
77. Thomas Kochan, p.25.

union image. Within the present study group 63.2 percent possess such an image. The group, however, showed a much more favorable attitude toward voting intention with 54.8 percent of the group indicating they would vote for a union if given the opportunity. Of the 983 non-union workers responding to Kochan's survey only 30 percent indicated a similar voting intention.

Since individuals having had previous experience with the grievance procedure have more knowledge on which to base their assessment of the grievance procedure, they may indeed respond differently to the variables of interest. Therefore, the group was divided into two sub-groups based on procedure usage and the above variables were analysed for group differences using independent t-tests. Table 14 provides a summary of means, standard deviations, and t-statistics for the two groups.

Significant differences appear between the means of the two groups, a not unexpected phenomena. Though no a priori hypotheses were made regarding which group would exhibit greater satisfaction, the results show that the grievant group, as a whole, is much less satisfied with the grievance procedure in question than is the non-grievant group. Moreover, the reason for this does not appear to be the final decision made on the grievance. The group was further subdivided into those individuals receiving a favorable

TABLE 14

Virginia State Grievance Study  
 Summary of Descriptive Statistics  
 Comparison between Nongrievants and Grievants

	Nongrievants			Grievants			t
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number	
Grievance Procedure Satisfaction	4.09	1.10	360	2.76	1.25	81	8.82*
Job Satisfaction	4.66	1.13	377	4.29	1.49	81	2.13**
Supervisor Satisfaction	4.59	1.35	373	3.86	1.75	81	3.50***
Union Image	3.84	1.19	376	3.44	1.31	80	2.47****
Union Instrumentality	4.21	0.93	376	4.48	1.12	80	2.03*****
Voting Intention	3.41	1.68	372	4.15	1.67	78	3.60*****

p<.0001 level\*  
 p<.04 level\*\*  
 p<.0006 level\*\*\*  
 p<.02 level\*\*\*\*  
 p<.05 level\*\*\*\*\*  
 p<.0005 level\*\*\*\*\*

decision (n=26) and one in which the issue was either decided in favor of management or dropped by the grievant (n=19). No significant differences were found when t-tests were performed between the two group means (See Table 15). In summary, the results suggest that individuals with experience with the grievance procedure are less satisfied with the procedure than those without that experience. These individuals also appear to be slightly less satisfied with their job in general and with their immediate supervisors. Although these results are statistically significant, they may be of no practical importance. It can be assumed that the group would exhibit less satisfaction since this is the fundamental impetus for use of the grievance procedure. Or, as an alternative, it can be argued that a person who has used the procedure and has found it an unacceptable method of resolving work related problems may become more dissatisfied with his/her job. Moreover, though the mean differences were statistically significant, they still indicate some overall satisfaction with the procedure. A similar argument can be made for the differences in union attitudes between the two groups. Though the grievant group possesses a somewhat stronger attitude toward unions, this difference does not appear to have any practical significance. Again, when comparing the means of the two groups, it appears that both the grievant

TABLE 15

Virginia State Grievance Study  
 Summary of Descriptive Statistics  
 Comparison between Grievants Based on Decision

	Favorable			Unfavorable			t Statistic
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number	
Grievance Procedure Satisfaction	3.06	1.29	31	2.50	1.07	28	1.82
Job Satisfaction	4.35	1.56	31	4.25	1.46	28	0.27
Supervisor Satisfaction	4.03	1.64	31	3.57	1.91	28	1.00
Union Image	3.30	1.13	31	3.70	1.16	28	1.32
Union Instrumentality	4.47	1.14	31	4.50	0.95	28	0.12
Voting Intention	4.10	1.70	31	4.15	1.66	28	0.10

group and the non-grievant group exhibit moderately positive union attitudes with respect to instrumentality.

The last variable compared between the two groups is that of voting intention. Findings show a significant difference between voting intention of the two groups. Grievants appear to respond more positively to the notion of voting for representation than do non-grievants. Of those individuals indicating grievance procedure usage 56 or 71.7 percent indicated agreement with the voting intention statement. This percentage was much higher than that of the non-grievant group. Only 51.6 percent of all individuals in the non-grievant group indicated some level of agreement with the voting intention statement.

#### Grievance Procedure Dimensionality

Results of the pilot study suggested preliminary support for the first hypothesis;

HI: Grievance procedures are composed of five critical sub-dimensions.

Therefore, the same nineteen items were used to examine the construct in the study group. The factor analytic results presented below are not an attempt to confirm those of the pilot study. Nunnally strongly suggests that although comparisons of factors in different analyses are often straight forward, if the same persons are involved, inferences drawn between two different groups may indeed

have little significance.<sup>78</sup> The nineteen items were subjected to principal components factor analysis for the purpose of determining whether there was a set of dimensions common to the study group's responses. Factors were then rotated orthogonally utilizing the Varimax method. Since it was hypothesized that there were five critical dimensions, the statistical package used was set to limit the number of factors to five in the final model. Those five factors emerged with an eigenvalue greater than 1.0, and are presented in Table 16. It should be noted that when the analysis was performed unrestricted, again five significant factors emerged.

The first factor, Procedural Due Process, explains 32.6 percent of the total variance extracted by the factor solution. The four items loading on this factor include the three items originally constructed for the hypothesized dimension of Procedural Fairness plus one item from the hypothesized dimension of Reprisal Protection. These data suggest that, when assessing a grievance procedure, people tend to look at the rights they have to present evidence and support for their complaint, to counter or question management actions as well as the materials or evidence used in support of those actions, and do so independently of the rights to final decision making by an outside neutral party.

-----

78. Nunnally, op.cit. pp. 367-368.

TABLE 16  
Virginia State Grievance Study  
Factor Analysis  
Grievance Procedure Dimensionality

Factor Name	Items	Variables	FactorI	FactorII	FactorIII	FactorIV	FactorV	h2
I Procedural Due Process	11	Right to...	.59856	.16373	.32860	.23151	.17547	.58
	13	Question Evidence	.64066	.15546	.08078	.16327	.15813	.49
	14	Present Evidence	.56498	.14212	.30356	.17531	.12460	.48
	15	Use Procedure	.64169	.10934	.15295	.22642	.08186	.51
		Cross Examine						
II Utilization Ease	6	Employee Training	.15718	.65570	.08966	.10195	.16706	.50
	8	Employee Representative	.23847	.33309	.26811	.28376	.21806	.37
	12	Employee Training	.17849	.81130	.10338	.18413	.15395	.76
III Independence from Management Control	2	Outside Protection	.11171	.06211	.57822	.01194	.19896	.39
	4	Outside Access	.21109	.10563	.48936	.17874	.17964	.36
	7	Outside Adjudicator	.20135	.06669	.49935	.03486	.06324	.30
	10	Employee Advocate	.30200	.17600	.37619	.31087	.22551	.41
	18	Bypass Supervisor	.04369	.07449	.53010	.21415	.06436	.34
IV Timeliness	16	Prompt ER Response	.32813	.16373	.06082	.65667	.12566	.59
	17	Set Time Limits	.15163	.09042	.10242	.80036	.14596	.70
	19	Prompt Resolution	.19909	.11678	.20968	.61161	.07450	.48
V Voice	1	Employee input ...	.07359	.16072	.11687	.09925	.75429	.62
	3	Procedure Format	.25116	.13986	.22660	.16682	.59670	.52
	5	Use and Issues	.06953	.26663	.20145	.03162	.30637	.21
	9	Final Adjudicator	.21505	.11552	.18203	.21165	.32257	.24
	EIGENVALUE	6.185	1.503	1.394	1.160	1.041	8.84	
	Variance Explained	32.6%	7.9%	7.3%	6.1%	5.59%	46.5%	
	%Total Variance	70.1	17.0	15.7	13.1	11.8		
	Alpha Coefficients (Factor scales)	.79	.71	.70	.80	.67		

The data suggest that a written policy protecting the worker from management abuse may not be distinguished conceptually as protection from reprisal but more so as a reaffirmation of the employee's rights to procedural due process.

Factor II, Utilization Ease, includes three of the original four items constructed for this hypothesized dimension and accounts for 7.9 percent of the total response variance. In general, individuals tend to group together, for evaluation purposes, information channels when assessing a grievance procedure. The form these channels may take can include training sessions on procedural usage for new employees or on-going communications about the procedure. Likewise, an employee representative whose function is to provide assistance to the employee in filling out grievance forms or answering questions is discerned as an appropriate information channel. The fourth item constructed for Utilization Ease, the presence of an employee representative to act as an advocate, failed to load significantly on this factor. These findings suggest that individuals do indeed perceive the "advocacy function" separately from the "information source function". This is in contrast to most current thinking and will be discussed in the next chapter.

The third factor accounts for 7.3 percent of the total variance explained and includes items originally constructed for the proposed dimensions of Content Fairness, Utilization

Ease, and Reprisal Protection. The dimension has been labeled Independence from Management Control. The variables loading on this factor suggest that when evaluating a grievance procedure individuals base their decisions in part on the presence or absence of what are considered critical third parties, i.e. a neutral adjudicator, an employee advocate and an outside agency affording employee protection from management reprisal. Moreover, the independence these actors exhibit from management control appears to be an important reference point.

Two of the five items relate to actors clearly outside of the workplace, i.e. the final adjudicator and an outside agency acting in some protective employee capacity throughout the grievance process. Two additional items pertain to supervisory contact and the ability of the employee to obtain grievance forms and information and to file grievances using a person or source other than the immediate supervisor. All actors and procedures have as a common element independence from management. The last item pertains to the presence of an employee representative acting as an advocate throughout the grievance process. Again, as in Factor II, this suggests that individuals differentiate in terms of the activities carried out by employee representatives. All five variables strongly suggest that neutrality or independence from management

control is a discernable reference base by which acceptability is assessed.

The factor loadings for Timeliness accounted for 6.1 percent of total factor variance and appear to support the initial hypothesis that Timeliness is a critical dimension of acceptability. The three items constructed to assess this dimension exhibited significant loadings. Again the data suggest that when evaluating a grievance procedure individuals assess whether or not the system affords reasonable response limits for management reply as well as the prompt resolution of their complaints.

The last factor, labeled Voice, explains 5.5 percent of the total variance, and indicates that individuals do react in a common way to the level of input the group may have into setting up complaint procedures, as well as their subsequent involvement in decisions reflecting its fairness. Four items exhibited substantial loadings on this factor. Those people who place high importance on the employee's right to decide how a procedure is structured also place high importance on the employee's right to decide what issues may be taken through the procedure and who will make the final decision on the issue. It should be noted that the item dealing with final decision making, loading on this factor does not imply that the decision maker be an outside or neutral third party, but only that the employee group

have a right to decide who the party will be. Likewise, those items dealing with issues do not imply fairness with respect to a final decision, but the employee's right to make decisions on what constitutes grievable issues. As such the dimension appears to be most closely associated to that of Procedural Due Process.

The factor solution based on data from the study group does appear to lend partial support of HI. The three factors labeled Voice, Timeliness, and Utilization Ease closely approximate those of Content Fairness, Timeliness, and Utilization Ease. No findings appear to support the dimension previously defined as Reprisal Protection. Instead, items constructed appear to be more closely associated with the general notion of fairness. Moreover, fairness appears to be multidimensional, consisting of two sub-factors, Procedural Due Process and Independence from Management Control.

#### Grievance Procedure Satisfaction and its Relationship to Voting Intention

Hypotheses II through VI consider the relationship between grievance procedure satisfaction and employees' intention to vote for a union, if given the opportunity to do so. Hypothesis II tests the relationship of the employees' global measure of grievance procedure satisfaction, with the "intention to vote" for a union.

Hypotheses III through VI take into account the proposed multidimensionality of the grievance procedure; each hypothesis was constructed to test separately various dimensions with voting "intent". To investigate the hypotheses, Pearson product-moment (PPM) correlations were performed on each set of variables specific to the hypothesis of concern. PPM correlation is used to specify the degree of relationship between two variables. It permits no causal inferences to be made.<sup>79</sup>

HII: Employee satisfaction with the grievance procedure is negatively correlated with intentions to vote for a union.

