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ABSTRACT

This study asks the question "Since paid work is a reality for most women, why are women not involved in union work?" It utilizes a socialist feminist framework to conceptualize the connections between patriarchy and capitalism, and how they interact to impact women's life choices. The study analyses 1085 survey responses of rank and file women from the Manitoba Government Employees Union to understand why women, who make up over fifty percent of the membership, are not found in high ranking leadership roles. The barriers that are tested for are grouped into the following categories: structure of the labour market, structure of unions, structure of reproduction, and attitudinal barriers. Job tenure, living arrangement, and comfort level with unions were significant factors in women's participation in unions. Both variables tested under the structure of unions were significant for women's involvement. The inconvenient meeting times and the lack of support for women's issues by the Manitoba Government Employees union, were significant factors in women's involvement in the union. It is concluded that the influence of patriarchy on union structure created an organization that neglects the needs of women.
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INTRODUCTION

The labour movement in Canada has a rich and diverse history. It is also a movement that has been male dominated. Where do women fit into the history of labour in Canada? Up until the 1960’s, women made up a small percentage of the labour force, and thus, a small percentage of union members. With the changing economy and the rise of the women’s movement, women flooded the labour market from the sixties onward. Today, paid work is a reality for most women. For the past thirty-five years, women have accounted for seventy-eight percent of all new employees in the labour market in Canada. During this same time period women have accounted for eighty-one percent of the total growth in union membership in Canada. However, when it comes to union leadership, in its various forms, women are under-represented at all levels. This study asks why. It uses a socialist feminist perspective to discuss women and unions, and to better understand the factors involved in a woman’s decision to become actively involved in her workplace union. For the purposes of this study, the factors are analyzed by looking at how patriarchy and capitalism interact to determine the structure of the labour market and the life choices of women.

In order to address this question, we must look at two separate phenomena and how they interact. First, we look at unions, their history, structure, operation, and policy. We also look at factors that have affected the labour movements
development, and specifically its relation to the changing nature of capitalism. Secondly, we look at women and the structure of gender relations. It is here that we discuss the nature of patriarchy and how it arranges women’s lives. The key point of the study is bringing together the structure of the labour movement and the structure of patriarchy.

Chapter one deals with women, work, and socialist feminism in an attempt to understand how capitalism and patriarchy structure society, particularly the labour market and the labour movement. It also looks at how this interaction impinges upon women’s life choices, specifically their decision to become actively involved in the labour movement. Chapter two takes a specific look at union functions and how they relate to women. The chapter also discusses feminism and unionism, questioning how the two social movements can align. It concludes with a list of four concrete strategic steps which, if followed, can result in a union structure which will address women’s roles as workers and reproducers. Chapter three examines the status of women in unions across Canada with a specific look at the Manitoba Government Employees Union. The chapter ends by stating that for the most part, the leadership structure of unions does not reflect the gender composition of their membership. Chapter four looks at a history of the organizing of Manitoba government workers. In addition to being historically under-represented in all organizations of Manitoban government workers, women’s issues
were rarely taken up as legitimate bargaining concerns. Understanding why the majority of women are not active in unions, chapter five discusses four major barriers to women's participation in unions. These include the structure of the labour market, union structure, the structure of reproduction, and attitudinal barriers.

Chapter six discusses data collection and methodology, as well as outlining the variables and hypotheses that are tested for. The hypotheses closely follow the barriers to participation outlined in chapter five. The study tests for the labour market descriptives such as job status and tenure, union operations of meeting times and union/bargaining issues, reproductive issues of familial responsibility and living arrangement, and attitudinal issues of involvement and comfort. Chapter seven reveals that of the eight hypotheses tested for, five were accepted and three were not. In concluding, chapter eight examines the significance of the accepted and rejected hypotheses in relation to socialist feminist theory. It is concluded that while not all hypotheses were accepted, there is support for the claim that women are not involved in union business because of the structure of gender relations and how it impacts the labour market and the labour movement. Women are not involved in union business partly because of the way reproduction is structured, and partly due to the way production and reproduction interact to impact societal structure and women's lives.
CHAPTER ONE: Women, Work, and Socialist Feminism

I. Women and the Labour Movement

A discussion on women in unions must be prefaced by a discussion on women's position in the labour market. Only after a discussion of the determinants that condition women's involvement in the labour market will we be able to understand the relationship between unions and women.

The location of women's labour has changed over time. While at times women's labour has been exclusively restricted to reproductive work in the home (see Ursel, 1992), since the middle of the 20th century it has expanded to include work in the public sphere. In 1891, women made up 12.6% of the entire labour force (Krahn & Lowe, 1993:151) and in 1994, this increased to 45% (Statistics Canada: Women in the labour Force, 1994). Although the number of women in the labour force has increased over time and work in the paid labour market is a reality for almost all women, the types of jobs they perform differ significantly from men (Armstrong and Armstrong, 1984: Kemp, 1994).

In the public and private spheres of society men and women occupy different roles and perform different amounts and types of work. Women are primarily responsible for reproductive labour - the procreation, socialization, and daily maintenance of the family. In addition, women are also a permanent part of the workforce. The expansion and
absorption of women's labour into the paid labour market has been substantially different from men's experiences with the labour market. Women's experience with the labour force has not been stable but is best characterized as a push and pull phenomena. Women have been pushed out of the labour market when their labour was necessary for reproduction, and pulled into the labour market when their labour was necessary for production. When women had their labour pulled into the labour market, there was often a conflict between production and reproduction. The state often stepped in to mediate this conflict (see Li, 1993; Ursel, 1992).

The structure of the labour force within a capitalist market economy is not only guided by market forces but by gender relations which structure the labour market in direct and indirect ways (Fox & Fox, 1987). In addition to the basic class division between owners and workers and skill levels, gender is the chief source of differences in wages and salaries, and the structure of the labour market. Women's location within the labour market was and is largely determined by wider social processes which create the push and pull phenomena. The responsibility that women have for reproductive labour is a pivotal factor in explaining women's role in the labour market as is the structure of capital and its demand for labour.

As the wage labour system in Canada was becoming entrenched at the turn of the century, women, in order to
support themselves in the new economy, began to work alongside men. This change to the location of women’s labour drastically changed women’s role in reproductive labour. It resulted in a declining birth rate which threatened the future labour supply (Pierson and Cohen, 1984). This contradiction between the short term interest of capital (immediate labour supply for increasing profit) and the long term interest of capital (the reproduction of the future labour supply) was mediated by state legislation. Numerous authors have documented how North American women were excluded from the labour market at the turn of the century so that their labour could be reserved for reproduction (Eisenstein, 1979: Ursel, 1992: Hartmann, 1994). This relocation of women’s labour to reproduction and exclusion of women from the labour market was pushed forward by the social reform movement that arose at the time to protest the harmful conditions of the family. While most working women were making a conscious decision to drop their birth rates, the social reform movement made them look like victims of an unmeditated wage labour system that did not take into account the "fragile nature" of women and their families. This pro-natalist movement called upon the state to save the family. The state did so by initiating numerous commissions in order to assess the working conditions of women (see Ursel, 1992). These commissions resulted in legislation which began the segregation of the workplace along gender lines. For example, the Factories, Shops, and Mines Acts of 1884, 1888,
and 1890 restricted the employment of women and children by work site and hours and conditions of work because of their "delicate nature" (Ursel, 1992:87).

This was the first sign of patriarchal relations re-organizing work during industrialization (Kemp, 1994). By restricting both their ability to work (by exclusion) and the conditions of work (limiting hours and prohibiting night shifts), these laws empowered the state to regulate and protect women in the interest of society and relegated women as powerless economically because of their detachment from production. The legislation justified the belief that women were inherently different from men. Their childbearing and family responsibilities made women biologically unsuited for demanding labour force jobs and such participation could lead to their neglecting those responsibilities (Kessler-Harris, 1987).

This formal exclusion of women as permanent workers in the labour market existed until the beginning of World War II. The years 1939 to 1945 saw a startling and rapid reversal of sixty five years of limited labour force participation when 600,000 Canadian Women entered the labour force (Pierson and Cohen, 1984:222). The unique circumstances of having a great majority of the labour force overseas during the Second World War forced women to take part in the labour market. When the war was over, the returning men resumed their jobs forcing women out of the traditional trades. Women were not eligible
to make any claim to employment or further training in those occupations which they performed during war. Although unique in its nature, this experience with the labour market entrenched the practice of using women's labour without permitting their integration within the labour market. As Ursel (1992) argues, this pattern was to be used by capital in the next phase of women's employment, their integration and segmentation in the labour market.

The post-war period was a time of the expansion of capital and a high demand for labour. Capital looked to the marginal position of women to help to fill this demand for labour. These years were characterized by increasing birth rates at the same time as women were being absorbed into the labour market. Because of the high birth rates, women's work did not readily present a threat to the long term interest of capital and women were more readily accepted into the labour market than they were at the turn of the century (Pierson and Cohen, 1984). However, the absorption of women into certain sectors of the expanding economy reflected patriarchal ideology which suggested that while women were engaged in the workforce, reproduction was still their primary responsibility.

The location of women in the labour market was segregated along gender lines. Li (1993) argues that women most often were recruited by certain sectors like administrative and clerical work, and for jobs that reflected their reproductive
labour such as teaching, sewing, housekeeping, and service work where they could be paid low wages and were not unionized. As capitalism developed, women became more dependent on the wage labour system to meet the financial needs of their family, the gender segmentation became further entrenched.

The labour market grew rapidly and began a shift away from manufacturing and industry toward service. The labour market became segmented into primary and secondary sectors (Armstrong, 1984: Krahn and Lowe, 1993). The primary sector is made up of those traditional occupations in the industrial and manufacturing areas and is dominated by a few large, oligopolistic industries. These are the areas where there is a history of a strong and militant labour movement, and is an area characterized by high wages and benefits, and job security. It is also employed most often by white males. The secondary sector is made up of jobs which are low-waged, low-skilled, and have little security or room for advancement. This sector is often characterized by many small, more competitively organized industries. The marginalized position of women in society made them especially attractive to capital in the secondary labour market. Capital made use of women as a reserve army of labour it could draw on when needed and pay lower wages without the worry of unionization. Women thus came to occupy a disadvantaged position in the labour market and the labour movement. Currently, this trend continues with
women making up the majority of part time and casual workers, and also the majority of service sector workers (Yeandle, 1984: Phillips and Phillips, 1993: White, 1993). Workers in the secondary labour market are often segregated into personal service jobs in a small number of industries or if employed by a large company are often scattered among various workplace locations such as banking or retail outlets. In 1991, 85% of employed women were in the service sector and more than three in ten were employed in its lower tier, retail trade and consumer services (Krahn and Lowe, 1993:163).

Although the specific form varied across time and place, we can see that women’s entry into the paid labour market occurred in ways that reproduced and entrenched their subordinate position in society relative to that of men’s. We can see that women’s location in the labour market was largely determined by wider social processes - the structural organization of reproduction and the changing nature of capital and its demand for labour. The state also played a central role passing legislation which initially entrenched women’s subordinate position in the labour market and created polices that encouraged immigration during times when the birth rate was declining (Li, 1993:371).

The way women were absorbed into the labour market also had a negative impact on unionization for women. Since women were drawn into the labour market in a segmented nature, they began work in employment niches which had no history of the
labour movement. And since, ideologically, women's work in production was viewed as secondary to reproductive work, and as temporary or part-time, unions did not flourish for segmented workers.

