

# A Profile of Pro-Union Casino Workers in Northern Nevada

*Merwin Mitchell*

*Department of Economics/030  
College of Business Administration  
University of Nevada, Reno*

*and*

*Yvonne Stedham*

*Department of Managerial Sciences/028  
College of Business Administration  
University of Nevada, Reno*

## Abstract

Why workers unionize has been a topic of considerable debate for nearly one hundred and fifty years. Research, however, concerning the determinants of voting behavior has primarily been conducted during the last two decades. Up to now, little has been done to evaluate why workers in gaming may be pro-union, anti-union, or ambivalent. Using a data base containing survey data for 237 workers, we find that pro-union workers are less satisfied with a variety of work dimensions and that they feel under more stress than other workers. We also find, contrary to evidence for other industries, that pro-union workers view themselves as being as capable as their anti-union counterparts and that there are substantive differences, on average, between workers with strong views and those with moderate or ambivalent views with respect to unions.

**Political beliefs towards unions may be the single most important factor in determining how a worker will vote.**

Unions are a major concern to managers in many industries. The reasons for this, summarized and discussed by Addison and Hirsch (1989), are self-evident in most cases. Most importantly, managers tend to feel that unions lower profits by (1) increasing direct labor costs through wage and benefit gains and (2) decreasing

managerial effectiveness through the imposition of work rules, grievance procedures, seniority criteria, and other constraints on the managerial decision process.

Unions in Northern Nevada have not been very effective in organizing casino workers. Only Circus Circus currently has a strong union presence. Recently, however, there have been a number of union organization attempts in Northern Nevada (Seal, 1995). For these reasons, understanding why some workers are pro-union and others are not is an important goal for management, as well as for union organizers. This paper offers a profile of pro-union and anti-union workers in the gaming industry in Northern Nevada. Many of our results support previous research findings in other industries, yet we also find some information that could not be predicted by previous work.

## Existing Research

Kochan (1979) conducted some of the earliest comprehensive work on profiling union and non-union voters. Using data from the 1977 Quality of Employment Survey (QES), Kochan found that 39 percent of non-union blue-collar workers would vote for unionization if an election were held. A number of studies followed Kochan using both the QES and alternative data sources, many of which we review here. These studies use a variety of data sources but have a number of important variables in common. The data analyzed in each study is described below, and the relevant results are summarized in Table 1. Because of differences in methodology across studies, we summarize each study's results in a qualitative fashion. In Table 1, we represent a positive relationship between a variable and intent to vote for unions (or pro-union attitude) with "+," negative with "-", and absence of the variable in the analysis with a blank space. A lack of a significant relationship between intent to vote (or pro-union attitudes) and a variable is designated with a 0. Only the variables relevant to our study are included in our review.

The results from Kochan's study are based on estimates from data that include both blue and white-collar workers and are listed as Study (1) in Table 1. Fiorito (1992) analyzed two different data sources, the Union Image Survey (UIS) and the 1988 Heartland Poll, to determine how altruism affects the propensity of non-union workers to vote for unionization. In addition to evaluating altruism's effect on intent to vote, Fiorito explored a number of other relationships common to this type of study. Fiorito's results for the UIS and 1988 Heartland Poll data are listed under (2A) and (2B) respectively.

The column labeled Study 3 in Table 1 summarizes results from Youngblood, DeNisi, Molleston, and Mobley (1984). They test the impact of big union image versus union instrumentality (explained below) on voting intent using data on non-professional, non-union workers. The data was a sub-sample from a regularly surveyed consumer panel in two southeastern states.

Hills (1985) analyzes data from the 1980 panel of the National Longitudinal Survey (NLS) to evaluate how male union and non-union workers differ with re-

**Gender and age do not play a large role in determining a person's propensity to vote pro-union.**

spect to union demand. Hills found that 87 percent of unionized non-professional service workers support union representation. In contrast, only 27 percent of these service workers non-union counterparts supported unionization. Study 4 in Table 1 reports Hills' findings with respect to the relationship between "attitude towards union representation" and a number of variables. Hills' results, reported here, conform to the rest of the studies reviewed in Table 1 in that they represent results across a number of industries.