In order to investigate the hypothesis, the relationship between responses to the question asking individuals for the level of global satisfaction with the grievance procedure and the question concerning voting intention was analysed. The data presented in Table 17 show a strong negative relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variable, and suggest that where a grievance procedure is in place, negative attitudes toward the procedure, i.e. dissatisfaction with it, will very likely be exhibited by those employees also expressing interest in unionization. These findings add to the research on worker attitudes toward the job that has

-----

79. Nunnally, op.cit. p. 109.

**TABLE 17**  
**Virginia State Grievance Study**  
**Correlation Coefficients for Grievance Procedure Satisfaction**  
**with Union Voting Intentions**

	<u>Intention to Vote for Unionization</u>		
	Study Group (n=477)	Nongrievant Group (n=390)	
		Grievant Group (n=82)	
Grievance Procedure Satisfaction	-.401*	-.369*	-.339**

p<.0001 level\*  
 p<.002 level\*\*

typically focused on job satisfaction or dissatisfaction as a key "determinant" of union voting intentions and behavior. Due process as encompassed in the grievance procedure has been proposed in this study to be an important non-economic work component not as yet addressed by other studies of grievance procedures. The data clearly show that satisfaction with this work component is as strongly related to unionization as other work components studied to date.

To test the relationship between the four critical elements of the grievance procedure and voting intentions, each of the twelve items dealing with specific aspects of the grievance procedure were assigned to one of four categories, (1) Fairness, (2) Timeliness, (3) Utilization Ease, and (4) Reprisal Protection. The assignment of each question was based on the previous findings of grievance procedure multidimensionality. Each question was compared to the identified factors and then put into one of the four categories mentioned above based on the best fit possible. It should be noted that not all dimensions are represented, and that one category, fairness, incorporated questions that are shown to tap more than one dimension. This problem with the study's research design is discussed in the final chapter. The mean group score for each respondent as well as each item score were then use as independent variables with the dependent variable, voting intent. To investigate

each hypothesis, PPM correlations were performed on each set of variables specific to the hypothesis of concern.

HIII: Employee perceptions of grievance procedure fairness are negatively correlated with voting intentions.

Though not as strong as general grievance procedure satisfaction, data on the items dealing with the fairness issue presented in Table 18 support the hypotheses. Question 28 pertaining to grievable issues is most closely related to the dimension of Voice or the right of the employee to decide what types of complaints can be taken through the grievance procedure. Out of the three questions it shows the strongest relationship to voting intention in the study group ( $r=.254$ ) and the non-grievant group ( $r=.254$ ). The question dealing with the general concept of fairness with respect to management decisions also exhibited a similar relationship to voting intention with the largest correlation ( $r=-.248$ ) being exhibited in the grievant group. Though significant, the question dealing with employee perusal of agency evidence showed a relatively weak correlation with union vote in the study group and no significant relationship to the dependent variable when analysed within the grievant/non-grievant groups. This may be due, in part, to the fact that 35.6 percent of the respondents indicated neither agreement nor disagreement with the statement. The data in general, does not present

TABLE 18

Virginia State Study

Grievance

	Intention to Vote for Unionization		
	Study Group (n=477)	Nongrievant Group (n=396)	Grievant Group (n=82)
Question 20: The reasons my agency gives for denying supporting a grievance is usually fair	-.223*	-.173****	-.248***
Question 26: Employees have good chance to look over and question agency evidence about their complaint	-.100**	-.044	-.091
Question 28: The grievance procedure is too limited in terms of what problems I can take through it	.254*	.254*	.124

p < .0001 level\*  
 p < .03 level\*\*  
 p < .02 level\*\*\*  
 p < .01 level\*\*\*\*  
 p < .001 level\*\*\*\*\*

exceptionally high relationships between these three questions and voting intention. This may be due to the fact that all three items necessitate some basic knowledge of how the grievance procedure works. That is, an individual who has never used the procedure may not be aware of what issues are grievable much less their ability to evaluate employer evidence or if the employer makes fair decisions in a specific complaint. With the exception of the general fairness issue this may also be the case for a grievant.

HIV: Employee perceptions of grievance procedure timeliness are negatively correlated with voting intentions.

Two items were constructed to assess the relationship between employee perceptions of timeliness and voting intentions. Those individuals agreeing with the statement that their present procedures encompass too many time delays in resolving grievances indicated a more positive attitude toward voting for a union than those believing the procedure to be prompt in resolving grievances (See Table 19). Likewise, individuals strongly disagreeing with the statement indicating a quick response from management at the first steps of the procedure were more apt to exhibit positive voting intentions. The strongest correlation ( $r = -.350$ ) appeared in the grievant group. These individuals are more likely to be aware of the time constraints and

TABLE 19  
 Virginia State Grievance Study  
 Correlation Coefficients  
 Grievance Procedure Timeliness and Union Voting Intentions

	Intention to Vote for Unionization		
	Study Group (n=477)	Nongrievant Group (n=390)	Grievant Group (n=82)
Question 21: There are too many time delays in resolving grievances through the state grievance procedure	.221*	.173**	.248**
Question 30: My agency usually responds to grievances at the first steps of the procedure quickly	-.202*	-.157***	-.350***

p<.0001 level\*  
 p<.0007 level\*\*  
 p<.001 level\*\*\*  
 p<.002 level\*\*\*\*

delay patterns associated with management response. It should be noted that, though significant, this relationship is not strong, particularly in the non-grievant group. This may again be due to the relatively large number of respondents indicating no opinion to the question, 29.5 percent of the total group. An additional problem may stem from the wording of the statement dealing with management response to grievances. The construction of this item was originally thought to address the notion of time delays in the procedure. However, it also generated the largest number of written-in comments. These were negative for the most part, and gave the impression that though management was often prompt in their response to grievances, those responses were usually seen as unjust or unfair. Though these qualified answers came from only five respondents, this item does indeed appear to have limited validity as a measure of timeliness. It may indeed be a better measure of grievance procedure fairness.

HV: Employee perceptions of the ease of utilization of the grievance procedure are negatively correlated with voting intentions.

Three items were used to assess utilization ease. One asked individuals to state their opinions concerning how well the Office of Employee Relations Counselors functioned as an agency providing information about the grievance

procedure, the second asked for their insights on how knowledgeable employees were about the system, and the third attempted to extract their preference for further assistance in its use. Of the three items constructed to assess employee perceptions with the procedure in terms of usage ease, the item pertaining to the presence of an employee representative to help process grievances was found to have the strongest correlation with union voting intention. The data presented in Table 20 suggest that employees perceiving a strong need for a representative to assist in the grievance process may be more likely to vote for union representation. One inference is that the consequence of unionization is inevitably the presence of such a representative in the form of a shop steward.

It was noted earlier that individuals do appear to distinguish among the functions carried out by employee representatives, and place separate importance on advocacy and assistance functions. As a consequence, the relationship between this item and union voting may indeed not be limited to the notion of procedure utilization ease, particularly if individuals responding to this item interpreted the "employee representative" as acting as both an information channel and an employee advocate. This appears to be the case in the study group and the non-grievant group. Though the perceived need of an employee

TABLE 20

Virginia State Grievance Study

Correlation Coefficient\*

Grievance Procedure Utilization

	Intention to Vote for Unionization		
	Study Group (n=477)	Nongrievant Group (n=390)	Grievant Group (n=82)
Question 24: The OERC does a good job of answering questions about the grievance procedure	-.013	-.030	-.145**
Question 25: Many employees do not use the grievance procedure because they do not know how it works	.212*	.210*	.222**
Question 27: More employees would use the grievance procedure if there was an employee representative at the work site	.310*	.345*	.126

p<.0001 level\*  
p<.04 level\*\*

representative at the work site is highly and significantly correlated with the item related to knowledge of the procedure ( $r=.462$ ,  $r=.508$  respectively) it is also strongly associated in these two groups with the need for an outside adjudicator.

The full correlation matrix for the groups are found in Tables 22 and 23. The results suggest that both basic functions carried out by a representative are taken into account when individuals responded to this question. This is not, however, the case with the grievant group. No significant relationship is found between the items dealing with the employee representative at the work site and outside adjudication (See Table 24). This suggests that grievants view an employee representative as a facilitator for procedure usage and those indicating a strong preference for such an individual also indicate positive attitudes toward unionization.

HVI: Employee perceptions of management reprisal for use of the grievance procedure is positively correlated with voting intentions.

Three of the four items pertaining to this final element exhibited the strongest relationship with union voting intention. These included the need for final settlement by an outside neutral party, the extent to which management assures employees of protection against

supervisor reprisal for procedure usage, and the consequences of filing a grievance on future promotions. It should be noted that the first item was originally constructed for the element of fairness. However, after analysis of the factor solution used in the first hypothesis, it was decided that this item was better placed under reprisal protection. The dimension of Independence from Management Control subsumed items pertaining to both final adjudication and reprisal protection. The data analysis suggests that those individuals who are most likely to perceive negative consequences to filing a grievance and, moreover, feel the need for an outside adjudicator at the final step of the procedure, are most likely to exhibit prounion voting intentions (See Table 21). Or stated differently, individuals who feel there is protection afforded to employees filing grievances and do not have fear of management reprisals may be less inclined to vote for unionization.

The item dealing with the Office of Employee Relations Counselors showed no significant relationship to voting intention in the grievant group, and a very weak relationship in the others. The grievant group is most likely to be knowledgeable about this agency and may have had greater frequency of contact with the Agency than had the non-grievant group. One conclusion to be drawn is that

TABLE 21  
 Virginia State Grievance Study  
 Correlation Coefficients  
 Grievance Procedure Reprisal Protection and Union Voting Intentions

	<u>Intention to Vote for Unionization</u>		
	Study Group (n=477)	Nongrievant Group (n=390)	Grievant Group (n=82)
Question 22: My agency goes to great length to make sure that employees can file grievances without having to worry about supervisory treatment later on	.291*	-.251*	-.317**
Question 23: I would be more likely to use the present grievance procedure if a person outside the Virginia state system was making the final decision	.295*	.284*	.256**
Question 29: Filing a grievance in this agency may have a bad effect on chances for promotions	.332*	.325*	.251***
Question 31: I would not call the OERC because I might get into trouble with my supervisor	.195*	.188*	.192

p<.0001 level\*  
 p<.004 level\*\*  
 p<.02 level\*\*\*  
 p<.002 level\*\*\*\*

these employees making contact with the OERC do so without their supervisors knowledge and, therefore, the activity does not enter into their concept of reprisal protection. Employees not making contact may indeed assume that management will know about it and the activity may, in fact, enter into their concept of reprisal.

In summary, results lend partial support to the four hypotheses which deal with the elements of grievance procedure fairness, timeliness, utilization ease, and reprisal protection. There is support for the conclusion that dissatisfaction with these elements is to an extent related to voting intention. That is, individuals who fear reprisal from the supervisor for procedure usage, who feel the procedure does not lend itself to fair decisions, or who do not feel the procedure lends itself to prompt resolution of their grievances are more likely to voice positive opinions about voting in union elections. However, the relationship between the item constructed to assess general grievance procedure satisfaction and voting intention was found to be the strongest of those analyzed.

#### Virginia Grievance Procedure Effectiveness

Since this study is the first empirical investigation of the Virginia grievance procedure, additional analysis was performed on employee perceptions of grievance procedure

effectiveness. These perceptions are thought to be strongly associated with satisfaction. That is, if an individual believes that the procedure available for use is effective in resolving problems arising within the work setting, he/she will be more satisfied with the procedure than an employee who views it as an ineffective tool in resolving complaints. Moreover, effectiveness can be assessed based on the hypothesis that grievance procedures have distinct and salient sub-dimensions.

For the purposes of constructing a preliminary scale of grievance procedure effectiveness eight of the twelve items were selected that appeared to represent salient dimensions of grievance procedures, and exhibited a strong and significant correlation with the global measure of satisfaction ( $r > .25$ ). These included the following;

Question 20: The reasons my agency gives for denying or supporting a grievance are usually fair.

Question 21: There are too many time delays in resolving grievances through the state grievance procedure.

Question 22: My agency goes to great length to make sure that employees can file grievances without having to worry about how their supervisors will treat them later on.

Question 23: I would be more likely to use the present grievance procedure if a person outside the Virginia state system was making the final decision about my complaint.

Question 27: More employees would use the grievance procedure if there was an employee representative at the work site.

Question 28: The grievance procedure is too limited in terms

of what problem I can take through it.

Question 29: Filing a grievance in this agency may have a bad effect on chances for promotions and pay raises.

Question 30: My agency usually responds to grievances at the first steps of the procedure in a quick manner.

The correlation matrix for all items appear in Tables 22 thru 24. Questions 21, 23, 27, 28, and 29 were reversed scored, therefore, a higher mean score would indicate higher perceptions of effectiveness. Each respondent's answers to the eight items were summed and averaged to give a mean score for grievance procedure satisfaction. Individual's mean score were then used to determine PPM correlation coefficient for the scale measure of satisfaction with general grievance procedure satisfaction and union voting intention. These are presented in Table 25. The coefficient alpha estimates of internal consistency for the total group, non-grievant group and grievant group are .78, .77, and .68 respectively. The results show extremely high relationships between general satisfaction and satisfaction as measured by the eight-item scale and in general, reaffirm a strongly negative and significant relationship between employee perceptions of grievance procedure satisfaction and their intention to vote for a union if given the opportunity.