It is also argued that the union movement played a role in the position of women in the labour market. Drawing on the work of Cockburn (1984) and Rose (1986), Fox and Fox (1987:377) argue that men's greater organizational strength in the nineteenth century gave them far greater bargaining power in the labour market than women had, and that the strategies that male unionists pursued in early struggles with industrial capitalism were not only informed by notions of gender but actively created the gendered segregation of jobs. Unions played an active role in keeping women out of the workforce at the turn of the century (Sangster, 1985). However, before we discuss women and unions we must place the understanding of gender inequity within a theoretical context. How can women's engagement with the labour movement and the current status of women in the labour market be explained? We need a context which adequately explains the relationship between gender and the labour market. This can be provided by utilizing a socialist feminist analysis which specifically focuses on the dynamic of reproduction within capitalist relations of production.
II. Socialist Feminist Theory

The sexual division of labour is as old as recorded history. This has meant that women's experiences of work are substantially different than that of men. Despite a major restructuring of work and the massive influx of women into the labour force, women's experience at work remains different than that of men. As argued in the previous section, the labour market reflects gender and manipulates gender divisions which leave women in a subordinate position inside and outside the labour market.

In searching for a theory which could explain the persistence of the sexual division of labour and its consequences for women workers/unionists it became evident that the theory must give equal weight to the structural imperatives of gender and the structural imperative of work. Within feminist theory, socialist feminism is the school of thought most concerned with the interaction of gender (patriarchy) and work (class). Socialist feminism seeks to understand both the gender system and the class system, and their impact on one another. This theory argues that women's oppression is socially structured and materially based (Brown, 1987).

Socialist Feminist theorists maintain that women's oppression stems from control over their labour power, both productive and reproductive, and is therefore both sexual and economic in nature (Eisenstien, 1979: Hartmann, 1976: Jaggar,
1983: Ursel, 1984, 1992). It expands on Marxist notions of class by incorporating a discussion of gender. Socialist feminism argues that class alone is an inadequate theoretical tool to fully explain women's role in society. The way in which a society structures its reproductive relations must also be addressed.

Within Socialist Feminism a specific analysis, "Dual Systems Theory", contends that the base of society is twofold - production and reproduction. The labour in each sphere produces products necessary for human existence. Productive labour produces the means of subsistence, food, clothing, and shelter. Reproductive labour produces human life through procreation, daily maintenance, and socialization. Reproductive labour produces socialized labourers to perform productive labour while productive labour in turn produces those things needed by reproductive labourers.

Socialist Feminists argue that, in our society and in others, women's reproductive labour is controlled and structured via patriarchal processes which permeate many different institutions. Hartmann defines patriarchy as a set of social relations which have a material base and allow for the domination of women by men (1976). This material base rests in the control of women by restricting their access to economic resources and by disallowing women control over their sexuality and reproductive capabilities (Tong, 1989:180).

The control of women is manifested in various processes
within reproductive relations: (1) The sexual division of labour, the division of work necessary to divide labour between the two sexes; (2) gender, the gender roles necessary to reinforce this division; (3) the enforcement of heterosexuality, necessary to ensure procreation; and (4) the subordination of women, necessary to ensure labour for reproduction. The sexual division of labour ensures that roles, purposes, and activities of one's labour is determined sexually (Eisenstien, 1990:125). The conception of women as reproducers and men as producers permeates the structures and ideologies of all of our institutions.

Dual systems theorists maintain one must analyze both class and patriarchy to understand social structure and the positions of men and women in that structure. Ursel (1992) defines patriarchy as a set of social relations that controls reproduction in relation to historically specific social and economic conditions. The nature of patriarchy varies based on the exchange between the spheres of reproduction and production.

a. Productive & Reproductive relations in Dual Systems Theory

There are relations that exist between the spheres of production and reproduction. Each sphere is dependent on the other, resulting in a co-determinative relationship. The nature of the relations of production will be determined by
and, in turn, determine the relations of reproduction. This exchange is not static but varies historically. As the following shows, depending on the point in time, the systems of production and reproduction will be in coordination or in conflict. The relationship between the two spheres and the resulting social structures will determine the status and choices men and women have in our society.

The logical fit between procreation and production was threatened as industrialization developed. As the unit of production changed from the family to the individual, women's labour became relocated to production. This change of women's labour created a conflict between class and patriarchal interests. The effects were detrimental to reproduction resulting in a declining birth rate and standard of living.

In order to control reproduction, a re-ordering of patriarchy was necessary. Patriarchy changed from strictly familial to social in nature. Ursel (1988, 1992) offers the only analysis of this restructuring in a Canadian context. She argues that while patriarchy was a system of decentralized control over women in agrarian societies, under capitalism it became centralized. Ursel (1988), Hartmann (1976), and Eisenstien (1979) maintain that this centralization was achieved through the development of social patriarchy. Social patriarchy is defined as the societal organization of sex-gender relations in the public sphere (e.g.) in work, legislation, and state policies (Ursel, 1988).
Ursel (1992) outlines chronologically how the development and implementation of certain laws had the effect of creating a patriarchal order that was housed in the state and its policies. Examples of this range from the early 1900's labour laws and Factory Acts, which restricted women's employment, to a host of welfare laws (such as the Family Allowance Act) which had the effect of subsidizing reproductive costs not met through the wage labour system. In addition, Li argues that as the pressure of declining fertility begins to threaten the ability of many advanced capitalist countries to replace its population through the natural process, the state revises and adopts various publicly funded programs such as child subsidy and day care grants to encourage families to procreate by picking up some of the costs of reproduction (1993:371). Therefore, reproduction is re-ordered through the development of social patriarchy. While familial patriarchy still exists, it does so in terms of a facilitative role, regulating proper sex-gender identities and relations as it exists in the family.

As the previous discussion shows, at times capitalism and patriarchy may serve to reinforce one another. Capitalism reinforces patriarchy by ensuring that power and privilege comes from those engaged in productive capitalist relations, not reproductive relations. Because of women's role in reproduction, they remain subordinate and the value of women is as a reproducer rather than a producer in a capitalist
society.

Patriarchy also serves to reinforce capitalism. Numerous institutions in society are immersed in ideologies or systems of belief about the suitable roles for men and women and have structured themselves along those lines. In the wage labour market, capitalists make use of women’s subordinate position under patriarchy to expand its secondary labour market characterized by low wages, and less job security.

Dual Systems Theory allows us to see that oppression derives from both sex and class, and is manifested through both the material and the ideological dimensions of patriarchy and capitalism (Eisenstien, 1990:129).

b. Capitalist & Patriarchal Factors Impinging on Women Today

The movement of women into the realm of paid labour has not fundamentally increased their power in society. Much of that can be attributed to the effects of patriarchy on the labour market and on women in general. Through the sexual division of labour, patriarchy maintains the subordinate status of women in both the workplace and in the home (Tong, 1989). Women are under-paid and under-represented in the workplace, and over-worked in the home. Because of women’s subordinate status in the workplace and at home, women are uniquely affected by the continuing changes in the relations between capitalism and patriarchy.

Currently, production is globalizing at a rapid rate
dismantling the historic compromise between production and reproduction achieved at the peak of the national welfare state. Capital is looking globally to secure cheap labour and remain competitive. As a result of obtaining cheap labour elsewhere, capital has less interest in domestic labour and plays no role in the costs of reproduction domestically. For example, capital does not pay into national daycare programs or subsidy programs. The high cost of subsidising reproduction unaided by capital is being felt by the nation state and its taxpayers. However, the state is in a weak position to force corporations and businesses to do anything about it for fear of capital flight. As a result, a re-ordering of patriarchal relations is necessary to control reproduction. This will impact women in a different way than men.

As a strategy to restructure reproduction, the state is looking back to the family to off-load the costs of reproduction. This is evident in right wing, neo-conservative policies that are geared toward the dismantling of the welfare state and encouraging the family to pick up the cost of reproduction. For example, cutting hospital stays, reducing care for the elderly and for persons with disabilities, the elimination of family allowances, the increased attention paid to maintenance enforcement (Dead-Beat Dads), and recently proposed Manitoba legislation of parental responsibility for their children’s crimes. The climate is to re-privatize reproductive costs wherever possible (Ursel, 1992:295).
This restructuring of reproduction in light of changes to production affects women in two ways. First in the reproductive sphere and secondly in the productive sphere. In the reproductive sphere, the changes to the welfare state will increase the time women must allocate to reproductive tasks. Even though both partners take part in the paid labour force, there has not been a substantial change to reproductive labour done in the home (Kemp, 1994). Women are still primarily responsible for the daily labour involved in reproduction. The privatising of reproductive costs and the contracting services of the welfare system will greatly increase women’s daily labour. For example, the lack of a national child care policy, care for the elderly, and medical care, all traditionally reproductive services that became socialized costs of reproduction, are being reduced or privatized. This is putting tremendous pressure on women’s lives and results in women having to relieve the pressure by often choosing between family and work. Women may choose to do different things such as, choosing not to have children, having smaller families, or delaying procreation. For women who decide to have children, part-time or casual jobs are more appropriate in order to accommodate family life.

The pressures of the changing nature of capital also affects women in the labour force. In recent years, there is a downsizing of North American companies with high rates of job loss. Since women hold a disadvantaged place in the labour
force by earning less wages than men and holding less secure, low skilled, unorganized jobs, they will face a large part of the negative influences of changes in production and to the welfare state.

In addition, as the state begins to dismantle the welfare state and re-privatize the costs of reproduction, many jobs that are cut directly affect women. For example, closing of hospitals directly affect the nursing profession where the majority of workers are women and the privatizing of service fields such as Home-Care threaten women’s jobs and wages.

Therefore, women face both the pressures of capital and its changing nature, and the pressures of patriarchy and the re-ordering of reproduction. How women experience the pressures of patriarchy are manifested in numerous ways. Of particular interest in this study are the reality of the double work day, the segmented labour market, and the history of male based labour movement.

III. Summary

When looking at how women’s work lives are structured and experienced, it is necessary to guide our understanding by using a theory that incorporates reproduction as a central theme. Socialist Feminist theory, specifically Dual-Systems Theory, allows us to capture the intricacies and co-determinative nature of production and reproduction in our quest to understand women’s lives. While a class primacy
argument will speak to issues of workers and a gender primacy argument will speak to the issue of women, a dual systems argument will give equal weight to production and reproduction which is especially relevant considering this study addresses women workers.

For the purposes of this study, we are interested in why women do not participate in unions. To begin a discussion on this, we will now turn to a discussion of women and unions.
CHAPTER TWO: Women and Unions

I. Union Functions

Godard (1994) offers a complex discussion about the functions of unions. He discusses five functions which include economic, democratic, integrative, social democratic, and revolutionary functions. It is important to note that these functions are only potential functions and do not represent all unions at all times. The specific role a union will fulfill is dependent upon numerous things.

a. Determinants of Functions

There is considerable variation in the function of a union based on the location of a particular industry in the labour market and by the type of industry in which unions are represented. For example, variation of function is determined by the type of occupation the union is serving. Unions serve a wide range of workers from truckers, to teachers, to secretaries, to doctors each holding different levels of education, income, ideology, and gender composition, and therefore occupying a different place in the social stratum. The differing ideologies of different occupational groups can determine which function the union will serve. As Godard points out, for example, one would assume that a truckers union would be primarily concerned with the economic function of unions based on characterization of truckers’ as dominated by poorly educated, white males who operate in a highly
individualistic, cowboy culture which typically entails cutthroat competition (1994:223). Alternatively, one would assume that a union representing social workers would perform a more social democratic function simply by virtue of the fact that they represent a group of highly educated men and women of varying ethnic groups who represent a collectivist, reform oriented culture and whose job niche has been developed in the public sector free from the competitive market forces (Godard, 1994: 223). It is also argued that unions whose memberships are predominately female will use the union process as a way to further address issues specific to them and to relate the interconnectedness between work and family life (Cockburn, 1984).