**Table 1. The Relationship Between Propensity to Join Unions (or Pro-union Sentiment) and Selected Variables – Summary Results from Previous Studies**

Variable Measures	Study						
	1	2A	2B	3	4	5	6
Overall Satisfaction	-	-	-	-			
Worker Autonomy	-				-		0
Job Security	0				-		0
Demographics							
Age	-	-	-			-	0
Female	+	+	0	+		+	+
Education	0	-	0		0		0
Wages			-	-		-	
Tenure/Seniority			0	0		0	
Instrumental Beliefs	+	+	+	+		+	
Big Labor Image	-	-	-	-		0	

key: + positive relationship with intent to vote for a union / pro-union attitude  
 - negative relationship with intent to vote for a union / pro-union attitude  
 0 no relationship with intent to vote for a union / pro-union attitude  
 (blank) variable not included in that particular study

Study 1 Kochan, A. (1979)  
 Study 2A Fiorito, J. (1992)  
 Study 2B Fiorito, J. (1992)  
 Study 3 Youngblood, S. A., DeNisi, A. S. Molleston, J. L., & Mobley, W. H. (1984)  
 Study 4 Hills, S. (1985)  
 Study 5 Silverblatt, R. & Amann, R. J. (1991)  
 Study 6 Schur, L. A., & Kruse, D. L. (1992)

Silverblatt and Amann (1991) analyze the determinants of voting intent by using data collected in southern Florida in 1986. Their sample includes only non-managerial workers who worked over 30 hours per week. Silverblatt and Amann focus on the differences in worker attitudes towards unions across race and ethnicity, and they examine a number of issues discussed here. Qualitative results for common variables are listed under Study 5 in Table 1.

A study by Schur and Kruse (1992) uses data from a Harris Poll to analyze the relationship between union vote and gender. The poll, commissioned by the AFL-CIO, was conducted by telephone and restricted to people over the ages of 18

who worked at least 20 hours per week. This study's results are summarized in the column labeled Study 6 in Table 1.

Table 1 gives some revealing insights. Existing research implies that a worker's satisfaction with his/her current job is negatively associated with propensity to vote for representation and union sentiment. Measures of worker autonomy and the effect of job security have a mixed relationship with vote intent. Age seems to be negatively related to vote intent while being female seems to be positively related to voting for union representation. Education has little effect on vote intent. Wages seem to have a negative impact on vote intent while job tenure seems to be unrelated. "Union instrumentality" refers to a belief by the worker that unions generally improve working conditions. This measure is, as might be expected, positively related to vote intent and union sentiment. Similarly, if a worker perceives unions as corrupt and/or disinterested bureaucracies ("big labor image") then that worker is less likely to vote for representation.

In contrast to the studies reviewed in Table 1, this study narrows the field of inquiry to a specific industry while broadening the scope of worker and job attributes analyzed with respect to their relationship to voting intent.

## Method

### Sample

The Institute for the Study of Gambling and Commercial Gaming at the University of Nevada, Reno assisted the authors in gaining the cooperation of four Reno casinos in collecting survey data. Questionnaires were distributed to employees on-site during their break periods and included all three shifts. Workers had been informed by management about the survey and participation was encouraged. Workers were also assured that individual completed surveys would not be available to management.

We used a six page questionnaire designed to measure intent to stay on the job, organizational commitment, and satisfaction with different job dimensions using established instruments of proven validity. In addition we gathered information on a number of job characteristics, demographic variables, and other worker characteristics. The surveys were administered by one of the authors who gave additional assurance regarding confidentiality and was on-site and available to answer participants' questions while they completed the questionnaire. The sample was collected by simply asking everyone who came into the casino luncheon room to fill out the questionnaire. Of those asked to fill out the questionnaire about 70 percent said they would, and of those about 55 percent actually finished.