TABLE 22  
Virginia State Grievance Study  
Matrix of Intercorrelations

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
	Total Group												
1 Grievance Procedure Satisfaction	-												
2 Question 20	.472 .0001 446	-											
3 Question 21	.275 .0001 446	.990 .0300 477	-										
4 Question 22	.447 .0001 445	.516 .0001 476	.135 .0031 476	-									
5 Question 23	.289 .0001 446	.246 .0001 477	.274 .0001 477	.303 .0001 476	-								
6 Question 24	.192 .0001 446	.213 .0001 477	.121 .0081 477	.133 .0036 476	.010 .8167 477	-							
7 Question 25	.156 .0001 466	.157 .0006 477	.254 .0001 477	.220 .0001 476	.314 .0001 477	.048 .2998 477	-						
8 Question 26	.320 .0001 445	.430 .0001 476	.040 .3890 476	.355 .0001 475	.186 .0001 476	.194 .0001 476	.167 .0003 476	-					
9 Question 27	.222 .0001 446	.169 .0002 477	.237 .0001 477	.202 .0001 476	.350 .0001 477	.020 .6652 477	.462 .0001 477	.134 .0033 476	-				
10 Question 28	.424 .0001 446	.289 .0001 477	.248 .0001 477	.301 .0001 476	.360 .0001 477	.119 .0096 477	.314 .0001 477	.182 .0001 476	.349 .0001 477	-			
11 Question 29	.395 .0001 446	.433 .0001 477	.239 .0001 477	.540 .0001 476	.360 .0001 477	.083 .0718 477	.338 .0001 477	.319 .0001 476	.310 .0001 477	.398 .0001 477	-		
12 Question 30	.271 .0001 445	.324 .0001 476	.217 .0001 476	.345 .0001 475	.138 .0025 476	.209 .0001 476	.236 .0001 476	.214 .0001 476	.185 .0001 475	.240 .0001 476	.274 .0001 476	-	
13 Question 31	.255 .0001 444	.232 .0001 475	.208 .0001 475	.257 .0001 474	.276 .0001 475	.091 .0477 475	.227 .0001 475	.162 .0004 474	.197 .0001 475	.272 .0001 475	.451 .0001 475	.174 .0001 474	-

TABLE 23  
Virginia State Grievance Study  
Matrix of Intercorrelations

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1 Grievance Procedure Satisfaction													
2 Question 20	.411 .0001 360	-											
3 Question 21	.356 .0001 360	.156 .0002 390	-										
4 Question 22	.395 .0001 357	.465 .0001 389	.169 .0008 389	-									
5 Question 23	.224 .0001 360	.243 .0001 390	.255 .0001 390	.297 .0001 389	-								
6 Question 24	.254 .0001 360	.228 .0001 390	.166 .0010 390	.161 .0001 389	.009 .0542 390	-							
7 Question 25	.142 .0068 360	.202 .0001 390	.238 .0001 390	.255 .0001 389	.293 .0001 390	.073 .1504 390	-						
8 Question 26	.213 .0001 359	.362 .0001 389	.071 .1641 389	.316 .0001 388	.144 .0045 389	.202 .0001 389	.191 .0001 389	-					
9 Question 27	.216 .0001 360	.172 .0001 390	.283 .0001 390	.220 .0001 389	.384 .0001 390	.005 .9240 390	.508 .0001 390	.160 .0016 389	-				
10 Question 28	.406 .0001 360	.264 .0001 390	.282 .0001 390	.299 .0001 389	.327 .0001 390	.111 .0289 390	.332 .0001 390	.157 .0019 389	.344 .0001 390	-			
11 Question 29	.355 .0001 360	.415 .0001 390	.301 .0001 390	.531 .0001 389	.355 .0001 390	.103 .0430 390	.361 .0001 390	.311 .0001 389	.346 .0001 390	.416 .0001 390	-		
12 Question 30	.263 .0001 359	.355 .0001 389	.227 .0001 389	.338 .0001 388	.119 .0192 389	.225 .0001 389	.192 .0001 389	.217 .0001 388	.194 .0001 389	.261 .0001 389	.274 .0001 389	-	
13 Question 31	.239 .0001 359	.287 .0001 389	.220 .0001 389	.289 .0001 388	.289 .0001 388	.134 .0077 389	.230 .0001 389	.179 .0004 388	.239 .0001 389	.324 .0001 389	.506 .0001 389	.206 .0001 388	-

TABLE 24  
Virginia State Grievance Study  
Matrix of Intercorrelations

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
	Grievant Group												
1 Grievance Procedure Satisfaction	-												
2 Question 20	.373 .0006 81	-											
3 Question 21	.204 .0675 81	-.031 .7702 82	-										
4 Question 22	.351 .0013 81	.539 .0001 82	.040 .7229 82	-									
5 Question 23	.353 .0012 81	.077 .4895 82	.438 .0001 82	.184 .0979 82	-								
6 Question 24	.164 .1431 81	.263 .0169 82	-.037 .7433 82	.078 .4875 82	.057 .6138 82	-							
7 Question 25	.198 .0760 81	-.062 .5781 82	.364 .0008 82	.069 .5396 82	.425 .0001 82	-.023 .8358 82	-						
8 Question 26	.277 .0121 81	.429 .0001 82	.102 .9866 82	.284 .0098 82	.171 .1249 82	.251 .0229 82	.068 .5467 82	-					
9 Question 27	.168 .1339 81	.081 .4714 82	.093 .4062 82	.073 .5122 82	.153 .1709 82	.105 .3469 82	.222 .0453 82	-.015 .0895 82	-				
10 Question 28	.324 .0031 81	.211 .0571 82	.175 .1155 82	.154 .1675 82	.288 .0086 82	.232 .0358 82	.201 .0701 82	.090 .4200 82	.320 .0034 82	-			
11 Question 29	.429 .0001 81	.426 .0001 82	.040 .7230 82	.546 .0001 82	.175 .1159 82	.079 .0480 82	.201 .0695 82	.252 .0022 82	.084 .4556 82	.188 .0913 82	-		
12 Question 30	.295 .0074 81	.233 .0349 82	.185 .0970 82	.364 .0008 82	.179 .1077 82	.161 .1490 82	.419 .0001 82	.186 .0941 82	.157 .1602 82	.166 .1360 82	.299 .0063 82	-	
13 Question 31	.273 .0138 81	.081 .4681 82	.210 .0577 82	.174 .1180 82	.243 .0364 82	-.037 .7400 82	.207 .0626 82	.124 .2688 82	.028 .8051 82	.072 .5214 82	.230 .0378 82	.076 .4952 82	-

TABLE 25

Virginia State Grievance Study

Correlation Coefficients for Grievance Procedure Effectiveness  
with General Grievance Procedure Satisfaction  
and Union Voting Intentions

	<u>Mean Grievance Procedure Satisfaction</u>		
	Study Group (n=472)	Nongrievant Group (n=390)	Grievant Group (n=82)
Grievance Procedure Satisfaction	.565*	.521*	.564*
Voting Intention	-.436*	-.408*	-.462*
coefficient alpha	.76	.77	.68

p<.0001 level\*

## Job Satisfaction and its Relationship to Voting Intention

HVII: Employee perceptions of job satisfaction are negatively correlated with voting intention.

In order to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and intent to vote, PPM correlations were performed on two measures of satisfaction, "overall job satisfaction", and "satisfaction with supervision", and the dependent variable "intention to vote". The data is presented in Table 26. Though numerous researchers in the area have suggested that satisfaction with general economic and non-economic work aspects are "...majors predictors" of voting intentions, reported correlations have been confined to the range of .10 to .20 when using data from general population surveys. Though in all cases significant, the relationship is a relatively weak one. The data from the total study group confirm this relationship ( $r = -.177$  for job satisfaction,  $r = -.175$  for supervisor satisfaction). However, such is not the case when looking at the grievant group. There is no evidence to suggest that there is any significant relationship between job satisfaction and voting intent for individuals who have had previous experience with the grievance procedure. This evidence clearly suggests that due process, viewed as an additional component of work plays a significant role in workers' attitudes toward work and their attitudes toward unionization.

TABLE 26

Virginia State Grievance Study  
 Correlation Coefficients for Work Satisfaction  
 with Union Voting Intentions

Intention to Vote for Unionization

	Study Group (n=472)	Nongrievant Group (n=390)	Grievant Group (n=82)
Job Satisfaction	-.177*	-.190**	-.037
Supervisory Satisfaction	-.175*	-.149***	-.104

p<.0001 level\*  
 p<.0002 level\*\*  
 p<.0004 level\*\*\*

In summary these results lend only partial support for the hypothesis that employee perceptions of job satisfaction are negatively correlated with voting intention. While a significant though weak relationship is shown in the total group and the group of employees with no previous grievance procedure experience, no relationship is seen in the group of employees having grievance procedure experience.

Union Attitudes and their Relationship to Voting Intention

Hypotheses VIII and IX investigate the relationship between an individual's beliefs and attitudes about unionization and their future intentions to vote in a union election.

Within this general area of study, researchers have examined workers beliefs about union instrumentality. An employee's perception of union instrumentality has been defined as belief an individual has that a union will provide for him/her certain important job outcomes such as improved wages, benefits, and working conditions. These beliefs become the basis for the employee formulating a set of attitudes about unions. These beliefs, if adequately measured, will be highly correlated with appropriate measures of attitudes. This relationship is confirmed by data in this study as well as earlier by Youngblood et al. Intercorrelations reported by Youngblood show a strong relationship between items propoting to assess union image

and those measuring economic and non-economic instrumentality ( $r=.57$  and  $.51$  respectively; no significance levels were reported).<sup>80</sup> These findings are comparable to the data in this study. For the total study group the correlation coefficient for the means of the two item union image scale and the two item union instrumentality scale was  $.51$ , for the non-grievant  $.49$ , and for the grievant group  $.53$  (all report a significance level of  $p<.0001$ ). Though this relationship does not preclude separate testing of the following two hypotheses, it should be taken into account if making further inferences about the data.

Table 27 contains correlation coefficients used to investigate the following two hypotheses.

HVIII: Employee perceptions of union instrumentality are positively correlated with voting intention.

The results support the major work done in this area, showing a strong relationship between employee beliefs concerning union instrumentality and voting intention. They suggest that individuals expressing the belief that unions are not good vehicles for providing better wages and hours and/or protection in the form of fair treatment by supervisors are much less likely to exhibit pronunion voting intentions than those who believe unions do provide those important work components.

-----

80. Youngblood, op.cit., p.52.

**TABLE 27**  
**Virginia State Grievance Study**  
**Correlation Coefficients for Union Attitudes**  
**with Union Voting Intentions**

	<u>Intention to Vote for Unionization</u>		
	Study Group (n=472)	Nongrievant Group (n=390)	Grievant Group (n=82)
Union Image	.643*	.619*	.705*
Union Instrumentality	.575*	.556*	.627*

p<.0001 level\*

In addition the data also provides strong support for the following hypothesis dealing with worker attitudes about union;

HIX: Workers' beliefs about of unions, i.e. union image, are positively correlated with voting intention.

Employees exhibiting what many researchers refer to as a "big union image", i.e. union are too strong and interfere with good employer/employee relations, are more likely to display negative voting intent. It may be noted that the items pertaining to union image exhibit a stronger relationship to voting intent than those of union instrumentality. This is the obverse of what was found by both Youngblood and Kochan. In these studies, the beliefs that workers held about unions, that is, how useful unions are in procuring improved wages and working conditions, were more strongly related to voting intentions than were the attitudes workers held about unions, i.e. their power and influence over employers. They have concluded that when faced with the decision to join or vote for a union, the individual is swayed more by perceived benefits occurring to union members than the image of the organization. To put it another way, he/she may not like the image portrayed by a union but becomes a member because of the power it has to improve his/her working conditions. The research cited above used national samples composed of both union and

nonunion members. All individuals responding in this study are nonunion. One assumption to be drawn is that this group may possess less knowledge about union activities than the aforementioned groups and, therefore, may not possess as clear an understanding of union instrumentality. If this is the case, one would assume that their general attitudes toward unions, the concept or image they hold about them play a more crucial role in the formation of their attitudes about voting for a union. Though this conclusion is appealing, the author is aware that it implies a causal relationship that cannot be supported by this analysis.