In addition to occupational group, the ideology of the union leadership and makeup of the union structure will determine which union function is most likely to be served. Unions that are structured in a purely democratic fashion will serve a different function compared to those with a bureaucratic, large, highly structured union. Further, the sexual composition of leadership will have an impact on which issues are put forth on an agenda at convention. For unions where women are highly under-represented in union leadership roles, the issues put forth for change may not reflect their needs (Cuneo, 1990).

The history of an individual union (including its history of militancy and conflict with employers and members) will
also determine which function a union will serve. As well, the history of the individual union, its development of policies and philosophies, determine which function the union will uphold. In unions where women were actively excluded from union membership, the historically conditioned processes that developed will have to be overcome in order for women to gain full acceptance.

In addition, the outside political order and societal ideology determines which functions unions will perform. The ideology of the general population and who is operating a particular national government will determine support given to unions and the ideology of democratic functioning (Korpi, 1983). Also the prevailing ideology and structure of women's role in a given society will determine what roles are socially structured for her in the workplace and the home.

Although not outlined by Godard's model, I argue that the functions of unions are also determined by the gender makeup of a union's membership and how active women are in those unions. Unions who have poor histories relating to women members and their issues, will likely be less responsive to their members. In addition, unions who operate within a purely economic function may not be as vital for women whose workplace issues move beyond the economic realm into the social democratic realm. The following discussion will focus on the functions that unions serve with a particular discussion on those functions for women.
b. Union Functions and Women

Economic Function;

The economic function of unions is concerned with the operation of unions to negotiate wages and benefits for its members. One of the major functions of many unions is to increase wages for its members. It is clear that unions have had a substantial economic effect on workers and the work process. Unions alter nearly every measurable aspect of the operation of a workplace. They raise wages substantially for members, alter packages of compensation, help workers determine rules and conditions of work, alter the way management deals with economic pressure, and are more productive than non-union work establishments (White, 1980; Hartmann et al, 1994). Because of the above effects, the labour position maintains that unions improve rather than harm the social economic system as a whole.

Most of the benefits women have gained from unions have been economic: unionization allows control over pay and working conditions; it ensures the benefits of a legally binding contract; it provides third party arbitration in case of irreconcilable disagreements between employer and employee; it enhances job security including health benefits and seniority; and it provides collective strength and a meeting forum. These benefits give power to workers, both men and women, over their work process (Kumar, 1993b). Further, unionized women workers receive higher pay and more equal
wages with men than do non-unionized women (White, 1980:58). The National Union of Provincial Government Employees (NUPGE) concluded, in 1986, that trade unions have influenced the level of women’s wages. ‘Considering there is a gap even among organized men compared to organized women, it is clear that without unions there would be an even greater wage gap for women’ (Gigantes, 1988). For example, in 1986 male teachers in Ontario earned an average of $17.77 under contract and $14.22 without a contract. Women earned $15.57 with a contract and $9.37 without a contract. Cuneo reports that in 1986, the Canadian Auto Workers (CAW) argued that unions have been beneficial for women based on the fact that women in unions make 72% of what men do in contrast to 62% for non-unionized women (1990:54-5). Similarly, Yanz and Smith (1984) report that, on average, the wage differential between women and men in unionized jobs is only 20% as compared with 40% in non-unionized jobs.

However, women do not have all of their economic needs addressed by unions. For example, the MGEU pursued different minimum wage rates for men and women throughout the 1950 and 1960’s (Smith, Bates, & Jones, 1995). Similarly, they did not play a role in the 1984 fight for pay equity legislation. Rather, this legislation was put forth by separate women’s groups and passed by a supportive government. The very fact that a wage gap still exists indicates that unions have not fully taken on the problem of pay equity. One of the problems
with unions taking on pay equity is that it questions the very basis on which work is structured. Equal pay for work of equal value questions what jobs serve the most valuable purpose in society at large. By questioning work structures, they threaten some less valuable but highly paid occupations that are male based. This makes it difficult to get support for pay equity issues from male union members.

*Democratic Function:*

The second function of unions, the democratic function, is defined by the ideological position that workers must be equally represented in an employee / employer relationship. In this sense, unions operate for that sole purpose. Under the democratic function of unions, unions provide workers with legal rights and protection against employers, collective representation, they regulate the exercise of managerial authority over members, and they, through their own structure, operate as a pure democratic institution.¹

In most cases, it is clear that the democratic function of unions did not occur for women. In fact, unions themselves have actively resisted women’s involvement and/or developed along lines that have neglected women’s needs. Basically, women were viewed as interlopers in the labour force and as less desirable union members because of their 'nature'. As

¹ There is literature which suggests that unions do not operate as pure democratic institutions and suggest that this is an idealist structure that has not yet been realized. See Godard, 1994: chapter 8.
women they were less militant, and too 'feminine', and work was not, nor should it be, their first priority. In addition, many unions felt their organizations might be weakened with the addition of women and the decision to keep them out was a defensive measure.

There are several historical accounts of exclusionary and discriminatory policies of many unions with regard to race and gender. Historically, men have tried to prevent women from entering trades and unions (Sangster, 1985). In Canada, women were excluded from the Knights of Labour until 1881 (Phillips and Phillips, 1983). Major unions actively fought against giving women equal pay for equal work (Sangster, 1985). Women that were organized in separate unions were rarely supported by male unions (Gabin, 1990). In 1898 the Trades and Labour Congress (TLC) called for the removal of all women from factories, mines, and all other industrial workplace (Phillips & Phillips, 1983).

There are also a host of other historical examples of unions not supporting women in their issues. For example, in 1950 the federal government enacted legislation which restricted women from receiving Unemployment Insurance if they left the workforce to be married. Unions did not fight against

---

2In the United States, the AFL newspaper the American Federalist in the early 20th century warned 'keep women out of the trade, and if not, out of the union.'

3The Moulders Unions in the USA (in late 19th century) gave members a $50.00 fine for instructing a woman in the work trade or on any union business.
this trend in legislation (Smith, Bates, and Jones, 1995). The Manitoba Government Employees Union did not challenge a provincial regulation from 1951 to 1962 which stated that 'No married women whose husband is living will be eligible for appointment to the civil service'.

While these policies themselves were obviously non-democratic in nature they also influenced women's views toward unions. Due to these types of policies and practices, women who were a part of the labour market often viewed unions as their enemies. Hartmann (1976) suggests that unions worked in conjunction with employers to keep women subservient to male bosses and workers. It is argued that these types of policies divided the working class along gender lines, keeping women in their traditional role in society (the private, reproductive sphere) and in the secondary labour market (characterized by low wages and poor benefits). In addition, White (1993) shows that in Canadian unions, women are under-represented in all areas of union leadership. Thus, the democratic function does not seem to be very applicable to women's experiences with unions.

Integrative Function;

The third function that unions perform is that of an integrative one. That is, unions give workers a sense of identity and belonging. However, the union movement began and grew the strongest in the primary sector of employment, industrial and craft unions, where the majority of members
were men. As a result, labour issues became synonymous with issues of work for men. Women's issues were not seen as labour issues largely because women were not seen as legitimate members of the workforce. Rose (1986) argues that the organizational strength of the male proletariat in the early years of industrialization was partly the product of a collective perception that low-paid female labour was a threat to male wages and masculinity. Historically, unions actively defended the patriarchal family in their fight for protective legislation for women and for the family wage which entrenched male leadership and female economic dependence (Fox & Fox, 1987:377). As a result of unions not integrating women, women workers did not readily identify with unions. Therefore, at least historically for women, a sense of belonging to a union was definitely lacking.

Social Democratic Function;

The fourth function of unions is a social democratic one. It can be argued that unions operate to further the well being of workers as a whole group, not just members of a particular union. Further, this position maintains that unions can be instruments for industrial democracy and serve as a prime constituency for a social democratic conception of society (Kuttner, 1986:33). They reduce the overall inequalities and contribute to, rather than detract from, economic and political freedom (Freeman and Medoff, 1987:303). For instance, in countries where unions are strong, such as
Sweden, the discrepancy between the wealthy and the poor is much less than in nations with labour forces which are not highly unionized, such as the United States (Olsen, 1990). Social unionists in Canada see collective bargaining as a way to improve wages and conditions of working people in general, not just in their own particular group. Social unionists are therefore active politically both directly (through coalitions, alliances, and lobby groups) as well as indirectly (through their affiliation with, for example, the New Democratic Party) (Godard, 1994).

For women, the idea of a social democratic function of unions seems like a breath of fresh air. Unions that operate on a social democratic basis would seem to be concerned with the general quality of life. However, much of union work remains focused on class issues. Issues that are important to women as a group, such as abortion, pornography, child abuse, and spousal abuse have rarely been taken on by unions as union issues (Ursel, 1992). Because of its focus on class as an issue, the issue of gender has been subverted.

Feminism is concerned with 'equal' rights and

---

4 Social Unionism is a term used to define a type of unionism that is socially based rather than capitalist based. It is a process whereby the connections between work lives and private lives are acknowledged and worked toward. It is further a process whereby decisions are reached by a less bureaucratic and more democratic and open practice.

5 The term 'equal' is concerned more with equal value of gender specific behaviours and equal opportunity regardless of gender in general than with equality specifically in relation to men and their already established groups.
opportunities for women across class divisions, not within one. Further, Feldberg (1987) argues that there has been little awareness of the differences that women workers bring to the workplace. Male issues, reified as the only type of work issues, are seen as defining issues of work for women. For example, in discussing employment equity, it is assumed that women are striving to be equal with already established male groups. In this sense, the male defined way of work is held as the standard or touchstone of what women should seek to achieve. This is often not what women require. Sadly, male unionists have forgotten that women (and their unique concerns) are also a part of the working class (Cockburn, 1984). While labour has made attempts to redistribute the profits of capital to labour, it has done little to redistribute profits among the different sectors of labour. That is, the labour movement has not fully taken into account all of the cultural and gender differences that exist within it or questioned these differences. Instead, it has remained focused on class, and not the differences within classes. Essentially, because unions are male-dominated, male-based, and developed from a male perspective, they operate as patriarchal institutions. Hence, it is questionable whether a patriarchal institution can address the problems of patriarchy. To this point, patriarchy has not been conceived of as a labour issue and class issues continue to take precedence as labour issues.
Based on this, some feminist writers argue that unionization is an inadequate strategy for women to reach their goals. Even if the social democratic function of unions is the most acceptable function for women, it must be augmented with a discussion of gender democracy which will speak to the connected nature of women's public and private lives.