It is important to note that response bias cannot be avoided in this kind of a study. First, there may be a difference between workers who use the lunchroom and those who do not. Second, there may be differences between employees who agreed to participate and those who did not. Third, there may be differences between those that finished and those that did not. Lastly, some who filled out the questionnaire may not have been truthful. Of these potential sources of bias, we believe that the only significant source of bias would be the second. There is no reason to believe that there is a consistent difference between workers who use the lunchroom and those who do not, a reasonable percentage of those that agreed to

complete the questionnaire finished it (55 percent) and those who did not typically stated that the questionnaire was too long (6 pages), and lastly both complete anonymity and confidentiality were expressly guaranteed making it less likely that an individual would lie. As with all survey data, whatever bias may exist is very difficult to evaluate since we do not have information on those who did not participate. We do know, however, that Hispanic and Asian employees were often reluctant to participate. Although the authors provided a Spanish version of the questionnaire, only twenty-two respondents used it. One common problem we faced, according to our interpreters, was that many non-English speaking workers were not literate in their own language and could not, therefore, fill out the questionnaire.

Of the survey participants, 7 percent were supervisors whose responses were not included in the analysis. There is useful information on 237 non-supervisory casino and hotel workers. The data were collected during the Summer of 1991.

## **Variables and Measures**

None of the casinos had any workers covered under a collective bargaining agreement. Workers' attitudes towards unions were measured by asking them to respond to the statement "A union would be very useful here." According to Premack and Hunter (1988), a worker's intent to vote is a very good proxy for actual voting behavior. We measured this intent by including the statement "I would vote for union representation if an election were held tomorrow." Workers were asked to respond based on a 5-point Likert scale with the choices "strongly agree," "moderately agree," "neither agree or disagree," "moderately disagree," and "strongly disagree," with strongly agreeing scored as a 5 and strongly disagreeing scored as 1 for analysis. These are, of course, ordinal responses meaning we cannot, for example, say that "strongly" is twice as large as "moderate" when it comes to a worker's intent or attitude. This limitation notwithstanding, this methodology is somewhat superior to the traditional yes/no choice that many studies have used because we can generate a more sophisticated qualitative sorting (of the studies reviewed above only Youngblood et al. 1984, measures vote intent with a variable that allows for uncertainty). In addition to identifying strong anti-union and strong pro-union workers at the two extremes, this measure allows us to identify milder versions of union sentiment as well as a middle category of undecided workers. These ambivalent or undecided workers have, in many of the studies reviewed above, been asked to choose between saying they will or will not vote for representation when a real choice for the undecided is to simply abstain from voting. We will show how these groups differ in ways that illustrate the importance of allowing degrees of sentiment over this issue. The study variables and measures are listed and described in Table 2.

## **Analytical Methods**

Based on workers' responses to the question concerning voting for union representation, the results were divided in three groups: workers who were likely to vote for a union (5 and 4 on the Likert scale), workers who were likely to vote

against a union (1 and 2 on the Likert scale), and workers who were ambivalent (3 on the Likert scale). The means of selected variables for these groups were

---

---

**Table 2. Variable Definitions and Their Measures**

**Demographic and Background Variables**

- (1) Age
- (2) Gender – 1=female, 0=male.
- (3) Dependents – (Number of children under 18, living at home)
- (4) Marital status – 1=married, 0=not married.
- (5) HS dropout – 1=dropout, 0=not dropout.
- (6) HS graduate – 1=high school graduate, 0=not HS graduate.
- (7) Some college – 1=worker has had some college but not 4 yr. degree.
- (8) 4 yr. degree – 1=worker has received a four year degree.

**Work and Market Characteristics**

- (9) Tenure – length of time this worker has been with this employer in months.
- (10) Casinos – number of casinos this worker has worked at in the last 5 years.
- (11) Yrs. in Reno – number of years this worker has lived in Reno.
- (12) Hours – average hours this worker puts in each week.
- (13) \$ gambled – average dollar amount this worker spends gaming each week.