#### Multivariate Equation

HX: The major predictors of union voting intention are perceived union instrumentality, labor union image, job satisfaction, and grievance procedure satisfaction.

Multiple regression was used to investigate the relationships among the hypothesized independent variables of grievance procedure satisfaction, job and supervisory satisfaction, union image, union instrumentality, and the dependent variable of voting intentions. In addition, the hypothesized regression model was estimated separately for the following subgroups: white versus black workers, male versus female workers, and grievants versus non-grievants. Table 28 presents the results of the regression equations

**TABLE 28**  
**Virginia State Grievance Study**  
**Regression Results for Total Sample and Subgroups with**  
**Voting Intention as the Dependent Variable**

Sample	Union Image	Union Instrumentality	Job Satisfaction	Supervisor Satisfaction	Grievance Procedure Satisfaction	F*	R2	Number
Total Group	.76*	1.10*	-.02	-.01	-.36*	98.33	.53	483
Grievants	.62*	.48*	-.07	-.07	-.20***	21.96	.61	82
Nongrievants	.57*	.62*	-.03	.01	-.40*	82.51	.54	390
White	.61*	.59*	-.01	-.03	-.25*	85.23	.56	372
Black	.41**	.48*	-.07	.13	-.34**	13.55	.49	93
Female	.58*	.51*	.05	.01	-.45*	58.42	.57	225
Male	.58*	.66*	-.06	-.02	-.21**	54.48	.58	221

p<.0001 level\*  
p<.05 level\*\*  
p<.10 level\*\*\*

Figures in table are unstandardized partial regression coefficients.

used to predict voting intent for the entire sample as well as for each sub-group of interest.

Based on the total group regressions, job and supervisory satisfaction do not appear to be significant variables in predicting voting intent. Those variables, which are significant in explaining a large proportion of the variance in the dependent variable, include the measures of union image, union instrumentality, and grievance procedure satisfaction. The independent variables accounted for 53.4 percent of the total variance in the dependent variable. These results provide strong support for the hypothesis that satisfaction with the grievance procedure is a major explaining factor of an individual's intention to vote for or against unionization. When regressions are analysed across the various subgroups of interest the same results are found.

A word of caution is in order. Union image and instrumentality exhibited the highest relationship with each other among the independent variables. Extremely high correlations between independent variables will lead to erroneous coefficients of determination. One method for identifying this problem is to examine the bivariate correlations among the independent variables, looking for coefficients of about .8 or larger. If none is found it may be concluded that multicollinearity is not a problem. Lewis

suggests, however, that a preferred method of assessing multicollinearity is to regress each independent variable on all other independent variables.<sup>81</sup> This method will in fact give a much more precise indication of existing problems. Performing this analysis on union image, instrumentality, and grievance procedure satisfaction produced coefficients of determination of .31, .28, and .19 respectively clearly within the acceptable range, and indicating no problems with multicollinearity.<sup>82</sup>

The regression analysis provides sufficient data for confirming the proposed hypothesis. However, it provides only general insight into the variables influencing the voting intentions of Virginia public employees. Therefore, to provide more information, data from the respondents was grouped according to occupation and Secretariate and additional regression analysis was performed based on these subgroups.

The results shown in Table 29 indicate that, when based on occupational groupings, neither job nor supervisor satisfaction appeared as significant variables in the regression model at the  $p < .05$  level. Union image accounts for a significant proportion of the variance in the dependent variable for all groups with the exception of

-----

81. Michael S. Lewis-Beck, Applied Regression: An Introduction (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1980) p.60.  
82. Lewis-Beck, op.cit. p.61.

**TABLE 29**  
**Virginia State Grievance Study**  
**Regression Results for Total Sample and Subgroups by Occupation**  
**Voting Intention as the Dependent Variable**

Sample	Union Image	Union Instrumentality	Job Satisfaction	Supervisor Satisfaction	Grievance Procedure Satisfaction	F*	R2	Number
Total Group	.76*	1.10*	-.02	-.01	-.36*	98.33	.53	483
Adminstrators	.75**	.52*****	.40	-.29	-.09	6.97	.51	39
Professionals	.70*	.48***	-.07	-.08	-.34***	30.56	.62	108
Clericals	.48***	.52	-.14	.16	-.52***	7.17	.43	64
Supervisors	.29***	.76*	-.06	-.22*****	-.438***	19.05	.66	55
Techicians	.38***	.67*	-.01	.10	-.34**	18.47	.53	96
Protectives	.79*	.35***	.18	-.02	-.46**	22.34	.73	51
Trades	.97**	.47	-.28	-.05	.03	6.27	.62	29
Service	.41	.54***	-.03	-.38	-.14	6.80	.67	31

p<.0001 level\*  
p<.001 level\*\*  
p<.01 level\*\*\*  
p<.05 level\*\*\*\*  
p<.10 level\*\*\*\*\*

Figures in table are unstandardized partial regression coefficients.

service workers. Significant partial regression coefficients for union instrumentality are present for all occupational groups, excepting the skilled trades and clerical workers. When added to the full model, grievance procedure satisfaction is a significant predictor of voting intent for professionals, clerical, supervisors, technicians, and those individuals engaged in the protective services, corrections officers and state troopers (See Table 30).

When respondents were categorized by employing agency, this same pattern held true. For individuals in the Education, Public Safety, and Human Resources Secretariate, grievance procedure satisfaction exhibited significant regression coefficients. Union image and instrumentality were significant variables when regressions were performed on all secretariates, while no significant coefficients were found for job and supervisor satisfaction.

These results give strong support to the hypothesis that grievance satisfaction is a major factor affecting employee intentions about unionization.

The regression equations presented above were used to predict voting intention for the entire sample, as well as for each subgroup based on demographic characteristics, occupation, and employing secretariate. Based on the total sample regressions job and supervisor satisfaction exert no

TABLE 30

Virginia State Grievance Study  
 Regression Results for Total Sample and Subgroups by Secretariate  
 Voting Intention as the Dependent Variable

Sample	Union Image	Union Instrumentality	Job Satisfaction	Supervisor Satisfaction	Grievance Procedure Satisfaction	F*	R2	Number
Total Group	.76*	1.10*	-.02	-.01	-.36*	98.33	.53	483
ESO	.46*	.72*	-.15	.02	-.40*	26.85	.55	114
CRSO	.44*****	.91***	.19	.33	-.60	9.02	.85	13
TSO	.63***	.87***	-.16	-.02	-.33	8.04	.53	42
PSSO	.68*	.48**	.05	-.03	-.26***	34.14	.62	113
HRSO	.67*	.38**	.05	.01	-.37*	40.68	.60	145

p<.0001 level\*  
 p<.001 level\*\*  
 p<.01 level\*\*\*  
 p<.05 level\*\*\*\*  
 p<.10 level\*\*\*\*\*

Figures in table are unstandardized partial regression coefficients.

significant influence for the prediction of intent while union image, union instrumentality, and grievance procedure satisfaction appear relatively important for prediction of intent. In addition, the hypothesized independent variables accounted for 53.4 percent of the total variance in the dependent measure. With relatively few exceptions, this is likewise the case for the subgroups of interest. The results, therefore, lend strong support for the rejection of the null hypothesis. Grievance procedure satisfaction is clearly a major variable when used in conjunction with others studied to date in accounting for a significant proportion of the variance of voting intent.

#### Summary

In this chapter the statistical analysis of the data was presented. Characteristics of the respondent group as a total was presented as well as those of the grievants and non-grievants within this group. Anylsis of the data revealed that the grievance procedure does appear to be a multidimensional construct. Moreover all proposed relationships between the dependent variable voting intent and the independent variables of union image, instrumentality, job satisfaction, and grievance procedure satisfaction as stated in eight hypothesis developed in Chapter III were confirmed.

Further, when multiple regression techniques were used to test the linear relationship of job satisfaction, supervisor satisfaction, grievance procedure satisfaction, union image, and union instrumentality toward voting intention significant variation in the dependent variable was explained. These results confirm the role of grievance procedure satisfaction as a major variable as proposed in the final hypothesis of Chapter III.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to analyze a non-union grievance procedure and its relationship with attitudes employee hold toward their jobs and toward unionization. The analysis had three main focuses. First, an investigation was made into whether there existed underlying dimensions of the grievance procedure. Second, an assessment was made of employee satisfaction with a unique grievance procedure established for their use. Third, the relationship between employee perceptions of grievance procedure satisfaction, job satisfaction, and employee attitudes toward union representation were investigated.

Literature relevant to the main focuses of concern was reviewed to provide a perspective for the research. The conclusion was drawn that in order for a grievance procedure to be judged effective in fulfilling its prescribed goals, the employees needed to judge it to be acceptable for use in resolving their work related problems. The main goals of most such procedures are two-fold; the first being that of either maintaining the organization's present non-union status or stemming the spread of further unionization. This goal appears to be universal for all non-union systems. The second goal is that of providing a reasonable vehicle for

employee due process. Existing research findings suggest that due process provides the basis upon which employees evaluate the acceptability of any given grievance procedure. A grievance procedure has been posited to be multidimensional with five critical elements subsumed under it; Procedural Due Process, Substantive or Content Fairness, Timeliness, Utilization Ease, and Reprisal Protection. As critical as these procedures have been judged to be in the non-union sector by both practitioners and academics alike, surprisingly, no empirical research was found measuring grievance procedure satisfaction. Studies on employee's perceptions of grievance procedure satisfaction are found in the unionized sector, but the structure of these systems as well as their goals are usually different than those in the non-union sector. The study, therefore, was designed to gain some insight into this area.

A number of studies have dealt with the relationship between worker attitudes and unionization. There is general agreement that employee's perceptions of job satisfaction and their beliefs and attitudes toward unions hold the strongest relationships of any variables studied to date with actual voting behavior or intention to vote for or against a union if given the opportunity. Job satisfaction has been analyzed using a global concept, as well as extrinsic and intrinsic job components. Extrinsic job

components include both economic and non-economic rewards directly related to the job. Intrinsic components refer to rewards or satisfiers thought of as specific to the content of the job. In all cases a stronger relationship is found between satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with economic job components, and negative (or positive) voting intention, than with non-economic or intrinsic job components and the same.

Research on workers attitudes have focused on their beliefs about union instrumentality in gaining desired job outcomes and their general attitudes toward unions or union image. The relationship found between these sets of variables and voting intention has been shown to be the strongest among all variables studied to date.

Based on prior research findings, ten hypotheses were constructed to investigate the three major areas of concern. Data used for testing the hypotheses within the study were collected through the use of a self-reported mail questionnaire. Items within this survey came from a variety of sources. All items pertaining to grievance procedure acceptability were devised by the author using present literature as a basis for their construction. Information gained through interviews with a number of individuals knowledgeable about the grievance procedure used in the study, plus archival data and general studies on grievance

procedures was used to create the measures of grievance procedure satisfaction. Previously constructed and tested scales for satisfaction with work components, union attitudes and voting intention were taken from the literature for use in the study. The complete survey was pretested on a group of twenty-five individuals for the purpose of indentifying vague and/or misleading questions. Once refined it was further subjected to a pilot test to identify potential problems with response errors and for preliminary hypothesis testing in the area of grievance procedure acceptability. The final survey instrument was then sent to a sample of 1000 state public employees at their job locations. Since contacts with several large agencies failed to gain any cooperation on their part in obtaining employees' home addresses, sending the surveys to their work addresses was necessary. This sample was selected using a proportionally stratified random selection method based on secretariate and salary range. Surveys were also sent to 1000 employees randomly selected from four occupational groups exhibiting grievance rates higher than that of the overall state population. This was done to insure an adequate representation of employees with grievance experience within the final study group. The final group included 483 respondents, 82 with grievance experience and 390 with no grievance experience.

In order to investigate the dimensionality of the grievance procedure the following hypothesis was proposed;

HI: Grievance procedures are composed of five critical sub-dimensions.

Procedural Due Process, Content Fairness, Timeliness, Utilization Ease, and Reprisal Protection were used as critical dimensions to test this hypothesis. Though the results supported the hypothesis, the proposed factors or dimensions were not those extracted by the factor solution. It appears that when evaluating acceptability, individuals distinguish between Procedural Due Process, Independence from Management Control(Reprisal Protection), Voice, Timeliness, and Utilization Ease. The underlying nature of acceptability identified by factor analysis reflects to a great extent the ideas of writers within the area.