Revolutionary Function:

The fifth and final possible function of unions is that of a revolutionary or class conflict function. Here, unions are expected to play a role in the overthrow of employer capitalism and its replacement by a new, more democratic order (Godard, 1994:219). The role unions may play in the overthrow varies. Some see unions as tools of workers while others see unions as subsidiaries or educational tools for a massive political movement. This function, while important for some parts of the world, is of less importance in this discussion.6

C. Summary

Women in unions push unions to go one step further - to address their issues in their way. Unions, if they are to represent women, must give much higher priority to low pay, to sexual harassment, to domestic labour, and to child care

6 For a discussion on revolution and feminism, see Marie Marmo Mullaney, Revolutionary Women: Gender and the Socialist Revolutionary Role. New York, Praeger, 1983.
(Cockburn, 1984:46). So far, most unions have not been able to fulfill that function for women. If they do not challenge the broader societal division of labour that gives women dual responsibility for production and reproduction, women will remain enmeshed in a sex-segregated, low waged, unorganized sector of the economy. To address whether the union movement can be used to further feminist goals, a discussion of feminism and unionism must be addressed.

II. Feminism and Unionism

Gabin argues that while unionism delimits feminism it does not preclude it (1990:234). Although feminist and labour movements do not share the same theoretical tenants, they do have the possibility of 'feeding off' one another. A goal of feminism is democracy and equal value between men and women. The labour movement is concerned with democracy and equality between workers and owners of the workplace. Thus, the two are somewhat congruent. The alliance, however, is not simple. Sharing similar goals is not enough. Theoretically, problems begin to arise when the unit of analysis is addressed.

Jerry White argues that the union movement and the feminist movement must change to accommodate one another:
'Gender does not subsume class nor does class subsume gender. Class relations and gender relations are part of the mosaic; they condition each other. To ignore gender creates a two-dimensional and often patriarchal vision of the relationships within class and between classes. It takes us outward to the farthest reaches of structuralism, when what we really want to do is to understand the relationship between structure and agency. At the same time, the move to looking at only gender relations may create a blind spot for the structural class relations and wider political economy. In industrial relations we can afford neither.'

(1990b:215)

Historically, feminism has been a movement that traditionally focused on middle and upper class women and often excluded lower class women (Sangster, 1985). Contrastingly, the labour movement focuses on working class groups. Hence, there is some degree of conflict between the two groups. It can be argued that feminist bias prevents feminists from allying with working people and that male unionists gain too much from the patriarchal and sexist structure to support women's liberation (Balser, 1987:35). Feminists who are also unionists, struggle with how to integrate their commitment to both causes. Franzway, Court and Connell ask:

'How far can the structure of the union movement be challenged [by feminism] without undermining the collective principles of unionism? How viable or useful are autonomous women's organizations during a period of corporatism, where the top level connection of union organization with the state puts enormous pressures on the whole movement? Yet how can the impetus to tackle the oppression of women in and around work be sustained and amplified without the collective activity of women unionists supported by organizations of their own?' (1989:166)
Milkman coins the term "trade union feminism" to account for this rise in consciousness among feminist trade unionists (1985:309). It has represented a gradual yet significant shift in socialist feminist theorizing and agency. Franzway, Court and Connell discuss the position of a femocrat\(^7\) and women's union activities as similar. Both represent strategic activity of women working within the system for structural change. For feminism, unionization can be seen as a specific focus within a larger women's liberation movement. Feminist unionists must incorporate the idea that the personal is political and fight to address the linkages between gender inequality in the workplace and gender inequality in the home, marriage, and general society. The women's movement for legal and social rights and working women's movement for economic rights affect each others development. It is important to note a wide range of issues that are important to women's 'equality'. For instance abortion and wage controls are equally important when struggling for women's 'equality'. Briskin argues that women workers have pushed both movements to recognize that each has a stake in the political struggles of the other, and that women cannot separate their interests as workers from their interests as women (1984:25).

\(^7\) The term 'femocrat' is unique to Australia and New Zealand. Sometimes spoken pejoratively, it refers to those women appointed to work in 'women's affairs' and women's units in the state bureaucracy. It is now expanding to include feminist bureaucrats who seek to work on behalf of women, whatever be their position with government (Franzway, Court, & Connell, 1989:133-134).
Cockburn et al (1984) discuss employing a dual strategy. This dual strategy is aimed at balancing the ideas of disengagement and main-streaming. The first part of the strategy is to have separate women's organizations. These organizations will give women space and time to collectively explore and define their own particular needs. The second part to the strategy is to feminize existing structures. This consists of developing strategies for raising these needs (developed in the first part) as legitimate trade union concerns by utilizing institutions such as mainstream trade unions to address these needs. Some of this strategy has manifested itself in the formation of women's committees and affirmative action positions on union executives.

Unions must make an effort to organize women's issues within unions for the benefit of both parties. To some degree, unions have taken on the task. Most Canadian unions have policies against sexual harassment and several have developed strong women's committees. Unions must also relate the ideas of the interrelatedness of work and non work experiences. Therefore, when revisiting the issue of union functions, it seems clear that unions must function in a social democratic way for women. Women must be looked at as both workers and women. There must be an incorporation of feminist issues and theory within the labour movement. Hence, feminism offers a new and unique way of understanding the relationship between the individual person and the group. The union movement can
help to rebuild itself through utilizing feminism.

Feldberg (1987) argues that more than just a change in attitude is necessary. There is a need to create and recreate structures that allow women the space to define and implement their own priorities. This will enable the labour movement to widen its base of power and influence in the society at large in the move toward democracy and to truly represent working people.

The term given to this movement is the 'feminization of the labour movement'. Four processes in the movement toward cooperations between feminism and unionism can be identified:

(1) Growth of unionization among working women. This includes the organizing of women who are not yet organized by addressing the possibilities of desegregating working women. It also includes developing skills and self-reliance of women in the union movement. This can be achieved by increasing participation of women in the labour movement as a whole and also includes the exercise of leadership from a feminist perspective.

(2) Steps taken toward bringing a feminist perspective to unionization and toward integrating gender and work issues (double oppression of women) (Balser, 1987:29). Gender must be recognized as an important issue. This can be seen in the

---

8 This term refers to not only the increasing numbers of women in the labour movement, but also to the incorporation (and attempts to incorporate) feminist ideas and process with the labour movement. Briskin and McDermott term this 'The Feminization of Militancy' (1993).
development of Women’s Committees in unions which are in effect sub-groups of the larger organization which monitor the interaction between women and the union, develops women’s issues, and raises consciousness among its members. Kumar argues that unions must pay specific attention to the needs and situation of women in all union decision making processes by increasing issues of concern to women in collective bargaining negotiations (1993a:207). Pragmatically, bringing a feminist perspective to unions must consist of increasing the representation and participation of women in individual unions. Participation must be present in all levels of unions, from rank and file to leadership roles. As Cuneo states, ‘ultimate power in the labour movement rests in the formal positions at the top...Women cannot completely empower themselves by remaining excluded from formal positions...without women in key leadership positions, it would be impossible to have women’s interests reflected in union policies (1993:119).

(3) Steps should be taken to resolve the direct conflicts, such as what issues are put on the bargaining agendas, what policies the unions undertake (e.g. affirmative action) between feminists and unions at large and small levels. This is an attempt to improve the relations with organized and organizing women and men.

(4) There must be a focus on reproduction by the labour movement. Unions must recognize the gender bias that exists in
the labour market and the labour movement, and by doing so understand the differently connected nature of women's work and private lives. Therefore, unions must take into account reproduction by focusing on reproductive issues. In order to do so, unions must not only change the issues that they address, but incorporate women into their structures.

If these four steps are undertaken, the resulting union structure would be a feminist one that will address women's roles as both workers and reproducers. While these steps are essential, they have not yet been achieved. Unions have not whole-heartedly taken on the feminization of the labour movement (Phillips and Phillips, 1983 & 1993; Julie White, 1980 & 1994; Balser 1987; Feldberg, 1987; Franzway et al, 1989; Jerry White, 1990a&b & Gabin, 1990).

All four strategies outlined above point to the need for women to obtain positions of leadership in unions. This is the first step toward the feminization of the labour movement and toward making unions work for women. To date, women in the labour movement are under-represented in all positions of leadership. This under-representation is exemplified in the following chapter.
CHAPTER THREE: THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN UNIONS TODAY

In various institutions across Canada, women are underrepresented in leadership roles. In universities, in large corporations, in politics, and in unions, women, in both numbers and ideas, do not adequately reflect the population of women.

The following discussion will address the representation of women in positions of leadership within various unions across Canada. The gaps in representation of women in the tables that follow can be attributed to the things discussed in chapters one and two. These are specifically, the history of the women’s involvement in the labour movement, the history of a particular union, the history of a particular industry and its relation to women, union policies such as affirmative action, and union structure and how it relates to women and their issues. Although this chapter addresses unions across Canada, it will focus on the position of the MGEU in comparison to other Canadian unions.

In Canada, women have entered the workforce in remarkable numbers since the 1960’s. Between 1976 and 1993, total employment in Canada increased by 31%. Women accounted for 78% of that increase (Statistics Canada: Labour Force Annual Averages, 1993; A3). Nearly all the increase was found in the service producing industries with part-time employment doubling in this time period. Women’s employment increased in all occupational areas including white collar, professional,
service, clerical and sales, and blue collar occupations (see table 3.1).

**TABLE 3.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Collar Work</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar Work</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professionals</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial &amp; Administrative</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As women's employment increased, their rate of unionization also grew remarkably. Women union members increased by 34% between 1983 and 1991. Male membership grew by only 4% in the same time period. Women accounted for 81% of all the growth in total union membership in Canada between 1983 and 1991 (Statistics Canada: Women in the Labour Force: 1994: 58). In 1992, women represented 41.3% of all Canadian union members (CALURA, Labour Unions, 1992:14). Table 3.2 shows the percentage of women members in Canadian Unions between 1962-1992.
While these numbers may be encouraging, women are still less unionized than men. In 1990, 31% of Canadian women workers were in unions compared to 38% of Canadian male workers (Briskin & McDermott, 1993:4). See table 3.3 for further comparison.
TABLE 3.3
Canadian Union Membership by type of Union- 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union Membership</th>
<th>total in 000's</th>
<th>percent male</th>
<th>percent female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Unions</td>
<td>1,156.7</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Unions</td>
<td>2,160.7</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Unions</td>
<td>548.7</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,866.1</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistics Canada, CALURA, 1992:14

One might suspect that women would hold a powerful role in unions based on their increasing membership, but this is not the case. Women are under-represented in almost all areas of union business (White, 1993; Kumar, 1993a; Lawrence, 1994). This under-representation is important when we look at how unions operate. Union leaders are elected directly or indirectly by union memberships, bargaining goals are established by participatory mechanisms, tentative collective bargaining agreements must be ratified by a vote of the membership or a body (delegates) elected by the membership, and strikes must be authorized by a membership vote (Flanagan, 1993:7). While it may seem that unions are collective institutions, their actual operation resembles that of governments in that they are operated primarily by elected officials. Unions differ in their structure, but most unions elect people to take care of them and their workplace needs. Members elect boards of directors, executive committees at
various levels, negotiating committees, and a host of standing committees. It is safe to conclude that union members relinquish considerable authority to their leaders. Although elected members are supposed to represent their members' interests, some people argue that personal preferences of union leaders and the actual structure of union business (e.g. setting agenda issues) negates the ability of the membership to directly control decisions that are made.\(^9\)

Since unions are groups made up of heterogeneous sectors of different ages, races, occupations, and locations, knowledge about the structure of the leadership is important in determining who makes decisions and who puts issues on the agenda for change. Are people from different backgrounds, races, ages and gender, equally represented on boards, executives, delegates, and committee members? To what extent do union officers reflect and represent their membership? One of the criteria outlined in the previous chapter stated that in order to bring a feminist perspective to unions, there must be an increase in the representation and participation of women in individual unions. Participation must be present in all levels of unions, from rank and file to leadership roles. The following will address the level of leadership of women in unions across Canada.