**Measures of Satisfaction and Work Attitudes**

- (14) Commitment Ind – an index derived from 14 questions that serves as a measure of how committed workers are to an employer or firm (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979).
- (15) Satisfaction Ind – a composite derived from subindices reflecting attitudes about work, supervision, promotion, income, and coworkers (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969).
- (16) Stress – the worker rates the stress level of his or her job by indicating the level of agreement to “This is a stressful job” on a 5 point Likert scale (5=strongly agree, 1=strongly disagree).
- (17) Fire – the worker rates his/her chance of being fired in the next month (1=very unlikely, 5=very likely).
- (18) Self esteem – the worker rates his/her chances of getting another job of equal value (1=very easy, 5=very difficult).
- (19) Stay intent Ind – an established measure consisting of 8 questions regarding a worker’s future intentions to stay or quit - shown to be a good proxy for actual turnover (Bluedorn, 1982; Price and Bluedorn, 1977).
- (20) Benefits Ind – an index composed of 6 questions regarding the provision of benefits (Heneman and Schwab, 1985).
- (21) Work Ind – separate sub category for Satisfaction index above that measures satisfaction with work specifically.
- (22) Supervision Ind – See (21)
- (23) Promotion Ind – See (21)
- (24) Income Ind – See (21)
- (25) Cowork Ind – See (21)

**Measures 26–32 were obtained by asking workers to rate each statement on a 5 point Likert scale with “strongly agree” = 5 and “strongly disagree” = 1.**

- (26) Interest of Management – “My employer is interested in my well being.”
- (27) Supervisors – “My supervisor is good about following rules and procedures ...”
- (28) Control over hours – “I have a lot of control over the number of hours I work ...”
- (29) Control over when – “I have a lot of control over when I work during the week.”
- (30) Decisions – “In general, decisions regarding my job are made in an arbitrary fashion.”
- (31) Work effort – “I feel I work harder than my coworkers.”
- (32) Job makes for happy home – “This job contributes to a happy home and social life.”
- (33) Weekly earnings including tips – on average over time.
- (34) % Dealers – 1=dealer, 0=not dealer.

compared and the differences in means were evaluated for statistical significance. We also evaluate the data using correlational analysis. Pearson correlation coefficients are measures of the strength of the association between two variables and fall in the range between plus one and minus one. Positive values indicate that the two variables move in the same direction. The stronger the relationship, the larger the absolute value of the correlation coefficient. The correlations between the study variables and union sentiment and voting intention were determined and evaluated for statistical significance. The reader should note that the primary point of interest is whether or not a correlation coefficient is significantly different from zero and, if so, whether it is positive or negative.

**Table 3. Descriptive Characteristics of Pro-Union and Anti-Union Casino Workers in Northern Nevada**

Variables	Variable #	Anti-Union <sup>a</sup>	Pro-Union <sup>b</sup>	Difference
Age	(1)	38.09	36.13	1.996
Gender	(2)	.48	.56	.08
Dependents	(3)	.72	.57	.13
Marital Status	(4)	.41	.35	.06
HS Dropout	(5)	.10	.10	.00
HS Graduate	(6)	.26	.30	.04
Some College	(7)	.46	.37	.09
4 yr. Degree	(8)	.07	.17	.10**
Tenure in months	(9)	37.14	31.03	6.11
Casinos last 5 years	(10)	1.47	1.68	.21*
Years in Reno	(11)	12.00	10.44	1.56
Hours/week	(12)	37.98	34.12	3.86**
\$ gambled/week	(13)	17.33	23.04	5.71
Commitment Ind	(14)	48.54	42.95	5.59***
Satisfaction Ind	(15)	118.48	107.75	10.73*
Stress	(16)	3.22	3.59	.37**
Fire	(17)	2.08	2.25	.17
Self-esteem	(18)	2.46	2.41	.05
Stay intent Ind	(19)	42.95	39.75	3.20*
Benefits Ind	(20)	15.94	14.65	1.29*
Work Ind	(21)	22.26	17.66	4.60***
Supervision Ind	(22)	33.84	31.07	2.77*
Promotion Ind	(23)	11.64	10.59	1.05
Income Ind	(24)	11.88	8.75	3.13***
Coworkers Ind	(25)	30.92	31.13	.21
Interest of Management	(26)	2.80	2.64	.16
Supervisor follows rules	(27)	3.53	3.65	.12
Control over # hrs.	(28)	2.93	2.85	.08
Control over when to work	(29)	2.57	2.81	.24
Decisions arbitrary	(30)	2.87	3.00	.13
Work effort	(31)	3.28	3.21	.07
Job helps home life	(32)	2.78	2.47	.31*
Weekly earnings tips	(33)	327.99	315.05	12.94
% Dealers	(34)	.32	.36	.04

<sup>a</sup> N = 96 and includes all respondents who answered "strongly agree" = 5 and "moderately agree" = 4.