Procedural Due Process within the work place appears to mirror the concept of due process within the judicial system. At the heart of the law of public governance, individuals without question have the right to full use of the system, the right to present evidence in their own defense, and the right to question the evidence and supporting witnesses used against them. These elements also appear to be fundamental to private organizations. When assessing a grievance procedure people look at the rights they have to present evidence and support for their

complaint, be it concerning an action taken by management such as wage or promotion decisions, or in defense of an employee action resulting in discipline. Moreover, subsumed within the dimension is the employee's right to counter or question management actions as well as evidence used by management in support of its actions. The results lend support to the writings of authors, such as Selznick, on the justification for bringing due process to the workplace. In questioning whether this particular principle of public governance can and should be applied to private organizations, he has argued that it should because of an already blurred distinction between public and private law. Furthermore the argument is made that laws of governance should apply to all rule-making authority. The results of this study do indeed suggest that individuals carry the same concept of procedural due process to the workplace that they use within their public judicial system.

The second dimension the grievance procedure found in the analysis draws a close parallel to the concept of substantive due process. Substantive due process was defined earlier as that portion of the judicial system which treats of the rationale or purpose of laws, ensuring that a person's life liberty, or property is not arbitrarily taken away. Within the system of public jurisprudence, the individual accused is afforded the rights to representation

as well as a fair decision by a jury of his/her own peers. There appears to be, however, a further element common to all items subsumed within this dimension. Items loading on this factor suggest that when evaluating a grievance procedure individuals based their decisions in part on the presence or absence of third parties judged to be independent from management control. This dimension was seen as the one most difficult to interpret. While it comes closest to the study's original concept of fairness (Substantive due process), it likewise included items which were originally constructed to assess another hypothesized dimension, Reprisal Protection. It suggests, therefore, that while individuals quite readily distinguish between parties or processes that are independent of management control, that independence is indeed strongly linked to protection against management reprisal. This may not be surprising. One conclusion that can be made is that reprisal protection is indeed the critical dimension operating and outside parties, be they protective agencies, outside advocates, or final decision makers, are the agents providing protection. Another conclusion may be that fairness is the dimension of concern and that "outside parties" are intuitively seen as fair parties. In grievance procedures, the concept of fairness is most often associated within impartial and unbiased grievance resolution, i.e.

decisions made by parties outside the control of either party.

A third dimension extracted from the factor solution was comprised of four items pertaining to the ability of the employee to provide input into the grievance procedure in terms of how the procedure is set up, in the selection of issues grievable through the system as well as the final decision maker. It has been labeled Voice, based on its definition: the right to express one's wish, choice, or opinion, or to make that wish, choice or opinion prevail. The analysis suggest that individuals do react in a common way to the level of input the group may have into setting up and administering complaint procedure. Depending on how important the ability to influence such a system is to the employee, the presence or absence of this right may affect the overall satisfaction with the procedure. It was originally assumed that the item dealing with employee selection of the final adjudicator would load jointly with that dealing with the adjudicator's independence. This was not the case. The conclusion reached in this study is that the selection process and the nature of the final decision maker are distinctly separate concepts. Individuals who place great importance on decision maker neutrality may not place the same importance on their rights to select the decision maker. The reverse may also be the case. In

general, this factor excludes the concept of fairness with respect to procedure format and process, but focuses on the employee's right to make input into format and process.

The results of the study show that individuals make a judgement as to the importance of communication and facilitation in use of a grievance procedure and do so independently of other dimensions. The amount of training on the procedure or the presence of an employee representative whose function is to provide assistance to the employee in filling out grievance forms may or may not be important elements. However, three items dealing with utilization ease load on the common factor suggesting that where training is important, the employee representative will likewise be seen as an important element to the grievance procedure. This result was not unexpected. What is interesting is the apparent discrimination individuals place on the functions of an employee representative. Two items pertained to such a party, who may be most easily compared to the shop steward in the unionized setting. Respondents to the survey were asked to indicate the relative importance they placed on the representative's role as (1) an employee "advocate" and as (2) an employee "facilitator", that is a party whose function it was to assist the individuals and/or provide information on how the procedure worked. Respondents were able to discern between

these two functions. That is, individuals who placed relatively high importance on outside adjudication and protection were likely to place equally high importance on the advocacy function. The facilitating function was more closely associated with training in procedural usage.

The final dimension extracted from the data was Timeliness. Set time limits for employer responses to grievances, time limits between first filing complaints and receiving a final decision, and prompt resolution of the grievance composed the dimension of Timeliness.

In summary, a number of conclusions may be drawn. Grievance procedure acceptability does appear to be a multidimensional construct including but not necessarily confined to the five elements mentioned above. When making subjective assessments about such procedures individuals distinguish among major critical components. The most important of these appear to be Procedural Due Process while the least important is Utilization Ease. Though statistically significant, this difference does not appear to have practical importance. Respondents indicated that Procedural Due Process is extremely important to an acceptable complaint procedure. Utilization Ease was perceived as being highly important with the remaining three dimensions being placed between these two. Therefore, the conclusion to be drawn is that all five are seen by the

group as important to their concept of acceptability and are not substitutes for one another.

In order to examine grievance procedure satisfaction and its relationship to voting intention, a set of five hypotheses was tested, using Person product moment correlations as the test statistic.

HII: Employee satisfaction with the grievance procedure is negatively correlated with their intentions to vote for a union.

HIII: Employee perceptions of grievance procedure fairness are negatively correlated with voting intentions.

HIV: Employee perceptions of grievance procedure timeliness are negatively correlated with voting intentions.

HV: Employee perceptions of the ease of utilization of the grievance procedure are negatively correlated with voting intentions.

HVI: Employee perceptions of management reprisal for use of the grievance procedure is positively correlated with voting intentions.

All relationships as proposed in the hypotheses proved significant. That is, favorable attitudes toward union voting intention were found to be significantly related to general dissatisfaction with the grievance procedure as well as dissatisfaction with selected subdimensions of the

procedure. This relationship was found to be the strongest between the general grievance procedure satisfaction variable and voting intention ( $r = -.401$ ). When responses for individual items, constructed to measure satisfaction for four components of the grievance procedure, were used, the correlations between these items and voting intention did not exhibit relationships as strong as that for general satisfaction. The results suggest the following conclusions: Though no causal inference can be made, those individuals expressing general dissatisfaction with the grievance procedure are more likely to express a much more favorable attitude toward voting for unionization, if the opportunity were available to them. This relationship appears to be the strongest when perceptions of management reprisal for procedural usage are present, followed by the perception that, in general, the procedure is not considered fair with respect to management responses to complaint and the nature of the final decision maker. The dimension of timeliness appears to have the weakest relationship to voting intent of those studied.

Four additional hypotheses tested were constructed to investigate the relationships between job satisfaction, union image and instrumentality, and employee attitudes toward union representation. The first three of these hypotheses were designed to investigate the individual relationships.

HVII: Employee perceptions of job satisfaction are negatively correlated with voting intention.

HVIII: Employee perceptions of union instrumentality are positively correlated with voting intention.

HIX: Employee beliefs about of unions, i.e. union image, are positively correlated with voting intention.

In all three cases, the null hypothesis, indicating no significant relationship, was rejected. The results support the following conclusions: Individuals exhibiting general dissatisfaction with their job as well as dissatisfaction with their immediate supervisor are more likely to possess favorable attitudes toward voting for unionization in an election. This is the general conclusion of the literature done to date in this area. Similarly, those individuals who express satisfaction with their jobs and their supervisor are more likely to exhibit negative voting intention. The relationship between voting intention and union attitudes, however, was the strongest found within the study. Again this results confirm those found earlier within the literature and was not surprising. Individuals who possess positive attitudes concerning union, such as the perception that they are not overly strong are likely to express positive voting intentions. The same positive voting

intentions are exhibited by those individuals who feel unions are instrumental in attaining for their union members better wages and working conditions.

The final hypothesis incorporated the variable grievance procedure satisfaction into a model used in several previous studies to date to predict voting intent.

HX: The major predictors of union voting intentions are perceived union instrumentality, labor union image, job satisfaction, and grievance procedure satisfaction.

Data from this study only partially reject the null hypothesis. While researchers have found that job satisfaction in general and satisfaction with the immediate supervisor accounted for a significant portion of the variance of voting intent, these findings were not confirmed in this study. In only two subgroups was this relationship found to exist. When regressions were performed on individuals subdivided by race and occupation, job satisfaction was found to be an important determinant in voting intention for blacks, and supervisor satisfaction for those individuals working in the protective service area as a corrections officer. Union image and instrumentality were found to be significant independent variables in predicting union vote for the total study as well as for all demographic subgroups when based on sex, race, and prior

grievance experience. When broken down by occupation, union image appears to be a significant predictor for all groups excluding service workers. Union instrumentality is significant for all groups excluding clerical and skill trade employees. These findings were surprising. Earlier studies have shown that the relationship between union attitudes and voting intention are as strong in the traditional blue collar occupations as of those of white collar workers. Therefore, significant correlations would be expected in these three job categories. It should be noted, however, that in all cases either union image or union instrumentality show a significant relationship with voting intention.

Finally, when added to the regression equation, grievance procedure satisfaction was shown to be a significant predictor of voting intent for the total group as well as for all major demographic subgroups. It failed to account for a significant portion of the variance for those individuals in administration, skilled trades, or service workers or for those individuals working in the transportation secretariate. It should be noted that respondents within the transportation secretariate included a relatively large number of individuals working as skilled tradesmen, i.e. heavy machine operators. This is the occupational group which earlier showed insignificant results for instrumentality.

### Implications

At the outset of the study, the assumption was made that grievance procedures are normally established in the non-union setting for two fundamental purposes. The first is to maintain the organization's non-union status, or to prevent further unionization. Practitioners generally agree that, by far, this is the most important goal. The second is the provision of an acceptable vehicle of due process, that is, a procedure viewed by employees as one that will indeed function to resolve grievances in a fair and equitable manner. The implications presented below are considered to be important to any non-union organization presently having a grievance procedure or contemplating the establishment of one, regardless of whether both goals are encompassed in the basic philosophy of the organization.

Grievance procedure acceptability appears to be a fairly well defined notion in the minds of employees today. This may be due to their knowledge of typical unionized procedures, but more likely comes from a basic understanding of the public judicial system and the rights afforded individuals under that system. Therefore, establishing a procedure without the fundamental elements cited most often in the growing body of literature on non-union procedures, and now verified in this study, may in fact do more harm than good to the employee/employer relationship.

Moreover, it appears that a procedure that encompasses the critical dimensions of acceptability will act to curb the authority of management. The findings suggest that employees expressing dissatisfaction with grievance procedure fairness, including the neutrality of the final decision maker, are more likely to express pro-union attitudes than those satisfied with the process. The very nature of fairness restricts management's unilateral decision making authority, most notably in the area of termination at will. Therefore, organizations not willing to give up what has historically been considered core elements of management authority may be wiser to establish very informal "open-door" systems than embark on formalized procedure that exclude one or more critical elements.

For those organizations willing to develop such formalized procedures, the evidence indeed suggests that, where employees perceive them as being fair, relatively easily understood and where the employee does not feel threatened for using them, there is less likelihood of unionization. Moreover this aspect of the job, due process, appears to play a greater role in unionization than do other work related aspects studied to date.

It is unlikely that the establishment of a grievance procedure, even if it appears to be fair and equitable, can by itself stem the tide of unionization once started. A

large proportion of what have been seen as successful union campaigns, i.e. those in which union organizing drives have been defeated, have included the establishment of formalized grievance procedures. However, such procedures are not considered sufficient in and of themselves to maintain non-union status. Their presence appears to affect the employee's perception of union instrumentality by providing a system of due process. Such a system, shown to be highly important to the employee, is an inevitable "byproduct" of unionization.

In establishing such a procedure, should an organization provide access to its use to all employee groups? Within the public sector, studies have shown that such procedures often exempt judiciary, legislative, probationary, appointee, and senior management employees from its use. Low response precluded an investigation of grievance procedure satisfaction and unionization among employees of the executive, legislative, and judicial branch. However, there appears to be no significant relationship between these two variables for administrators, i.e. senior management. Taking this into account, if the goal of the procedure is to maintain non-union status (not primarily to provide due process for all employees) exempting these employees from access appears to be reasonable. However, prohibiting such employees as service

workers and skilled trades from grievance procedure usage, based purely on the results of this study, does not appear to be a rational strategy.