---

I. THE LEVELS OF LEadership AND Women

Julie White (1994) identifies five areas of union leadership: top executive positions of provincial and national unions, local presidents and executives, heads of union committees, delegates to convention, and union staff. The following briefly discusses women's involvement at each of these levels.

a. Executive Positions

Those who hold executive positions in unions at local and national levels have the jobs of making and instituting policy. In 1990, Julie White interviewed and surveyed women in labour centrals and women from thirteen other unions at various levels, and concluded that women were under-represented in all leadership levels.

Labour centrals are organizing bodies that various labour unions (both public and private) affiliate with. In Canada, there exists a national central, the Canadian Labour Congress, which acts as an organizing body for the provincial centrals. They are one of the most powerful voices representing union members. In examining labour centrals, it was found that women are under-represented in all labour central executive positions. For example, the CLC membership is 37% women, but only 26% of its larger executive council and 17% of its smaller executive are women. Further, women comprise 50% of
the membership of the Confederation des Syndicats Nationaux but 33% of its executive are women. The pattern continues among provincial labour federations (see table 3.4). Of the women in these leadership positions, it is interesting to note that of the 98 executive seats held by women, 39 (40%) are affirmative action seats. Without these, the representation of women on these labour central executives would fall from 29% to 18% (White, 1993:105).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LABOUR CENTRAL</th>
<th># WOMEN ON EXECUTIVE</th>
<th>TOTAL # PEOPLE ON EXECUTIVE</th>
<th>PERCENT OF WOMEN ON EXECUTIVE</th>
<th>AFFIRMATIVE ACTION SEATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCFL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFL</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QFL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBFL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSFL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEIPL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLFL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS:</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J. White, *Sisters and Solidarity*, 1993, p.103:Table 4-3.
With regard to unions as opposed to labour centrals, there is some evidence that the absolute numbers of women on national executive boards have increased. However, this change has not kept pace with the increases in the numbers of women joining unions (Cuneo, 1993:126). In 1990, women represented 30% of all unionized members yet accounted for only 17% of all executive board members (Jerry White, 1990). For example, in 1986, women made up 49% of all CUPE members yet only 25% of CUPE national board members were women. In 1989, one out of 84 (1.2%) of all executive board members in international unions were women, in national unions 557 out of 2228 (25%) board members were women, and in government unions 20 out of 156 (12.8%) board members were women. See Table 3.5.
Within NUPGE, the national union comprising all of the provincial government employees unions, under-representation of women is evident also. Within each component of NUPGE, the top level of leadership form an executive committee. This executive committee provides leadership for an executive council or board of directors which is a larger executive body. As table 3.6 shows, eight of ten provincial employees unions have an average gap of 37% between the percent of women as members and the percent of women as members of executive
committee. Further, there is an average of 25% difference between the percent of women as members and the percent of women on the board of directors.

**TABLE 3.6**

Women's Representation on Executive and Boards of Provincial Employees Unions - 1989

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNION</th>
<th>WOMEN % MEMBERS</th>
<th>% WOMEN ON EXEC.</th>
<th>GENDER GAP* ON EXEC.</th>
<th>% WOMEN ON BOARD OR COUNCIL</th>
<th>GENDER GAP* ON BOARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUPGE</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-39%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPE</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSGEU</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-40%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEIUPE</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLBEU</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPSEU</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGEU</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-55%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>-43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGEU</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-39%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUPE</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>+6%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSA</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCGEU</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>-26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Gender Gap is used to identify an over or under-representation of a particular gender within a given category. A negative indicates women are under-represented in those positions. A positive indicates women are over represented in those positions.

For the purposes of this study we are concerned with the MGEU. As table 3.6 shows, the MGEU had the lowest percent of women as executive committee members (zero) in 1989. This has
changed slightly since that time. The percentage of women members in the MGEU has grown by 2% between 1989 and 1995. The MGEU also reports that, in 1995, two of the executive committee members were women. This reduces the gender gap from -55% to -17%. It is extremely important when looking at the leadership structure of the MGEU to note that women remain under-represented.

This pattern also repeats itself in other unions. As Julie White found, the gaps between the percent of women members, and the percent of women on executives and as local presidents is evident in all 11 unions she studied in 1990. The highest gap was 37% and the lowest was 3%. Six of the ten unions had gaps larger than 20%. See table 3.7.
### TABLE 3.7
Women as Executive Members and Presidents of Canadian Union Locals - 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNION</th>
<th>% WOMEN MEMBERS</th>
<th>% WOMEN ON EXEC.</th>
<th>GENDER GAP* ON EXEC.</th>
<th>% WOMEN LOCAL PRES.</th>
<th>GENDER GAP * AS LOCAL PRES.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNA</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEIU</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAS</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERE**</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCGEU</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPE</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSAC</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFCW</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-37%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSSTF</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWC</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAW</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Gender Gap is used to identify an over or under-representation of a particular gender within a given category. A negative indicates women are under-represented in those positions. A positive indicates women are over represented in those positions.

**HERE** is an international union that does not have a Canadian executive.

Further, of those women holding leadership positions, Chaison and Andiappan report the following:
When compared to their male counterparts, women officers are more often secretaries, secretary treasurers or treasurers and less often presidents; they serve in the smallest locals, derive less of their income from union work and devote fewer hours per week to union activities. Women officers are frequently from locals with majorities of female officers and members. They have better chances of reaching office in locals where there are large proportions of female members.... Finally, almost three quarters of the women reached office by appointment, uncontested elections or elections in which there was no male opposition. (1987:282)

While women make up 56% of the total NUPGE membership, only 1/3 of local presidents were women while 2/3 of secretaries were women. CUPE and CSN found similar patterns.

It is, however, important to recognize that some women have been leaders of unions nationally and provincially. For example, the current Vice-President of the CLC - Nancy Rich, the former CUPE, OPSEU, AFL, SFL, and NSFL president - Judy Darcy, current president of the Winnipeg Labour Council - Heather Grant, and former president of the Manitoba Federation of Labour - Susan Hart Kulbabba. However, when put into historical perspective, the few female leaders over the number of years unions have operated seems to be the exception rather than the rule.
b. Committees and Bargaining

Positions on committees, especially bargaining committees are extremely important positions for unionists. Standing committee members are appointed by executive members to make up various types of committees such as finance, grievance, employee assistance, and numerous other committees. These committees counsel the executive and aid them in carrying out many parts of union work. Membership in these committees, particularly the chairs, are important ways for members to develop leadership skills and gain recognition in a leadership role. In a survey of their members, NUPGE found that of their ten components, women make up 56% of total membership, but they make up 33% of committee members and 30% of chairs of those committees. A breakdown of NUPGE components can be found in table 3.8.
TABLE 3.8
Women as Members and Chairs of NUPGE Component Committees - 1989

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>WOMEN AS % OF MEMBERS</th>
<th>% WOMEN CHAIRS **</th>
<th>GENDER GAP* AS CHAIRS</th>
<th>WOMEN AS % CTTEE MEMBERS **</th>
<th>GENDER GAP* AS CTTEE MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAPE</td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>+20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSGEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEIUPE</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLBEU</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPSEU</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGEU</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGEU</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUPE</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSA</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCGEU</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>56 %</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NUPGE, National Union Affirmative Action Survey, 1989:5

* Gender Gap is used to identify an over or under-representation of a particular gender within a given category. A negative indicates women are under-represented in those positions. A positive indicates women are over represented in those positions.

**This does not include women's committees

Once again, when paying specific attention to the MGEU, we can see that it has one of the highest gaps of under-representation of women. MGEU women make up only 37% of all
committee members and are the chair of only one out of 11 committees. In comparison to the other unions, the MGEU and the SGEU have the largest gaps of under-representation for women in all provincial employees unions across Canada. See table 3.8A for a breakdown of women members of standing committees in the MGEU.

**TABLE 3.8A**

Male Female Count on MGEU Standing Committees – 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE NAME</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>TOTAL MEMBERS</th>
<th>GENDER GAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+ 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>- 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>- 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>- 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological Change</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety, Health, &amp; Environment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Assistance Program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+ 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Reform</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>- 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes We Can Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>- 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+ 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Privatization</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>- 14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Gender Gap is used to identify an over or under-representation of a particular gender within a given category. A negative indicates women are under-represented in those positions. A positive indicates women are over represented in those positions.
Based on the fact that women make up 57% of the MGEU membership, table 3.8A shows that women are under-represented in 8 of the 11 committees of the MGEU and over-represented on three. On those committees where women are under-represented, the average under-representation of 27.6%. In total, women make up 43% of members on standing committees. When we remove the Women’s Committee from the equation, we see that women’s participation drops to 33% of members and translates to a gap of -24%. It is important to remember that being well represented is a key to having issues heard. As Cuneo states, without women in key leadership positions, it would be impossible to have women’s interests reflected in union policies (1993:119). This is especially relevant to Manitoba women workers who are facing much of the brunt of the neo-conservative privatization movement as was exemplified in the 1996 Home-Care strike. Yet when we look at women’s representation on the anti-privatization standing committee, we see that women are under-represented by a staggering 32%. It is clear that there is cause for concern when it comes to issues, which impact specifically on women, being addressed by standing committees where women are greatly under-represented.

Of all union committees, bargaining committees are the ones that hold the most responsibility and time commitment. Negotiating experience is the key to developing authority and credibility in a union. Experience on these committees is
often the road to the improvement of ones status within unions and create a pathway for future union power. In addition it is also a key to gaining a voice in and giving a voice to issues that are especially important to women. Bargaining committees are a route to higher level executive and staff positions. Women’s under-representation on these committees can help to explain women’s lack of power in unions in general. See table 3.9.

In looking at the MGEU, women fair somewhat better on bargaining committees than as leaders. MGEU women are equally represented on bargaining committees, but are highly under-represented on master contract committees, by 37%.
TABLE 3.9
Women as Members of NUPGE Component
Bargaining Committees – 1989

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNION</th>
<th>WOMEN AS % OF MEMBERS</th>
<th>% WOMEN BARGAINING COMMITTEE</th>
<th>GENDER GAP* ON BARGAINING CTTEE</th>
<th>% WOMEN MASTER CONTRACT COMMITTEE</th>
<th>GENDER GAP* ON MASTER CONTRACT COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCGEU</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>-24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUPE</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGEU</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPSEU</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEIUPSE</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSGEU</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPE</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Gender Gap is used to identify an over or under-representation of a particular gender within a given category. A negative indicates women are under-represented in those positions. A positive indicates women are over represented in those positions.

c. Delegates to Convention

Convention delegates play an important role in unions and are responsible for electing executive members, establishing general policy, and making constitutional and financial changes for unions. Representation in this area is extremely important for ensuring equal voting power between the genders. Table 3.10 shows under-representation is evident in the components of NUPGE. The participation of component women
members at the various union conventions does not reflect the proportion of women members in the components. The best level of representation is reported for the component union conventions at 41% which still represents a gap of 15%. Women were the most under-represented as delegates to the CLC conventions, where they were under-represented by 23%.