<sup>b</sup> N = 99 and includes all respondents who answered "strongly disagree" = 1 and "moderately disagree" = 2.

\*, \*\*, \*\*\* Statistically significant at the .01, .05, and .001 levels respectively.

## Results

Table 3 presents the means for workers who are likely to vote or likely not to vote for unionization leaving out the ambivalent workers who responded "neither agree or disagree" (3 on the Likert scale). Of the sample, 96 reported that they would be disposed to vote against union representation, 99 reported that they would be disposed to vote for representation, and 42 reported no inclination to vote either way.

Existing research (e.g., Wheeler and McClendon, 1991) implies that the greater the degree of uncertainty that workers have concerning their jobs and the lower their satisfaction with different aspects of their work, the higher is their expected

**Table 4. Correlates of Union Sentiment<sup>a</sup> and Voting Propensity<sup>b</sup> for Total Sample<sup>c</sup>**

Variables	Variable #	Correlation Coefficients	
		Sentiment	Voting Intent
Age	(1)	-.04	-.06
Gender	(2)	.05	.07
Dependents	(3)	-.07	-.05
Marital Status	(4)	-.07	-.04
HS Dropout	(5)	-.05	.00
HS Graduate	(6)	.05	.04
Some College	(7)	-.12*	-.10
4 yr. Degree	(8)	.15**	.15**
Tenure in months	(9)	-.03	.07
Casinos last 5 years	(10)	.06	.09
Years in Reno	(11)	-.04	-.06
Hours/week	(12)	-.09	-.13**
\$ gambled /week	(13)	-.01	.04
Commitment Ind	(14)	-.30***	-.22***
Satisfaction Ind	(15)	-.18**	-.13*
Stress	(16)	.15**	.12*
Fire	(17)	.03	.04
Self-esteem	(18)	-.02	-.02
Stay intent Ind	(19)	-.14**	-.13*
Benefits Ind	(20)	-.11	-.09
Work Ind	(21)	-.19***	-.17**
Supervision Ind	(22)	-.16**	-.11*
Promotion Ind	(23)	-.12	-.07
Income Ind	(24)	-.24***	-.22***
Coworkers Ind	(25)	-.06	.00
Interest of Management	(26)	-.07	-.05
Supervisor follows rules	(27)	.09	.05
Control over # hrs.	(28)	.00	-.01
Control over when to work	(29)	.12*	.10
Decisions arbitrary	(30)	.07	.06
Work effort	(31)	.01	-.01
Job helps home life	(32)	-.10	-.10
Weekly earnings tips	(33)	-.02	-.04
% Dealers	(34)	.04	.05

<sup>a</sup> Response to "A union would be useful to the workers at this company" on a five point Likert scale, "strongly agree" = 5 and "moderately agree" = 4.

<sup>b</sup> Response to "If a union election were held today I would vote for union representation" on a five point Likert scale, "strongly disagree" = 1 and "moderately disagree" = 2.

<sup>c</sup> N = 237

\*, \*\*, \*\*\* Statistically significant at the .01, .05, and .001 levels respectively.



need or demand for union services. On this basis, we predict that measures relating to how workers feel (positively scaled) about their job will be negatively related to union sentiment and intent to vote.

We employ a one tailed t-test where we have prior expectations concerning the direction of the relationship between two variables. Our study also includes a number of variables of interest for which we have no prior expectations (e.g., hours worked). Mean differences for these measures are subjected to a two-tailed test.

Table 4 presents correlation coefficients for the variables described in Table 2, for both union sentiment and voting propensity. Sentiment is a very good proxy for voting, and the results for both sets of correlations are very close in most cases and are similar to the variable of "union instrumentality" reviewed in Table 1.