This study's findings have implications for academic researchers interested in the area of employee attitudes and unionization. First, job satisfaction, when tested with a sample of public sector employees, failed to act as a significant predictor of voting intention. These results appear further to muddy the waters on the relationship between the two variables. Job satisfaction in the past has had a mixed record in terms of its ability to predict unionization. The relatively weak correlations found in this study, together with the regression results, do not confirm or deny its importance as a variable in the study of unionization. Secondly, and more importantly, the study adds information concerning the the nature of grievance procedure satisfaction and its relationship to unionization in the non-union setting. Further endeavors in this area will be strenghtened significantly by including this variable. The site of this study afforded a unique opportunity to investigate this variable. It appears to be one of the few large non-union organizations with a grievance procedure modeled closest after those found in the unionized sector. Though the conclusions drawn were favorable, i.e., Virginia state public employees are

generally satisfied with their established grievance procedure, access was not gained to the employees through the cooperation of the organization. The state system is probably no different than any other non-union organization. That is, the unspoken, but not uncommunicated philosophy exists that, if non-union employees are questioned about their attitudes toward unionization, this very act may indeed spark a unionization drive. Therefore, though researchers should consider further work in the area of non-union grievance procedures, access to a site for this research may be difficult to find.

This study has importance to labor organizations, particularly those interested in the public sector employee. The results of this study show that within the population, employees possess positive attitudes toward unions including that of pro-union voting intention. Though not surprising, it confirms the general assumption held today that public sector employees may indeed be just as likely to unionize if given the opportunity as their fellow workers in the private sector. Moreover, and of more concern to unions, the study shows that non-union organizations are able to establish grievance procedures, which culminate in a final decision by an entity that, though not an outside party per se is seen as fair and equitable by employees who use it. When such procedures are seen as acceptable by employees, there is less likelihood for unionization.

What are the implications of this study for the specific organization studied? It has been shown that the grievance procedure set up within the organization is judged by a majority of those employees responding to the survey to be satisfactory for their use. This respondent group has been determined to be representative of the state employees as a whole. However, the results of this study likewise show that a majority of these respondents, though only a slight majority, indicated some level of agreement with the statement that they would vote for representation by a public sector union if given the opportunity to do so. Taking these results into account it appears that even though these state employees exhibited general satisfaction with their jobs and working conditions, the possibility of a successful unionization attempt is very real. If this is the case why have these employees failed to become members of a public sector union? The logical conclusion is that unionization attempts have not been made and moreover probably would not be successful because of the current policies within the Commonwealth of Virginia prohibiting public sector union from engaging in collective bargaining. This function is by far the most important for present day labor organizations. If due process is provided by a non-union grievance procedure, and collective bargaining rights for labor organization are proscribed, the impetus for unionization is virtually eliminated.

### Future Research

The results of this research suggests further studies in this area. This may be difficult to accomplish because of the lack of access to groups of non-union workers. Nevertheless the following areas for further research are suggested:

Because the acceptability dimensions extracted from the factor analysis were not those originally proposed, subsequent questions in the survey dealing with grievance procedure satisfaction were not sufficiently complete to accurately assess employees' satisfaction with all critical dimensions. Therefore, a similar study including more complete scales designed to measure procedural due process, independence from management control, voice, timeliness, and utilization ease is called for.

As mentioned earlier, the study was done in the public sector and may not be generalizable to other groups when assessing satisfaction with a specific grievance procedure. However, this is not felt to be the case with grievance procedure acceptability. At this time, there is no reason to believe that the employees surveyed in this study have a different concept of the critical elements of grievance procedure acceptability than any other group of private or public sector employees. However, a replication of this

study in the private sector would provide useful data for confirming this assumption.

Because of the diverse nature of non-union grievance procedures, similar research is suggested in other non-union organizations, particularly in those whose procedures that culminate in final decision making by the chief executive officer or Personnel Director instead of an outside or neutral third party.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aram, J.D. and P.F. Salipante. "An Evaluation of Organizational Due Process in the Resolution of Employee/Employer Conflict." Academy of Management Review 6(1981): pp.197-204.
- Babbie, E.R. Survey Research Methods CA.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1973.
- Berenbeim, R. Nonunion Complaint Systems: A Corporate Appraisal. Conference Board Report 770, New York: The Conference Board, 1980.
- Brett, J.M. and T.H. Hammer. "Organizational Behavior and Industrial Relations." In Industrial Relations Research in the 1970's. Madison:IRRA, 1982, pp.221-81.
- Brief, A.P. and D.E. Rude. "Voting in Union Certification Elections: A Conceptual Analysis." Academy of Management Review 6 (1981): pp.261-67.
- Commonwealth of Virginia v. County Board of Arlington County 232S.E. 2d 30.
- Commonwealth of Virginia, Department of Personnel and Training The Grievance Procedure for State Employees Richmond:Office of Communications, Department of Personnel and Training, 1983.
- Cronbach, L.J. "Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests." Psychometrika 16(1951): pp. 297-334.
- DeCotiis, T.A. and J.Y. LeLouarn. "A Predictive Study of Voting Behavior in a Representative Election using Union Instrumentality and Work Perceptions." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 27 (1981): pp.103-18.
- Drought, N.E. "Grievance in the Non-Union Situation." Personnel Journal (1967): pp.331-36.
- Epstein, R.L. "The Grievance Procedure in the Non-Union Setting: Caveat Employer." Employee Relations Law Journal 1 (1975): pp.120-27.
- Farber, H.S., and D.H. Saks. "Why Workers Want Unions: The Role of Relative Wages and Job Characteristics." Journal of Political Economy 88 (April 1980): pp.349-69.

Feuille, P., and J. Blandin. "Faculty Job Satisfaction and Bargaining Sentiments: A Case Study." Academy of Management Journal 17 (1974): pp.678-92.

Fishbein, M., and I. Ajzen. Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1975.

Flango, V.E. "Faculty Attitudes and the Election of a Bargaining Agent in the Pennsylvania State College System." Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector 4:2 (1975): pp.157-74.

Getman, J.G., S.B. Goldberg, and J.B. Herman. Union Representation Elections: Law and Reality. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L. and B.J. Grabrowsky. Multivariate Data Analysis Oklahoma: Petroleum Publishing Co., 1979.

Hammer, T.H. and M. Berman. "The Role of Noneconomic Factors in Faculty Union Voting." Journal of Applied Psychology 66 (1981): pp.415-21.

Hamner, W.C., and F.J. Smith. "Work Attitudes as Predictors of Unionization Activity." Journal of Applied Psychology 63 (1978): pp.415-21.

Herman, J.B. "Are Situational Contingencies Limiting Job Attitude-Job Performance Relationship?" Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 10 (1973): pp.208-24.

Hills, F.S. "The Relevant Other in Pay Comparisions." Industrial Relations 19 (1980): pp.345-351.

Joint Senate and House General Laws Committee Study on Grievance Procedures, the Report to the General Assembly of Virginia, Senate Document No. 23 Richmond: Commonwealth of Virginia, Department of Purchases and supplies, 1978.

Kochan, T.A. "How American Workers View Labor Unions." Monthly Labor Review 102 (April 1979): pp.23-31.

Kochan, T.A. Collective Bargaining and Industrial Relations, from Theory to Policy and Practice Homewood:Irwin, 1980.

LeLouarn, J.Y. "Predicting Union Vote from Worker Attitudes and Perceptions." Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association, 1979 Madison, Wis.:IRRA, 1980, pp.72-82.

- Locke, E.A. "Toward a Theory of Task Motivation and Incentives" Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 3 (1968) pp. 157-189.
- Martin, J.E. "State Employee Affiliation and Attitude Differences." Journal of Applied Psychology 63 (1978): pp.654-57.
- Michael, S.R. "Due Process in Non-Union Grievance Systems." Employee Relations Law Journal 3 (1978): pp.516-27.
- Miller, R.L. "Grievance Procedures for Nonunion Employees." Public Personnel Management (1978): pp. 302-311.
- Mobly, W.H. "Intermediate Linkages in the Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Employee Turnover" Journal of Applied Psychology 62 (1977) pp. 237-240.
- Newman, J.E. "Predicting Absenteeism and Turnover: A Field Comparison of Fishbein's Model and Traditional Job Attitude Measures." Journal of Applied Psychology 59 (1974): pp.610-15.
- Nunnally, J.C. Psychometric Theory New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.
- Opinions of the Attorney General and Report to the Governor of Virginia: From July 1, 1969 to June 30, 1970. Richmond: Office of Communications, Department of Personnel and Training, 1983.
- Quinn, C., Hill, T., and J.L. Nichols Maintaining Nonunion Status Boston: CBI Publishing Co., Inc., 1982.
- Schriesheim, C.A. "Job Satisfaction, Attitudes Toward Unions and Voting in a Union Representation Election." Journal of Applied Psychology 63 (1978): pp.548-52.
- Selznick, P. Law, Society, and Industrial Justice New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.
- Stieber, J. "The Case for Protection of Unorganized Employees Against Unjust Discharge." Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association, 1979. Madison, Wis.: IRRA, 1980. pp.155-63.
- Strauss, G. Managerial Practices. In J.R. Hackman and J.L. Suttle (Eds.), Improving Life at Work: Behavioral Science Approaches to Organizational Change Santa Monica, Calif.: Goodyear Publishing, 1977.

Thomson, A.W.J., and V.V. Murray. Grievance Procedures Westmead, England: Saxon House, 1976.

Virginia Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Report to the Governor: Employment Trend and Complaints of Discrimination Richmond: Virginia Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1984.

Walker, J.M., and J.J. Lawler. "Dual Unions and Political Processes in Organization." Industrial Relations 18 (1979): pp.32-43.

Warren W.H. "Ombudsman, Plus Arbitration: A Proposal for Effective Greivance Administration." Labor Law Journal (1978): pp.562-69.

Weiss, D.J., Dawis, R.V., England, G.W., and L.H. Lofquist. Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation 22. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center, 1967.

White, R.N. "State Grievance and Appeals Systems: A Survey." Public Personnel Management Journal (1981): pp.313-23.

Yenney, S.L. "In Defense of the Grievance Procedure in a Non-Union Setting." Employee Relations Law Journal 2 (1977): pp.434-43.

Youngblood, S.A., DeNisi, A.S., and W.H. Mobley. "Attitudes, Perceptions, and Intentions to Vote in a Union Certification Election: An Empirical Investigation." Proceedings of the 34th Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association, 1981. Madison, Wis.: IRRA, 1982, pp.244-53.

## APPENDIX A

# The Grievance Procedure for State Employees

---



Commonwealth of Virginia  
Department of Personnel  
and Training

*An Equal Opportunity Employer*

## THE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

### AUTHORIZATION

The 1978 General Assembly, in keeping with effective employee relations management, passed legislation to insure that employees of the Commonwealth would have an effective procedure by which various grievances could be fairly and objectively reviewed. In its 1979 Session, the General Assembly passed amendments to the law which emphasize "problem-solving" in dealing with employee concerns.

The Governor of Virginia in approving the legislation has further mandated that this procedure be used in an atmosphere where "resolution" becomes the measure of its effectiveness and that such resolution will reflect the balanced best interests of the grievant, responsible management and the citizens of the Commonwealth. The legislation authorizes an "open-door" concept in which employees are encouraged to freely discuss their concerns with immediate supervisors and upper-management levels.

The Office of Employees Relations Counselors was established to assist employees with the use of the procedure when requested by employees. Additionally, the office interprets the grievance procedure, rules on grievability at the management steps and directs full compliance with the grievance procedure as it relates to State employees.

### COVERAGE OF PERSONNEL

#### Included:

- all permanent non-probationary classified State employees subject to the provisions of the State Personnel Act, except that managerial employees engaged in agency-wide policy determinations and directors of major State facilities or geographic units, as determined by the Office of Employee Relations Counselors, may grieve dismissals only
- employees of local welfare departments and local welfare boards, except where the locality has

elected to include them in the local governing body's grievance procedure

- employees of constitutional officers employing 15 or more persons, except where the locality has elected to include them in the local governing body's grievance procedure (15 or more persons is defined to consist of appointees and deputies as well as employees)

**Excluded:**

- probationary employees
- appointees of elected groups or individuals
- agency heads
- chief executive officers of government operations and institutions of higher education appointed by boards and commissions
- law-enforcement officers electing to pursue a grievance under Chapter 10.1 of Title 2.1
- employees of State-supported institutions of higher education and community college systems other than classified employees
- employees of judicial and legislative agencies
- former employees, except where the employee is grieving a removal for disciplinary purposes, provided the grievance is filed within 60 days of the date of removal. Grievances initiated prior to a termination may continue to be processed through the grievance procedure

**DEFINITION OF GRIEVANCE**

A grievance shall be a complaint or dispute of an employee relating to employment, including but not necessarily limited to:

- disciplinary actions, including dismissals, demotions and suspensions
- the proper application of personnel policies, procedures, rules, regulations, ordinances and statutes
- acts of reprisal as a result of utilization of the grievance procedure
- complaints of discrimination on the basis of

race, color, creed, political affiliation, age, handicap, national origin or sex

Management reserves the exclusive right to manage the affairs and operations of State government. Accordingly, the following complaints are not grievable under this procedure:

- establishment and revision of wages or salaries, position classifications or general benefits
- work activity accepted by the employee as a condition of employment or work activity which may reasonably be expected to be a part of the job content (The measurement and assessment of work activity through a performance evaluation shall not be grievable except where the employee can show that the evaluation was arbitrary or capricious).
- the contents of personnel policies, procedures, rules, regulations, ordinances and statutes
- failure to be promoted (except where the employee can show established promotional policies or procedures were not followed or applied fairly)
- the methods, means and personnel by which such work activities are to be carried on
- termination, lay-off, demotion or suspension from duties because of lack of work, reduction in the work force or job abolition
- the hiring, transfer, assignment and retention of employees within the agency (provided such actions do not constitute disciplinary actions)
- the relief of employees from duties of the agency in emergencies

**PROCEDURE**

Most employee concerns or complaints can be resolved informally through communication between employee and supervisor. Accordingly, employees are encouraged to take their complaints to their immediate supervisor and then to upper-management levels to seek a solution. Employees are also encouraged to pursue grievable issues through the grievance procedure and supervisors are to assist them in this process.