MGEU women are well represented when it comes to union delegates, but fall behind considerably when sending delegates to national conventions, CLC conventions, and federation of labour conventions. Women are under-represented by 32%, 37%, and 22% respectively. Compared to other unions, MGEU percent of women delegates to CLC are seriously below the average, by 15%, and 10% below the average of national delegates. The MGEU remains fairly consistent with other unions with regard to union and federation of labour delegates. However, women are still under-represented in all categories in all unions.
TABLE 3.10
NUPGE Component Women Delegates to Conventions- 1989

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNION</th>
<th>WOMEN AS % MEMBERS</th>
<th>WOMEN AS % OF UNION DELEGATES</th>
<th>WOMEN AS % OF NATIONAL DELEGATE</th>
<th>WOMEN AS % OF CLC DELEGATES</th>
<th>WOMEN AS % FED OF LABOUR DELEGATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Gender Gap*</td>
<td>% Gender Gap*</td>
<td></td>
<td>% Gender Gap*</td>
<td>% Gender Gap*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSA</td>
<td>87 %</td>
<td>78% -9%</td>
<td>66% -21%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>75% -12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCGEU</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34 -22</td>
<td>26 -31</td>
<td>33% -24%</td>
<td>42 -15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUPE</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>45 -16</td>
<td>48 -13</td>
<td>48 -13</td>
<td>43 -18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGEU</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35 -21</td>
<td>57 +1</td>
<td>34 -22</td>
<td>34 -22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGEU</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44 -11</td>
<td>23 -32</td>
<td>18 -37</td>
<td>33 -22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLBEU</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12 -23</td>
<td>0 -35</td>
<td>20 -15</td>
<td>25 -10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPSEU</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38 -16</td>
<td>36 -18</td>
<td>38 -16</td>
<td>40 -14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEIUPSE</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42 -16</td>
<td>20 -38</td>
<td>16 -42</td>
<td>43 -15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSGEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42 -18</td>
<td>45 -15</td>
<td>20 -40</td>
<td>31 -29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33 -17</td>
<td>14 -36</td>
<td>33 -17</td>
<td>36 -14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>56 %</td>
<td>41% -15</td>
<td>34% -22</td>
<td>33% -23</td>
<td>39% -17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NUPGE, National Union Affirmative Action Survey, 1989:16

* Gender Gap is used to identify an over or under-representation of a particular gender within a given category. A negative indicates women are under-represented in those positions. A positive indicates women are over represented in those positions.

d. Staff Positions

Staff positions are hired positions that are filled from the rank and file members. They act as a support system for the general union membership and help members with various union issues. There is a further distinction between staff
members, those hired for head office work and those hired for field work. Field workers are in direct contact with rank and file members and are in a positions to influence certain issues at a grassroots level, while those in the office are somewhat secluded from development of certain issues. White found that more women are hired for positions in the head offices and less in the field. Although there is no research to support this claim, it may be possible that this inhibits or even discourages development of women's issues at grassroots levels. See table 3.11 for a breakdown of women service staff.
### TABLE 3.11
Women Service Staff in Canadian Unions - 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNION</th>
<th>% Women as Members</th>
<th>% Women Staff</th>
<th>Gender Gap*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNA</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEIU</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAS</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERE</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGEU</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCGEU</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPE</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPE</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSAC</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFCW</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSSTF</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWC</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAW</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USWA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Gender Gap is used to identify an over or under-representation of a particular gender within a given category. A negative indicates women are under-represented in those positions. A positive indicates women are over-represented in those positions.

J. White, *Sisters and Solidarity*, 1993, p.115, Table 4-5.

The MGEU has 22 male staff and 20 female staff. While this seems equal on the surface (only a -9% gap), this equality disappears when we break down the categories of
staff. Table 3.11A shows us that women hold all of the support positions and none of the management positions. When it comes to the technical staff, women make up only 30% of those staff.

**TABLE 3.11A**

MGEU Staff by Sex - 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF TYPE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Technical staff include professional and special project staff.

II. Summary

It is thus evident that women are significantly under-represented in positions of power within unions which creates a major problem for them. For the most part, the leadership structure of unions does not reflect the gender composition of their membership. This is especially true of the MGEU. In comparison to other unions, women were under-represented to a greater degree than women of other unions. This is true of all positions; leadership, committees, and delegates to convention.

Based on the status of women in unions presented above, it is clear that there is a need to feminize the labour movement. The process that this should take is based on the
steps outlined at the end of chapter two. One of the strategies to feminize the labour movement is to increase the exercise of leadership from a feminist perspective. This undeniably includes increasing the representation and participation of women in individual unions. By doing so, women will put themselves in positions of power which will enable them to address issues of special importance to them. However, how this process takes place is dependent on how a particular union functions. The functions of unions, as outlined above, are dependent on a variety of things. These include the location of a particular industry in the labour market, the outside political order, the composition of leadership, and the history of an individual union, specifically the development of its policies and philosophies (Godard, 1994). It is at this point that we need to discuss the individual history of the MGEU and how it impacted on women's current position in the MGEU.
CHAPTER FOUR:

THE HISTORY OF ORGANIZING MANITOBA GOVERNMENT WORKERS

Women's struggle in the Manitoba Government Employees Union has been a long one. Early on women and men fought for the same issues separately. Men and women workers faced anti-labour groups, and right wing and neo-conservative governments. In addition, women were faced with an ideology that suggested that they did not belong in the workforce and/or were inferior when they did work. The role women played in reproduction had a tremendous impact on women's entry into the labour force. Early in the 1900's women were legally excluded from the paid labour market so that their labour could be reserved for reproduction. Later in the century, women's subordinate position was used by capital as it expanded its markets. Currently, the position of women in the workforce has been affected by patriarchy and has had an impact on the way women were absorbed by the labour movement.

a. The Creation of the Province 1870 to General Strike 1919

Manitoba, especially Winnipeg, was marked by a strong labour movement early in its history. At this time women played a significant, but separate role from men. In 1871, the first government was appointed and the first bureaucracy developed. Working conditions for all workers from factory workers to government workers were less than favourable.
combat these conditions, a host of socialist parties grew from Winnipeg’s working class who vigorously criticized the government’s politics, favouritism, and patronage.

During this time, a separate women’s movement in Winnipeg also gained momentum. Originating in the Women’s Labour League and the Local Council of Women, a suffrage campaign was sparked, as a fight for decent salaries and working conditions. The suffrage campaign win in 1916 (the first in Canada) received mixed support from male unionists. This success was hard fought in the face of sexism and sarcasm. For instance, upon an inspection of a local factory, Premier Roblin suggested that ‘women worked because they wanted pin money...extravagant women were the curse of the age...don’t let kind hearts run away (with us), women have to learn how money comes’. In contrast, a survey of Toronto working women in 1928 found that women’s labour was necessary to support working-class families and that women worked outside the home out of need (Smith, Bates and Jones, 1994:17).

At this time, women’s employment also changed. With the rising bureaucracy, there was an increased need for clerical workers. Clerical work was one of the few opportunities for women. As men aspired to managerial jobs, more clerical jobs were filled by women. But women were less likely to advance in the civil service. In the public service, women’s wages were lower than men’s wages.
Many women working for the provincial government made below the subsistence level of $10 per week, particularly women engaged in manual work, such as cleaning, cooking, working in laundries and so on. A seamstress at the industrial training school in Portage made $20 a month in 1915. A waitress at the school for the deaf made $300 a year, and a hospital worker $336 a year. (Smith, Bates & Jones, 1994:16)

The first government unions, the Manitoba Government Telephone Workers (MGTW) and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW), were established in 1911. In 1918 it was reported that a local of IBEW representing telephone operators was the largest organization of women workers in the country. However, Smith, Bates, & Jones (1994) suggest that these were traditional industrial based unions that did not pursue policies specifically for women. These patriarchal practices became entrenched in labour policies keeping women in their traditional reproductive roles.

In 1917 the Federation of Civic Employees was founded. At the same time the Manitoba labour movement became increasingly militant. In response to the government’s refusal to negotiate with all unions, several strikes (including sympathy strikes), took place culminating in the General Strike of 1919.

b. 1920 to the Depression Years

After the general strike, the Manitoba Government Employees established the Manitoba Civil Service Association (MCSA) which was recognized as a charitable and patriotic organization rather than a trade union. There were no ties to
the radical reformist One Big Union and individuals could not belong to the MCSA if they were a member of a union. All executive members were of British descent and male. There were five women out of 24 members. Rarely were work issues in general, let alone women’s issues in particular, raised by the MCSA. The MCSA died in the mid-twenties, and broke off into several sports, social, and theatre clubs known as provincial clubs. An attempt was made to revise it in 1935 with limited success but it was not re-established until 1942.

Due to the inactive stance of the MCSA, and because there was no formal organization to represent all government workers during the depression, some workplaces organized unions on their own. The first workers to organize into a union were those of the Brandon Mental Hospital who established the Mental Hospital Attendants Federation Labour Union in 1926. In a unique step for its time, both male and female workers became part of the union. The union pressured the government on a variety of work issues and as a result, a Royal Commission was established to study the working conditions at the hospital. In its report, the commissioners agreed that working conditions and hours of work were unfair. They recommended the implementation of guidelines on the amount of time someone should work including a day off per week for all employees. However, no mention was made in the report about the inequality of women’s wages or the inequality of work rules, nor did the association raise it as a work issue. This
was the case even though a large number of people employed at the hospital were women who made substantially less than did men. For example, male attendants made $900 per year and female attendants only $600. Male supervisors made $1,020 per year and female supervisors only $750 per year. In addition, women were subject to rules that did not apply to men. For example, if unmarried women were found out past 10:30 p.m. or were found to be drinking alcohol they were dismissed from their jobs. No such rules applied to men.

We can see from this example that women were a cheap source of labour in comparison to men. The different rules are also a reflection of the patriarchal attitudes requiring women to uphold certain virtues which required a strict set of moral behaviours.

These rules alone are obvious examples of the patriarchal nature of the workplace in the early 1900's in Manitoba. The fact that the union representing these workers didn't address the wage discrepancies or the differential rules is a clear example that, in addition to the workplace, unions reflected the patriarchal ideologies of the time. It is also indicative of the attitudes and process that unions further used to guide them in their development.

In other workplaces, women were not represented by unions. Instead, separatism between the sexes again prevailed. Largely because of the inactive and patriarchal stance of the labour unions and governments of the time, women had to look
elsewhere for support for their issues. For women, there were few organizations that questioned government dealings with employees or addressed broader social issues. Women themselves founded two organizations that questioned government and offered financial help to those affected by the depression. These organizations were the Women’s Service Bureau (comprised of four groups) and the Commercial Girl’s Club. These organizations collected money (25 cents per cheque) from employed women in the civil service to assist unemployed women and raise issues of concern to all women with the government. Among these issues were questions about adequate working conditions and the large amounts of women being laid off from the civil service. At this time however, the government was unresponsive to women and their concerns. The government response was that ‘because of their ‘peculiar talents’, women were suited to specific jobs, and those jobs did not require any workers, therefore it was impossible to do anything for women’ (Smith, Bates, and Jones, 1994).