Because the information in Tables 3 and 4 is consistent, we will describe the results simultaneously. Note, however, that Table 4 includes more information because the correlations are based on a 5 point continuum. Table 3 (mean differences), on the other hand, combines the strong and moderate responses to form a dichotomous variable for voting intent. To do this it is necessary to exclude the ambivalent worker since we do not know how he/she would vote.

In the following, we highlight some important results displayed in Tables 3 and 4.

**Demographics** - Gender and age do not play a large role in determining a person's propensity to vote pro-union. These results contrast with recent studies using national or regional cross sections of respondents by Fiorito (1992), Silverblatt and Amann (1991), and Youngblood, DeNisi, Molleston, and Mobley (1984). Those studies consistently found that being female and younger in age are positively related to a worker's propensity to vote.

**Education** - Workers with a four year degree are more likely to vote pro-union. Notice, however, that there is a mildly significant negative correlation between having some college and union sentiment in Table 3. Based on the data of this study, we are unable to reasonably explain this result.

**Job history** - Some workers who have worked at other casinos in the last 5 years are more likely to vote pro-union. (This variable is marginally significant in mean differences and not significant as a correlate). This is consistent with the findings of Hills (1985) that a worker's frequency of unemployment is a positive indicator of actual pro-union voting.

**Hours /Hourly Pay** - Workers who work fewer hours per week are more likely to vote pro-union. Note that the fewer hours worked by pro-union employees is not reflected by a significant earnings difference. When earnings are viewed on an hourly basis, pro-union workers' hourly earnings are, on average, 7 percent higher than that of their counterparts.

**Intent to Stay** - Pro-union workers report a lower propensity to stay (i.e. they are more likely to voluntarily quit) than anti-union workers.

**Organizational Commitment** - Workers who are less committed to the casino they work for are more likely to vote pro-union.

**Satisfaction** - Generally, less satisfied workers are likely to vote for representation. Pro-union workers are less satisfied with benefits, work, and supervision as measured by our indices. Pro-union workers are less satisfied with income even though they earn more in hourly wages.

**Stress** - Pro-union workers report more stress on the job than anti-union workers.

Overall, the results confirm our expectation that pro-union workers will generally report less satisfaction with many job aspects and more stress. Our results also support the findings reported by Frey (1986) who surveyed a variety of work attitudes based on a sample of casino dealers. Furthermore, these data point toward some important issues besides those made obvious by the mean differences listed above. One of the most important results centers on the fact that pro-union workers and anti-union workers report virtually no difference in their market "self esteem," measured as the expectation of being able to replace their current employment with a job of equal value (see Table 3, Variable 18). This result contradicts work by Kochan (1979) that finds that union employees have low job-self esteem and Odewahn and Petty (1980) who found that workers who intend to vote for unionization have a diminished view of their job skills relative to workers who are not in favor of representation. The significance of this is that pro-union workers in gaming cannot be typified as desiring representation because they are lower quality workers. Based on their perceptions of their abilities they are at least as qualified as their anti-union coworkers. There is also virtually no difference in reported work effort (see Table 3, Variable 31) between anti-union and pro-union workers and both report that they are getting along with their co-workers (see Table 3, Variable 25).

However, the data also contains some conflicting information. Notice that while pro-union workers are less satisfied with work and supervision and are overall less committed to their job, these attitudes are not well reflected in the following variables: "interest of management," "supervisor follows rules," "control over number of hours," "control over when to work," and "decisions arbitrary." As a matter of fact, pro-union and anti-union workers tend to have similar attitudes about how supervisors follow rules and their degree of control over when to work.

Another interesting finding is that pro-union workers are more dissatisfied with income even though they earn more on an hourly basis than their anti-union counterparts. This anomaly should be worrisome for managers who feel that they can stem pro-union activity by simply increasing wages. Work by Meng (1990)

**One interesting feature of job esteem is that the avid pro-union and anti-union workers have significantly more job self-esteem than those ambivalent towards unions.**

and Kochan and Helfman (1981) indicates that even if workers are satisfied with income and fringe benefits that does not necessarily translate into satisfaction with other job attributes.