## Management Steps

### First Step:

1. The employee shall identify the grievance verbally to the immediate supervisor in an informal meeting within 60 calendar days after the event or action which is the basis for the grievance.
2. The supervisor shall give a verbal response to the employee within three (3) work days following the meeting.
3. If a resolution is not reached at this point, the employee shall submit to the supervisor on Form A the nature of the grievance and the specific relief requested within three (3) work days.
4. The supervisor, in turn, shall give the employee a written response on Form A within three (3) work days.

### Second Step:

1. If the first-step written response is not accepted, the employee should indicate on Form A the desire to have the grievance advanced to the next step. The grievance must be submitted to the next direct level of management within ten (10) work days following receipt of the supervisor's reply.
2. Upon receipt of Form A, the second-step manager shall meet with the employee within three (3) work days. The only persons present at this meeting are the employee, the second-step manager and appropriate witnesses.
3. The manager shall give the employee a second-step response in writing on Form A within three (3) work days.

### Third Step:

1. If the second-step written response is not accepted, the employee should check on Form A the desire to advance the grievance to the third step. The employee is allowed ten (10) work days to forward the grievance to the agency head or chief executive in the facility or geographic unit, whichever is lower (i.e., highway district, community

college, mental health facility), in which the grievant is employed.

2. Upon receipt of Form A, the third-step manager shall meet with the employee within three (3) work days. The persons present at this meeting are the employee, and at the employee's option a representative of his or her choice, the third-step manager and appropriate witnesses.
3. The third-step manager shall give the employee a third-step response in writing on Form A within three (3) work days following the meeting.

### Determining Issues Qualifying for the Management Steps

If, during the course of the grievance procedure, a question arises as to whether a given issue is or is not grievable, the Office of Employee Relations Counselors is empowered to render a decision. If the office finds that the issue is grievable, then the grievance may be pursued through the three management steps. However, if the office finds that the issue is not grievable, the employee may request on Form A an immediate determination by the agency head as to whether the issue qualifies for a panel hearing. If the issue so qualifies, it shall be returned to the appropriate management step. If the issue does not so qualify, the employee may appeal to the Circuit Court.

### Panel Hearing

#### Determining Issues Qualifying for a Panel Hearing

If the employee wishes to advance the grievance to a panel hearing, the employee must so note on Form A and forward Form A to the agency head within ten (10) work days of receipt of the third-step reply, whereupon the agency head, in turn, will rule on whether or not the grievance qualifies for panel hearing within ten (10) work days.

A prior ruling by the Office of Employee Relations Counselors on the issue of grievability is not binding on the agency head's decision as to whether the issue qualifies for a panel hearing. However,

if the agency head rules that an issue does not qualify for a panel hearing, the employee may appeal to the Circuit Court for a final decision. Such appeals shall be to the Circuit Court having jurisdiction in the locality in which the grievant is employed for a hearing on the issues of whether the grievance qualifies for a panel hearing. An appeal can be made by filing a notice of appeal (Grievance Form A) with the agency head within ten (10) work days after the date of the decision. Within ten (10) work days thereafter, the agency head shall transmit to the clerk of the court: a copy of the decision of the agency head, the notice of appeal and any exhibits. A list of evidence furnished to the court shall also be furnished the grievant. The court may affirm the decision of the agency head or may reverse or modify the decision. If an issue is determined to qualify for a panel hearing by the agency head or Circuit Court, the following procedure shall apply:

#### **Panel Hearing Procedure**

##### **1. Panel Members**

A panel shall consist of three members: one member appointed by the grievant, one member appointed by the agency and a third member selected by the other two members. To insure an impartial panel, such panel shall not be composed of any persons having direct involvement with the grievance being heard, such as the grievant, supervisor replying at the three management steps, representatives of the grievant at the third step and witnesses who have appeared at the first three steps. Panels chosen in compliance with these requirements shall be deemed to be impartial.

##### **2. Panel Selection**

The employee and the agency shall select their respective panel members within three (3) work days following the receipt of the decision that the grievance qualified for a panel hearing. The full panel selection shall be completed within ten (10)

work days. However, this time limit may be extended in instances where the agreement on a third panel member has not been reached. In such instances, the agency shall within five (5) work days request the chief judge of the Circuit Court to select a third panel member.

##### **3. Panel Hearing Date**

The full panel will set the date, the time and place for the hearing, which shall be held within ten (10) work days following the selection of the full panel. The panel chairperson shall immediately notify the grievant and management of the hearing date.

##### **4. Case Presentation**

The grievant and management may be represented by legal counsel, or other representatives of their choice, at the panel hearing. Such representatives may examine, cross-examine, question or present evidence in behalf of the grievant or management before the panel. (Detailed rules for the conduct of panel hearings are included in Appendix I.)

##### **5. Panel Decision**

The panel shall render its decision on Form B and distribute copies to the employee, agency head and Director of the Department of Personnel and Training within fifteen (15) work days of the conclusion of the hearing. The reasons for the panel's decision should be noted on Form B. The majority decision of the panel shall be final and binding and shall be consistent with provisions of law and written policy. The agency head is responsible for assuring that panel decisions are implemented.

#### **GENERAL PROVISIONS**

##### **1. Procedural Compliance**

Face-to-face meetings are required between the employee and the supervisor or managers in the meetings specified in the above procedure.

It is important that both the employee filing the grievance and the agency observe all the procedural requirements set forth above. Failure by the grievant, without just cause, to comply with all substantial procedural requirements set forth above will terminate the employee's right to further appeal. Failure of the agency, without just cause, to comply with all substantial procedural requirements will, at the option of the grievant, advance the grievance to the next step of the procedure. Such agency failure to comply with the substantial procedural requirements at the panel hearing step of the procedure will result in a decision in favor of the grievant, provided such decision is consistent with law and written policy.

Matters relating to procedural compliance should be referred to the Office of Employee Relations Counselors.

## **2. Extension of the Time Periods**

The time periods outlined above constitute substantial procedural requirements. However, such time periods may be extended by mutual agreement between the grievant and the appropriate agency supervisor or manager to whom the time period is applicable. The panel chairman may, with just cause, extend the time periods applicable to the panel.

## **3. Costs**

The agency is responsible for court costs of appeals to the Circuit Court for determination on whether an issue qualifies for a panel hearing. The grievant is responsible for the cost of legal counsel or other representation in the preparation or presentation of the employee's case in all or in any part of the proceedings.

## **4. Termination of Employment**

Grievances initiated prior to a termination of State employment may, at the employee's option, continue to be processed through the grievance procedure. Former employees may not have access to

the State grievance procedure, except where the employees are grieving removals for disciplinary purposes, provided such grievances are filed within 60 days of the removal dates.

## **5. Standards of Conduct Policy**

The employee Standards of Conduct Policy as approved by the Department of Personnel and Training with respect to the various agencies constitutes the written policy governing all disciplinary actions.

## **6. Authority**

This State grievance procedure is effective July 1, 1979 and supercedes the grievance procedure issued by the Department effective July 1, 1978. Statutory authority: Section 2.1—114.5:1 Code of Virginia.

## **APPENDIX I: RULES FOR THE CONDUCT OF PANEL HEARINGS**

These procedures are to assist grievance panels in preparing for and conducting panel hearings.

Prior to the convening of a panel hearing, each panel member should carefully review the grievance and become acquainted with the issues to be addressed. Panel hearings are not meant to be conducted as full court proceedings and panels shall not be bound by the technical rules of evidence. Panels, however, should take into account all reliable and substantial evidence produced at the hearing.

A panel's responsibility is to insure the proper application of State and agency policies and procedures. Panels do not have the authority to formulate or to change policies or procedures. Nor do they have the authority to consider matters which the grievance procedure makes nongrievable. A panel by a majority vote may uphold or reverse

the action of the agency or, in appropriate circumstances, may choose a modified remedy. Panel decisions, however, must be consistent with provisions of law and written policies. While in appropriate cases a panel might determine that a grievant is entitled to reinstatement, from which back pay and a restoration of benefits might flow, in no case does a panel have authority to award damages or attorney fees.

The conduct of panel hearings shall be as follows:

1. The panel shall determine the propriety of attendance at the hearing of persons not having a direct interest in the hearing.
2. At the option of each party, opening statements may be made at the beginning of the hearing and the panel may ask for such statements in order to clarify the issues involved in the grievance.
3. The agency and thereafter the grievant, or their representatives, shall then present their claims, proofs and witnesses who shall submit to questions or other examination. The panel may, at its discretion, vary this procedure but shall afford full and equal opportunity to all parties for presentation of any material or relevant evidence and shall afford the parties the right of cross-examination.
4. The panel by majority vote may decide procedural questions and rule upon objections raised during the course of the hearing.
5. Witnesses other than the parties should remain in the hearing room only while giving their testimony.
6. Members of the panel may question anyone giving testimony in order to clarify points being made.
7. Exhibits offered by the grievant or the agency may be received in evidence by the panel and, when so received, shall be marked and made a part of the record.

8. The parties shall produce such additional evidence as the panel may deem necessary to an understanding and determination of the dispute. The panel shall be judge of the relevancy and materiality of the evidence offered. Evidence is to be taken in the presence of the panel and both parties.

9. After each side has had the opportunity to present its evidence, the panel chairperson shall specifically inquire of all parties whether they have any further proofs to offer or witnesses to be heard. Upon receiving negative replies, both parties shall be given the opportunity to make closing statements summarizing their positions, following which the hearing should be declared closed.

10. The hearings shall be reopened at any time before the actual implementation of the panel's decision:

- Upon a majority vote of the panel on its own motion.
- Upon a majority vote of the panel on the application of a party for good cause shown.
- Upon direction from the State Director of Personnel that a panel's decision appears to be inconsistent with law or written policy.

The panel shall render its decision within fifteen (15) work days of the conclusion of the hearing. The facts found and the reasons for the panel's decision must be set forth on Form B.

#### **NOTE**

It is the responsibility of the full panel to select the chairman.

#### **FORMS**

Grievance forms may be obtained from the agency or the Office of Employee Relations Counselors.

## APPENDIX B

INTERVIEWS<sup>1</sup>

Wayne F. Anderson  
Secretary of Administration and Finance  
Commonwealth of Virginia

James L. Bozarth  
Administrative Services Director for Operations  
Virginia Department of Mental Health and  
Mental Retardation

Henry P. Broughton  
Employee Relations Manager  
Virginia Department of Corrections

Deborah L. Bryant  
Employee Relations Manager  
Virginia Department of Mental Health and  
Mental Retardation

Albin T. Butt  
Employee Relations Director  
Virginia Tech

Randy E. Campbell  
Personnel Division - Virginia Department of  
Highways and Transportation

John Garrison  
Employee Relations Manager  
Virginia Tech

Carolyn O. Marsh  
Director of the Office of Employee  
Relations Counselors

Elliot S. Schewel  
Virginia State Senator and former Chairman,  
Joint Subcommittee to Study Grievance Procedures

Betty A. Tulloh  
Employee Relations Manager  
Virginia Employment Commission

-----

1. The positions appearing below denote those held by individuals at the time this study was carried out.

APPENDIX C

Last week, a questionnaire was mailed to you seeking information about the elements people feel are important to a good complaint procedure. We asked your help in filling it out, and returning it to our staff at Virginia Tech.