In addition to wage discrepancies, rules for moral behaviour, and attitudes toward women’s work skills, the civil service also explicitly discriminated against married women. For example, in 1937, only ten married women held permanent positions in the government, and three held non permanent positions. The government was not in support of employing married women and kept extensive records on their and their husbands incomes.
c. The Second World War

The Second World War had a tremendous impact on the economy of Canada. In 1942 the MCSA was re-established. This time it was organized into units based on provincial departments, with each having its own executive. There was a central council to oversee the organization as a whole. Although the MCSA was not a union, it did handle some grievances in cases where one was 'exceptionally adept at her job'. In one example, the MCSA unsuccessfully bargained for a secretary to receive an increase in salary (although she would still make less than her male predecessor). The MCSA claimed they achieved equality for women. However, in discussions with the government about a cost of living raise, the MCSA suggested a bonus for women that was half of what the bonus was for men (Smith, Bates, and Jones, 1994).

Under the auspices of the War Measures Act which gave the federal government jurisdiction over all labour matters in 1944, Privy Council Order 1003 guaranteed the certification of workers into unions following certain guidelines. When labour returned to provincial jurisdiction after World War II, the Manitoba Government enacted the new Labour Relations Act in 1948 which replicated the Privy Council Order 1003. Although there was some concern about the impact of this legislation by many unions across Canada, the MCSA did not express any of those concerns. This lack of analysis of the possible inequalities of labour legislation for women was indicative of
the stance of the labour movement with regard to women workers (Fudge, 1993).

d. From Association to Union

At the 1950 convention, the MCSA changed their name to the Manitoba Government Employees Association (MGEA). The MGEA leadership was made up of 13 men and one woman.

The MGEA’s concern for women workers was similar to that of the MCSA. It also reflected the status of women in society at large. At this time employers were using women’s subordinate position to fill the secondary labour market. It is also the time when the welfare state was expanding its social services. Women were implicated in both of these processes by fulfilling many of those expanding jobs in the service sector. This is the time that we see women’s labour being pulled between the reproductive sphere (home) and the productive sphere (workplace). The entry of women in the work force on a more permanent basis also marks the time when women began a more permanent relationship with the union movement.

The relationship of women workers with the MGEA was fraught with the same patriarchal processes that were present in the labour market. Many policies and practices of the MGEA were similar to those practices that had historically guided the MCSA. While the MGEA questioned the governments dismissal of communists from the civil service and the age restrictions of workers, they did little to support the rights of working
women. For instance, a civil service regulation adopted in 1951 stated that "No married women whose husband is living shall be eligible for appointment to the civil service". This regulation remained in effect until 1962. For the eleven years that the regulation was in force, the MGEA never challenged it. In fact, while the MGEA pursued a policy for a minimum rate of pay for married men - a rate that would provide for a decent family life - they did not question the different minimum wages for women and men. The push of the MGEA for a family wage was indicative of the overall labour movement’s push for a family wage that would allow a woman to maintain her traditional role as reproducer and man his role as breadwinner. Tong argues that for decades, the family wage served as the primary patriarchal rationale for keeping women out of the workplace (1989:181). The labour movement is centrally implicated in this process.

The MGEA also had no part in the passing or enforcement of the 'Fair Employment Practices Act' of 1953 or the 'Equal Pay Act' of 1956. Although these acts were passed, they were only acted on half heartedly and were never pursued by the Association as a way to meet the needs of women members.

As a result of the inactive stance of the MGEA on women’s need for equal wages and for equal working rights, it is of little surprise that the MGEA did not address issues of reproduction for its women members. Several gender biased practices existed. For example, if a woman had a baby, she was
forced to resign her job. It was not until the 1960's that women began to press the MGEA to look at their issues. But it was not until 1968 that the government allowed women to leave their jobs to have children without resigning their positions.

The Manitoba government granted their employees a modified form of collective bargaining in 1965. The MGEA and provincial government signed Bill 64 which officially made the MGEA the only bargaining agent of the civil service. Therefore, no other organization could legally represent workers of the civil service.

In 1967 the federal government established The Royal Commission on the Status of Women. In Manitoba, a variety of women's organizations presented a brief to the Royal Commission. This brief presented a picture of wage discrepancies and labour market discrimination. They found that, in the Manitoba civil service, women were 43.4% of all employees, but they were clustered in low-wage dead-end jobs: 78% of clerical jobs were filled by women and only 13% of managerial jobs were filled by women. The average monthly salary of married men was $658.28, and for single men was $546.65, but for married women was only $336.74, and for single women was $351.85. The commission also reported that 75% of all women made less than $7000 per year (women's average salary was $4000-$5499) and only 25% of all men made less than $7000 per year (men's average salary was $8999-$9999). Of the 287 job classifications, 75% were gender
designated. The results of this commission clearly show the status of women in the labour market - the secondary labour market characterized by low waged, insecure, gender specific jobs.

In response to the report, the Civil Service Commissioner suggested 'the MGEA has been trying to rectify the wage discrepancies; however, as it has not been a priority for them, it has been dropped in the bargaining process.' This is clearly a reflection of the MGEA process when it comes to addressing the gender dimensions of the workplace. For instance, in 1968 all the people who negotiated the contracts between the MGEA and government were male, all the members of joint council were male, and all the members of the MGEA executive were male. This in light of the fact that 44% of the MGEA's members were women. One executive member claimed that 'There has been little evidence to suggest that the MGEA made attempts to correct the inequities, and indeed little evidence to suggest that the association has even been aware of them' (Smith, Bates, & Jones 1994:173). The MGEA had never taken a stance on pay equity issues, unequal rules for pensions, unequal work rules such as dress codes, or the department structures which meant that job categories such as clerical, were never represented collectively.
In the early 1970’s the MGEA was restructured, reflecting many of the generational, political, and social changes of the time. Feminism and nationalism played a substantial role in the remaking of the union. A task force was established to look at issues such as the right to strike, to affiliate with a national organization, the granting of political rights to provincial employees, and the creation of occupational groups. The MGEA underwent dramatic restructuring. It developed a grievance procedure, components were established, collective bargaining instituted, maternity benefits secured, and members were referred to as brothers and sisters. In addition to the Rand Formula, and the outreach efforts by MGEA executives to organize the unorganized, membership grew from 1,591 to 8,245 in one year. Several young women, spurred on by reports by the Action Committee on the Status of Women, the YWCA, and the Canadian Congress of Women, became increasingly active in the MGEA.

In an attempt to address the concerns of frustrated workers, and because of pressure from many active women, in 1973, the MGEA established its first Status of Women Committee to help women members become more aware of their rights and discriminatory policies within the civil service. However, little was accomplished. Affirmative action positions were denied and union delegates voted down a resolution calling for the government to give female employees up to six weeks pay
for maternity leave. In 1974, a government report entitled The Manitobans in the Civil Service written by MGEU women members yielded a picture of gender discrimination and union inaction.

As a result of the report and the activity of frustrated union members, the MGEA underwent dramatic restructuring in the fall of 1974. It developed a grievance procedure, occupational components were established, collective bargaining instituted, and maternity benefits secured. While this represented a dramatic shift from just one year earlier, the MGEA still did not deal adequately with all women's issues. As a result, and has been a historic pattern with women in Manitoba, women looked outside the union to have their issues addressed.

This is exemplified in the 1984 fight for pay equity legislation. Leaders of the MGEA suggested that the fight for pay equity was not a fight of the MGEA. This resulted in some active union members forming an affiliation with outside women's groups to form the Pay Equity Coalition in 1984. Based on the fact that women were ghettoized into low paying job classifications, the coalition demanded equal pay for work of equal value. Due to the activity of the coalition, and the acknowledgement and support of the NDP provincial government the Pay Equity Act was passed in 1984. The Act required employers to eliminate the gap between male and female equal job classifications.

After the Act passed, and after initially denying
involvement with the issue, the MGEA supported it. However, they criticized union members involved with the coalition for going outside their own organization. They argued that negotiations and collective bargaining were the best ways to deal with these issues, and not some other mechanism such as outside organizations.

f. The 1990’s and the future

In the 1990’s the MGEA expanded by building links with other unions and establishing several media campaigns to encourage support and active participation from its membership. It also changed its name from Association to Union becoming the Manitoba Government Employees Union (MGEU) in 1992.

In the 1990’s the MGEU, like other civil service unions, was hard hit by the political prioritization of deficit reduction. In Manitoba, this resulted in staff reductions, hourly reductions known as Filmon Fridays, and wage freezes. Of particular concern is Bill 22 which allows the government to override collective agreements in the public sector. Further are the decreasing funding of many public programs including child care and health care, which are major employers of women in the civil service. Privatization and contracting out are also having a profound impact on public sector employees. In 1996, there was a strong show of support by the MGEU for its women workers in the field of health care
and home care. The successful strike of women workers indicates a move toward a better understanding of women's issues by the MGEU.

g. **Summary of Women's Status in the Organization of Manitoba Government Workers**

As this brief history outlines, the labour movement started out strong in Manitoba with the development of several militant unions and women's organization. However, as the years progressed, we can see that the MCSA and MGEA did not always act as a union fighting for its employees rights nor for the social democratic rights of all workers. For example, it did not allow itself the right to strike until 1974. It instead often acted on the behalf of government and at their request.

Women's issues were not a priority throughout the union's history. As a result, women civil servants had to seek support outside their own union to lobby for change. Alliances with other women's groups outside the association/union were key to the success of the suffrage campaign in 1916 and the pay equity legislation in 1984. Beyond not supporting women in their fights, the alliances women formed were often criticized and questioned by the unions.

Participation of women in the association/union has also consistently been problematic for women. In 1920, women made
up 20% of the members. This grew to 57% in 1995. Despite almost tripling their numbers to comprise a majority of members, women have been under-represented in positions of leadership since the association developed. In 1960, there were no women members on the board of directors, in 1989 zero out of 5 members of the board were women, in 1995 two out of five members are women. Issues of importance to women are rarely taken up as legitimate bargaining concerns. Affirmative action clauses have been voted down three times at convention and women are mentioned only once in the constitution, in reference to a sexual harassment clause. Further, the MGEU has done little to question the structure of reproduction in our society and how that impacts on women.

The history of the MGEU is one of neglect and ignorance when it comes to dealing with women's issues. The issues that the union has and continues to deal with, are mostly those of wages and job security. As is exemplified in the maternity leave and the pay equity fights, the MGEU did not seem to question the economic ordering or structure of society, and the role gender plays in that structure. In order to have unions work for women, these things must be addressed. As previously outlined, the criteria for the feminization of the labour movement must include leadership from a feminist perspective which includes adequate representation for women in positions of leadership and addressing of issues that are of most concern to women—issues of reproduction.
Public sector unions are fighting a very tough battle in a period of layoffs, privatization, and wage freezes, and an ideology that sees government employees as overpaid and unnecessary. In the fight against this, the MGEU needs solidarity. However, women are still fighting for inclusion. Women make up 57% of the MGEU's membership yet they remain under-represented at all levels of leadership and confront serious opposition to their issues by fellow union members and leaders. Clearly, a precondition to solidarity within the MGEU is a resolution of these inequalities.