Up to this point, we have ignored analyzing the ambivalent worker. There are some interesting features that arise with this group that warrant closer examination. In the following, we summarize the results for this group of workers. (Specific statistical results are available from the authors upon request.)

**Age** - Ambivalent workers (numbering 42) are, on average, only 30 years old - significantly younger than the rest of the sample.

**Education** - Ambivalent workers tend to be concentrated in the two categories of high school graduate and some college. Few are dropouts and few have 4 year degrees.

**Attitude** - Ambivalent workers tend to fit the profile of pro-union workers in measures that reflect attitudes toward work. They are significantly less committed and satisfied than anti-union workers but not more committed or satisfied than pro-union workers.

**Job Esteem** - One interesting feature of job esteem is that the avid pro-union and anti-union workers have significantly more job self-esteem than those ambivalent towards unions.

**Dealers** - Dealers are unlikely to be ambivalent towards unions. However, there tend to be as many pro-union dealers as anti-union dealers.

## Discussion and Summary

Many of the correlation coefficients are low in magnitude yet quite significant. Readers are cautioned against dismissing statistically significant but small correlation estimates. The reasons that people vote for unions are complex and varied. As a result, any given measure may be a strong indicator for how some employees feel while being irrelevant to others. These estimates are, in fact, strong relative to the those obtained in other studies with much larger data bases (e.g., Kochan, 1979).

Overall, this study confirms what most observers of workplace behavior would expect with some notable exceptions. Pro-union workers tend to be less satisfied with pay and with non-pay dimensions of the job. On the other hand, when asked specific questions regarding supervision (see Table 2, Variables 27 and 30) and job flexibility (Variables 28 and 29) there is no evidence that they are less satisfied than anti-union workers. This, we feel, indirectly points to the fact that many workers vote pro-union as a result of overall views regarding unions. Our evidence seems to suggest that many workers' attitudes are political or philosophical in nature. Theoretical work by Summers, Betton, and Decotiss (1991, p. 369) suggests that "... there are individuals who will vote for or against the union simply on the basis of belief about the value of union membership." Support for this is offered in work by Desphande and Fiorito (1989), and Youngblood, DeNisi, Molleston, and

Mobley (1984) where both sets of authors find that perceptions about "union image" have a strong effect on voting intention independent of worker satisfaction.

We can only conjecture at the importance of worker perceptions of unions since we do not have explicit data regarding these influences. Table 1 includes categories for positive ("union instrumentality") or negative feelings ("big labor image") that previous studies have used, even though those variables are not included in this study. We do this to point out the consistent influence these variables exert on how individuals vote or feel about unions in general. The influence of union instrumentality is very strong. Youngblood et al. (1984), for example, estimate the correlation between union instrumentality and vote intention to be .73 and .60, respectively. Hence, future efforts to gather data on casino employees should account for general and specific worker perceptions and instrumentality beliefs regarding unions.

Political beliefs towards unions, therefore, may be the single most important factor in determining how a worker will vote given a representation election, and management's ability to alter these attitudes may be limited in the short-run. Management's ability to deal with pro-union sentiment in the long run, however, may be much more responsive to the work place experience. Workers probably develop an attitude towards the need for representation based on a history of experiences relating to their relationship with management. It could be, therefore, that union demand could be dramatically reduced over a period of years if policies are consistently pursued that reduce turnover and increase morale over a period years.

This does not imply that nothing can be done in the short run. The robust negative relationships between voting intent and satisfaction and organizational commitment implies that there are a reasonably large number of workers for whom the immediate job experience is having a direct influence on their propensity to vote. For example, regardless of the political beliefs of workers, managers have a considerable influence on the stress that workers experience. The consistent relationship between pro-union attitudes and heightened perceptions of stress clearly point to the need for managers to evaluate the full costs of imposing conditions that lead to tension and stress in the work place. We often heard from workers that one of the things they resent most is that they are continually reminded of how expendable they were – how easily they could be replaced. Supervisors who engage in this type of conflict relationship with workers not only have less committed and less effective workers in the short run but are ultimately the best friends union organizers have.