If you have already completed and returned it to us, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, your prompt response will be very much appreciated. It is important that your questionnaire be included in the study if the results are to be truly representative.

If by some chance you do not have the questionnaire, please call me immediately, collect (703-961-6585) or send me a note. I will mail another one to you.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Murmann  
College of Business  
207 Pamplin Hall  
Virginia Tech  
Blacksburg, VA 24060



VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

*Blacksburg, Virginia 24061*

College of Business  
Industrial Relations Center

Dear State Employee,

How important is an employee grievance procedure? What is a good procedure? What rights should an employee have when filing a complaint about his or her job situation? These are a few of the basic questions under study in a Virginia Tech analysis of employee complaint procedures. At this point in our project we need your help! We ask that you take 15 minutes to fill out and return the enclosed questionnaire.

You were selected to receive this questionnaire as part of a representative group of Virginia State employees. Your response to the questionnaire will be entirely confidential. No persons other than the undersigned will have access to your completed questionnaire. No questionnaire will be studied individually; all will be combined for analysis.

Your cooperation in completing this questionnaire and returning it in the enclosed, post-paid envelope will be greatly appreciated.

with many thanks,

Suzanne K. Murrmann  
Research Associate

Jerald F. Robinson  
Professor

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY



An acceptable complaint procedure is one that is considered by an employee to be a good method for solving problems that arise on the job. An employee may have a complaint about many actions or decisions made by management including such things as pay, discipline, promotion, demotion, transfer, or discharge. There are several possible elements that may be important to whether or not a complaint procedure is acceptable to employees.

EXTREMELY IMPORTANT  
HIGHLY IMPORTANT  
FAIRLY IMPORTANT  
OF MINOR IMPORTANCE  
NOT IMPORTANT

Ask yourself, how important are the following aspects of an acceptable complaint procedure and circle the appropriate letter in the column to the right of each.

- |                                                                                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1. Employee input into how a procedure is set up .....                                                     | EI | HI | FI | MI | NI |
| 2. An outside agency protecting employees' rights to file complaints .....                                 | EI | HI | FI | MI | NI |
| 3. Employee input into the types of complaints which can be settled through the procedure .....            | EI | HI | FI | MI | NI |
| 4. Access to information and forms through someone other than the supervisor .....                         | EI | HI | FI | MI | NI |
| 5. Use of the procedure for any work complaint .....                                                       | EI | HI | FI | MI | NI |
| 6. Training for new employees on complaint procedure use .....                                             | EI | HI | FI | MI | NI |
| 7. Final settlement of a complaint by an independent decision maker .....                                  | EI | HI | FI | MI | NI |
| 8. Availability of an employee representative to help fill out complaint forms .....                       | EI | HI | FI | MI | NI |
| 9. Joint employer/employee selection of final decision maker .....                                         | EI | HI | FI | MI | NI |
| 10. Availability of a person to act as an employee representative throughout the complaint procedure ..... | EI | HI | FI | MI | NI |
| 11. Right to question all employer evidence about the complaint .....                                      | EI | HI | FI | MI | NI |
| 12. Periodic training for all employees on complaint procedure use .....                                   | EI | HI | FI | MI | NI |
| 13. Employee's right to present his/her side of the story .....                                            | EI | HI | FI | MI | NI |
| 14. A written policy protecting employees from negative supervisor actions for filing complaints .....     | EI | HI | FI | MI | NI |
| 15. The right to cross-examine employer witnesses .....                                                    | EI | HI | FI | MI | NI |
| 16. Employer reply to a complaint required within a specific number of work days .....                     | EI | HI | FI | MI | NI |
| 17. A set time limit between first filing a complaint and receiving the final decision .....               | EI | HI | FI | MI | NI |
| 18. Ability to bypass the supervisor when filing a complaint .....                                         | EI | HI | FI | MI | NI |
| 19. A procedure that provides for prompt resolution of a complaint .....                                   | EI | HI | FI | MI | NI |

The following statements relate to the Virginia State grievance procedure which is available to all state employees.

Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with them by circling the appropriate letter to the right of each.

STRONGLY AGREE  
SOMEWHAT AGREE  
AGREE  
SOMEWHAT DISAGREE  
DISAGREE  
STRONGLY DISAGREE  
NO OPINION

- 20. The reasons my agency gives for denying or supporting a grievance are usually fair ..... SA A ?A ?D D SD NO
- 21. There are too many time delays in resolving grievances through the state grievance procedure ..... SA A ?A ?D D SD NO
- 22. My agency goes to great length to make sure that employees can file grievances without having to worry about how their supervisors will treat them later on..... SA A ?A ?D D SD NO
- 23. I would be more likely to use the present grievance procedure if a person outside the Virginia state system was making the final decision about my complaint ..... SA A ?A ?D D SD NO
- 24. The Office of Employee Relations Counselors in Richmond does a good job of answering questions about the grievance procedure ..... SA A ?A ?D D SD NO
- 25. Many employees do not use the grievance procedure because they do not know how it works ..... SA A ?A ?D D SD NO
- 26. Employees have a good chance to look over and question agency evidence about their complaint at any grievance hearing ..... SA A ?A ?D D SD NO
- 27. More employees would use the grievance procedure if there was an employee representative at the work site..... SA A ?A ?D D SD NO
- 28. The grievance procedure is too limited in terms of what problems I can take through it..... SA A ?A ?D D SD NO
- 29. Filing a grievance in this agency may have a bad effect on chances for promotions and pay raises ..... SA A ?A ?D D SD NO
- 30. My agency usually responds to grievances at the first steps of the procedure in a quick manner ..... SA A ?A ?D D SD NO
- 31. I would not call the Office of Employee Relations Counselors because I might get into trouble with my supervisor ..... SA A ?A ?D D SD NO
- 32. Have you filed a grievance through the Virginia State grievance procedure during the last five years? |\_\_\_|YES |\_\_\_|NO

If your answer is yes, what is the farthest you have taken any grievance?

- ( ) 1st Step (your immediate supervisor)
- ( ) 2nd Step (next direct level of management)
- ( ) 3rd Step (agency head or chief executive in unit)
- ( ) 4th Step (panel hearing)

Please indicate the issue involved: \_\_\_\_\_

Please indicate the final decision on this grievance: \_\_\_\_\_

If you have used the grievance procedure please answer the following questions, otherwise go on to Question 37.

33. Was there a fair opportunity at your meeting(s) or hearing for you or your representative to present witnesses, and evidence in support of your case?  
 YES     NO
34. Was there a fair opportunity at your meeting(s) or hearing for you or your representative to question witnesses and evidence presented by the employer?  
 YES     NO
35. In general did you understand the grievance process?  
 YES     NO
36. If your grievance was taken to a 4th step panel hearing, how satisfied are you with the fairness and impartiality of the hearing itself, not the outcome?
- |                      |                   |                          |                       |           |                   |
|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Very<br>Dissatisfied | Dissat-<br>isfied | Somewhat<br>Dissatisfied | Somewhat<br>Satisfied | Satisfied | Very<br>Satisfied |
|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------|

Please circle the appropriate answer under each statement.

37. How satisfied are you in general with the Virginia state grievance procedure?
- |                      |                   |                          |                       |           |                   |
|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Very<br>Dissatisfied | Dissat-<br>isfied | Somewhat<br>Dissatisfied | Somewhat<br>Satisfied | Satisfied | Very<br>Satisfied |
|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------|
38. How satisfied are you in general with your immediate supervisor?
- |                      |                   |                          |                       |           |                   |
|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Very<br>Dissatisfied | Dissat-<br>isfied | Somewhat<br>Dissatisfied | Somewhat<br>Satisfied | Satisfied | Very<br>Satisfied |
|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------|
39. How satisfied are you in general with your job?
- |                      |                   |                          |                       |           |                   |
|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Very<br>Dissatisfied | Dissat-<br>isfied | Somewhat<br>Dissatisfied | Somewhat<br>Satisfied | Satisfied | Very<br>Satisfied |
|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------|

In private industry, grievance procedures are often found where labor unions are present. Please read each of the following statements relating to unions and decide how you feel about them. Then circle the appropriate answer under each statement.

40. Unions are becoming too strong.
- |                   |       |                   |                      |          |                      |
|-------------------|-------|-------------------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|
| Strongly<br>Agree | Agree | Somewhat<br>Agree | Somewhat<br>Disagree | Disagree | Strongly<br>Disagree |
|-------------------|-------|-------------------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|
41. Unions make sure that employees are treated fairly by supervisors.
- |                   |       |                   |                      |          |                      |
|-------------------|-------|-------------------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|
| Strongly<br>Agree | Agree | Somewhat<br>Agree | Somewhat<br>Disagree | Disagree | Strongly<br>Disagree |
|-------------------|-------|-------------------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|
42. Unions help working men and women to get better wages and hours.
- |                   |       |                   |                      |          |                      |
|-------------------|-------|-------------------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|
| Strongly<br>Agree | Agree | Somewhat<br>Agree | Somewhat<br>Disagree | Disagree | Strongly<br>Disagree |
|-------------------|-------|-------------------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|
43. Unions interfere with good relations between employers and workers.
- |                   |       |                   |                      |          |                      |
|-------------------|-------|-------------------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|
| Strongly<br>Agree | Agree | Somewhat<br>Agree | Somewhat<br>Disagree | Disagree | Strongly<br>Disagree |
|-------------------|-------|-------------------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|
44. If such were legal, I would vote for representation by a public employee labor union.
- |                   |       |                   |                      |          |                      |
|-------------------|-------|-------------------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|
| Strongly<br>Agree | Agree | Somewhat<br>Agree | Somewhat<br>Disagree | Disagree | Strongly<br>Disagree |
|-------------------|-------|-------------------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|

*Please complete the following information about yourself.*

1. What is your Year of Birth? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Your Race  White  Black  Hispanic  Asian  Other
3. Your Sex  Male  Female
4. Your Marital Status  Single  Married  Separated/Divorced  Widowed
5. Indicate the Highest Level of Education you have obtained  
(check one only)
  - less than Grade 12
  - completed Grade 12
  - Business or Technical School
  - College/University but less than B.A./B.S. Degree
  - B.A./B.S. Degree
  - Advanced Degree
6. What is your Present Job Title  
*please specify* \_\_\_\_\_
7. In what agency or department are you presently employed?  
(Examples: Corrections, Mental Health, Va Tech, DMV)  
*please specify* \_\_\_\_\_
8. In what city/town do you spend the greatest amount of work time?  
(Please indicate the county if your office or place of work does not lie within city/town boundaries)  
*please specify* \_\_\_\_\_
9. How many employees, if any, do you supervise?  NUMBER
10. What is the length of your total state classified employment?  YEARS
11. If your job includes supervisory responsibilities, have you ever taken part in the following grievance procedure activities as an agency representative?  
(check all appropriate)
  - I have acted as an agency witness at a grievance hearing.
  - I have had a grievance(s) filed against me.
  - I have been selected as a panel member by my agency.
12. Are you a present member of any state employee association?  
 YES  NO
13. If not, would you join an employee association if given the opportunity?  
 YES  NO  I CAN'T DECIDE

*MANY, MANY THANKS FOR YOUR HELP!*

Suzanne Murrmann

Return address:

207 Pamplin Hall  
College of Business  
Virginia Tech  
Blacksburg, Virginia 24060

**The 4 page vita has been  
removed from the scanned  
document**

**The vita has been removed from  
the scanned document**

**The vita has been removed from  
the scanned document**

**The vita has been removed from  
the scanned document**

A STUDY OF  
GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE DIMENSIONALITY  
IN A NON-UNION SETTING

by

Suzanne Karsa Murrmann

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was to analyze a nonunion grievance procedure and its relationship to employee attitudes toward their jobs and toward unionization. The analysis had three main focuses of concern. First, an investigation was made of the underlying dimensions of grievance procedures. Second, an assessment was made of employee satisfaction with a unique grievance procedure established for their use. Areas of inquiry were selected based on the concept of procedure multidimensionality. Third, the relationship between employee perceptions of the grievance procedure, job satisfaction, and employee attitudes toward union representation were investigated. This line of inquiry was based on the proposition that the availability of a grievance procedure in a nonunion setting reduces the likelihood that employees will perceive a need

for union representation, and that the strength of this association depends on the procedure's acceptability to the employees.

The findings show the presence of five salient sub-dimensions of grievance procedures, that is, critical elements necessary for such a system to be judged acceptable for use by employees for resolving work related problems. Moreover, the data lends strong support for the belief that satisfaction with a grievance procedure available for use is strongly associated with an individual's intention to vote for representation by a labor union if given the opportunity to do so.