Last of all, we find evidence suggesting that strongly pro-union and anti-union workers have similar views of their job market abilities and have superior perceptions compared to those workers with weaker attitudes towards unions, be they pro, con, or ambivalent. Managers may attempt to control the work environment by harassing pro-union employees or even by attempting to hire workers that they suspect have anti-union sentiments. To the extent that our results are generalizable, they seem to suggest that such a policy may lead employers to have antagonistic relations with potentially some of their best workers, increase the incidence of turnover, decrease morale, and eventually confirm and entrench the belief by many workers that they cannot face their employer without representation.

## References

- Addison, J.T., & Hirsch, B.T. (1989). Union effects on productivity, profits, and growth: Has the long-run arrived? *JOURNAL OF LABOR ECONOMICS*, 7, 72-105.
- Bluedorn, A.C. (1982). The theories of turnover: Causes, effects, and meaning. In S. Bacharach (Ed.), *RESEARCH IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF ORGANIZATIONS*, 1, 75-128, Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.
- Deshpande, S. P., & Fiorito, J. (1989). Specific and general beliefs in union voting models. *ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT JOURNAL*, 32, 883-897.
- Fiorito, J. (1992). Unionism and altruism. *LABOR STUDIES JOURNAL*. Fall, 19-34.
- Frey, J. (1986). Labor issues in the gaming industry. *NEVADA PUBLIC AFFAIRS REVIEW*, 32-38.
- Heneman, H. & Schwab, D. (1985). Pay satisfaction: its multidimensional nature and measurement. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PSYCHOLOGY*, 20, 129-141.
- Hills, S. (1985). The attitudes of union and nonunion male workers toward union representation. *INDUSTRIAL AND LABOR RELATIONS REVIEW*, 38, 179-194.
- Kochan, A. (1979). How American workers view labor unions, *MONTHLY LABOR REVIEW*, April, 23-31.
- Kochan, A. & Helfman, D. E. (1981). The effects of collective bargaining on economic and behavioral job outcomes. *RESEARCH IN LABOR ECONOMICS*, 4, 321-365.
- Meng, R. (1990). The relationship between unions and job satisfaction. *APPLIED ECONOMICS*. 22, 1635-1648.
- Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M., & Porter, L. (1979). Measurement of organizational commitment. *JOURNAL OF ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR*, 14, 224-247.
- Odewahn, C. A., & Petty M. M. (1980). A comparison of levels of job satisfaction, role stress, and personal competence between union members and nonmembers. *ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT JOURNAL*, 23.
- Premack, S. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1988). Individual unionization decisions. *PSYCHOLOGICAL BULLETIN*, 103, 223-234.
- Price, J. and Bluedorn, A.C. (1977). Intent to leave as a measure of turnover. Paper presented at the 37th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Orlando, FL.
- Schur, L. A., & Kruse, D. L. (1992). Gender differences in attitudes towards unions. *INDUSTRIAL AND LABOR RELATIONS REVIEW*, 46, No.1, 89-103.
- Seal, K. (1995). Union targets Nevada's nonmembers. *HOTEL AND MOTEL MANAGEMENT*, July 24, 1995.
- Silverblatt, R. & Amann, R. J. (1991). Race, ethnicity, union attitudes, and voting predictions. *INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS*, 30, 271-285.
- Smith, P., Kendall L.M., & Hulin C. (1969). *MEASUREMENT OF SATISFACTION IN RETIREMENT AND WORK: A STRATEGY FOR THE STUDY OF ATTITUDES*. Chicago Ill: Rand McNally and Co.
- Summers, T. M., Betton J. H., & Decotiss, T. A. (1991). Voting for and against unions: A decision model. *ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT REVIEW*, 11, 643-655.
- Wheeler, H.N. & McClendon, J.A. (1991). The individual decision to unionize. In G. Strauss (Ed.), *THE STATE OF THE UNIONS*, Madison, Wis.: Industrial Relations Research Association.

Youngblood, S. A., DeNisi, A. S. Molleston, J. L., & Mobley, W. H. (1984). The impact of work environment instrumentality beliefs, perceived labor union image, and subjective norms on union voting intentions. *ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT JOURNAL*, 27, 576-590.