The focus of this study is why women are not active members of unions. As outlined above, the structure of reproduction, the organization of the labour market, the structure and individual histories of unions, and perceptions have been discussed as possible barriers. Chapter five will examine more concisely the barriers that women confront generally as workers and unionists when it comes to becoming equally represented in union structures. Chapter six will analyze the specific manifestations of these barriers in the MGEU through the examination of a survey sent to rank and file women members of the MGEU.
CHAPTER FIVE: BARRIERS TO WOMEN’S PARTICIPATION

Women represent the fastest growing segment of the union population. Their numbers have increased remarkably in the past twenty years. Despite this increase, the nature of involvement has not increased in the same fashion. The literature suggests a wide range of barriers to participation of women in unions in general and for women in positions of leadership in unions. Traditionally, industrial relations theory has offered, at best, sexist explanations as to why this is the case. Forrest argues that the explanation within industrial relations theory is simple; whether by nature or by socialization, women are not willing to join unions (1993: 328). This study attempts to offer a more materially based explanation as to why women are less active in unions than men.

Barriers to women’s participation in unions can be grouped into four broad categories: (1) the structure of the labour market (2) the structure and operation of unions themselves (3) the organization and structure of reproduction in our society and (4) attitudinal barriers.
I. Structure of the Labour Market

While it is well documented that there is a division among workers based on class, it is also important to recognize that the divisions in the labour market have a gender base. The labour market can be analyzed in terms of dual sectors and a segmented nature (Hartmann, 1976; Armstrong and Armstrong, 1984; Phillips and Phillips, 1983 & 1993; Kemp, 1994). It has been argued that this segregation into sectors is an expression of patriarchy in the workplace (Kemp, 1994:108).

The primary sector of the labour market is made up of workers who are highly skilled and receive high wages, good job security, and opportunities for promotion and who are, for the most part, white males. Historically labour unions have played a significant role in the primary sector and unions are often included as part of the definition of the primary sector.

The secondary sector is characterized by low wages, insecure employment, and unskilled labour which makes it easier to replace workers.\(^\text{10}\) Women and ethnic minorities traditionally make up a large part of this sector (Yeandle, 1984: Phillips and Phillips, 1993). For various reasons this

\(^{10}\) Kemp (1994) argues that work women do in the labour market is often labelled unskilled because they utilize skills learned in the home from other women and not from a certified institution or on the job, for example home care workers, housekeeping, cleaning. She argues that this is labelled unskilled in the workplace rendering less pay from employers.
sector is weakly unionized and more easily controlled by employers. It is more difficult and costly to unionize the secondary labour market because of the scattered workplaces.

Milkman (1985) has argued that a major barrier to organizing women is the structure of their work in the secondary labour market. Women are segregated into clerical work, personal service, jobs in caring professions, and in a small number of industries (service as opposed to production industries). For example, 23% of working women are employed in the service sector and financial industries. Women make up 73% of bank employees (Julie White, 1980:71). Women also make up a majority of government workers in the public sector (Armstrong and Armstrong, 1984).

Current trends in the economic restructuring of the Canadian labour market suggest that this segmentation will continue. Trends in employment see the creation of more non-standard, part-time, and part-year service work, work in small workplaces and shifts to home work, offshore production, and contracting out (Briskin and McDermott, 1993:3). Briskin (1993) argues that women will be centrally implicated in this shift. The challenge for gender equity in the labour market equals the challenge of economic restructuring in general (Briskin & McDermott, 1993:6). In examining economic restructuring we must question patriarchy because of the role women have been assigned in that process.

With the introduction of micro-technology, another trend
in the labour market, the segregation into low paid sectors seems likely to continue for women. Ironically, because of changes in the capitalist order (the increase in service sector jobs as opposed to jobs in the production industry) the ghettoization of women has offered some protection from increasing unemployment rates. The growth of the service sector allowed women to enter waged work without competing directly with men for jobs. This created a job ghetto known as the 'pink collar' ghetto. However, with more people looking for work there is increased competition in this ghetto, the 'protection' once offered seems to be fading. This puts employers at an advantage over workers because with increasing competition wages can be decreased. Yanz and Smith (1984) discuss how other trends in the labour market affect women:

'If anything, women's segregation into low-paid sectors seems likely to increase with the introduction of microtechnology. And it can also be expected to eliminate the "protection" from unemployment that the segregated labour market has offered women up until now. The economic squeeze is exacerbated by the cutbacks and political pressures that are blind to the realities of women's lives. Social services that make it possible for women to work are being unremittingly cut back. Cuts in UIC, job training allowances, and family benefits all limit women's possibilities for economic independence.' (1984:24)

Unionization is vital to protect against these trends. Unfortunately, these areas have traditionally had the lowest rates of unionization and the highest rate of employer
opposition to unionization (Forrest, 1993). The question to ask is why are jobs in the periphery and new trends in the labour market which specifically implicate women, obstacles to unionization and effective union work?

It can be argued that the impact of unions have not been uniform because they have traditionally developed in male dominated craft industries in the core sector of the labour market. This legacy has allowed workers in male dominated industries to benefit to a greater degree than those workers outside of them. With economic restructuring and a move away from core sectors, any benefit stays there. Most gains that were made by unions were done so by male dominated unions in the 1940’s, 1950’s, and 1960’s. It can be argued that inroads were made during this time for the following reason. Capital gave in to some demands made by unionized workers in the core labour market because it had unorganized women in the periphery to fill its expanding markets. The government also played a role in aiding this by channelling women away from core jobs into periphery sectors. For example, having women only postings for jobs in the service sector and offering training for women only in those areas (Smith, Bates, and Jones, 1995).

In addition to the development of unions within a certain market sector, the occupational distribution of female labour may help explain women’s lower rates of total union membership. Sutton (1980) found that of all occupational
categories, clerical, sales, and service occupations show the strongest negative relations with union membership. Further to this point, women are often scattered among large numbers of small workplaces, such as retail stores which makes it even more difficult to unionize them. The attempts made by retail workers in an Ontario store 'Limite' owned by Canadian retail giant Bigi Ltd. underlies the problem. Women in small retail chains of Bigi Ltd. challenged their large corporate bosses on work issues ranging from random reduction of work hours, high turnover rates of management, work on commission basis only, and lack of benefits. They attempted to create a union in 1994. However, these attempts were thwarted by the powerful corporation which made it extremely difficult for union organizers to work (by reducing hours and transferring them to other stores) and eventually dismissing the head organizer. Although the Garment Workers Union attempted to help, they suggested that they did not have enough resources to deal with the organizational drive (Klein, 1995).

Klein (1995) suggests that women who dominate work in retail "McJobs" are not viewed as workers even though the turnover rate is slowing down and women are using these jobs as a primary means of economic survival. The labour movement has not had much time for low-wage service sectors even though these areas represent a huge potential for growth in unions. There has not been a lot of effort by unionists in this area because the viability of using dues that are received from
minimum wage and part time pay cheques make dealing with large retail chains not worth their while (Klein, 1995).

Given this, how does the structure of the labour market affect the public sector which is the focus of this study. It can be argued that although the public sector is unionized, the barriers of labour force segmentation may also play a role in involvement among those workers. We see that in the public sector, the sex segregated nature still exists. Women are channelled into certain occupational streams and hold almost all of the administrative support positions. They are disproportionately compressed in the lower levels of virtually every occupational group. Women also make up the majority of part-time and contract workers in the public sector. Therefore, because women are in less stable jobs with high turnover rates, this could impact their involvement in unions.

a. Labour Law

When it comes to organizing the unorganized, labour law plays an important role. Labour unions are legally instituted in Canada. This process began in 1944 with the enactment of PC1003 which gave unions a legal voice. It was augmented by passage of the Rand formula\(^\text{11}\) and subsequent laws. While this

\(^{11}\) The Rand Formula was passed by Justice Ivan Rand of the Supreme Court of Canada in 1945. It states that where unions exist and union membership is not a requirement of employment, all employees will pay union dues to shoulder their portion of the burden of expense for administering the law of their employment.
was a positive move, not all of the results have been as beneficial or equal. Fudge and Glasbeek argue that labour legislation has had several negative impacts on the labour movement and working people.

After the enactment of the PC1003, unions moved away from a militant stance to a judicial, management style no longer questioning the economic order but trying to gain their fair share of the pie. Union operation, specifically collective bargaining, became subject to government regulation. Fudge (1993) argues that the certification process itself is a regulated one that is detached from the actual workings of the industry and its dynamics. Because early labour legislation was generated by male unions and preceded the segmentation of the labour market, its procedures and standards reflect and reinforce the gendered occupational structure of the labour market (Fudge, 1993:236).

The PC1003 also has implications for the organizing of the labour movement because the bargaining process is organized on a workplace by workplace model as opposed to an industrial model. This has two major effects. First, it makes it more difficult to organize workers in scattered workplaces such as franchised outlets. This is specifically detrimental to women who make up the majority of workers there. It is also detrimental because new trends in the labour market suggest a

the union contract... all employees must take the burden along with the contract. (Smith, Jones, & Bates, 1995).
move away from large workplaces to smaller ones. Secondly, it fragments the labour movement by keeping workplaces and industries in competition with and separated from one another.

The PC1003 also affected the public and private sectors differently. Different legislation and bargaining rights were enacted for government employees than were enacted for employees of private companies. For instance, public sector workers are exempt from striking which is justified by the idea that since public sector employees work for government, they are considered public officers, providing essential services to the public. As such, they should not be guided by special interest groups such as unions. Labour laws for public servants restrict bargaining on certain issues, force binding arbitration, and relinquish the right to strike. Therefore, while both public and private sector employees are unionized, the power that the public sector employees can yield over their employers is limited. In an attempt to cut back the costs of government, guided by a neo-conservative movement, public employees have suffered the harshest setbacks which they were unable to counteract because of the inherent limitations of the PC1003 which guides their union negotiations (Fudge and Glasbeek, forthcoming).

b. Summary

While the dual labour market theory offers a good explanation of women's lower rates of total unionization in
the labour market, it does not address the issue of women’s low participation within unions. It does not fully explain why women are under-represented in union leadership even when they make up a large percentage of the membership. To help understand this I will turn to examine a feminist analysis of unions and the workplace.

II. Union Structure

In discussing union structure, it may be beneficial to look for two themes in the following discussion. The first is the way capitalism and patriarchy affect the labour movement and its operation. The second concerns how this overall operation and the ideology surrounding the labour movement manifests itself in individual unions.

Many theorists argue that the labour movement, while espousing the ideology of equality, has not been immune to incorporating unequal social practices within it’s operation. Patriarchy is one such example. Individual unions have a history of sexist practices and discriminatory policies (Milkman, 1985). Historically, this has kept women out of unions based on the very real concerns of male workers; women represented an alternative and cheap source of labour for employers to exploit. It was easier for union men to exclude women (backed by a strong ideology) than to force employers to pay all workers a fair wage. As a result unions were shaped by men based on their ideology and role in the productive world
(Quadagno, 1988). Union work developed according to the way work was organized, which was essentially a male defined way. Unions developed in a hierarchical and rigid manner with a fixed pattern and a centralized power structure. While the influx of women has changed the composition of union membership, the process itself has not changed. Unions still operate in a hierarchical male dominated fashion and rarely take into account all the different concerns that women bring to the workplace. While male and female workers share the same concerns when it comes to wages, benefits, and job security, women have certain issues that conflict directly with the interests of male workers. Affirmative action, fast track programs, seniority clauses, and sexual harassment are examples of issues which frequently result in conflict between male and female workers. Men and women often have different priorities among the issues they want their union to address. But the very principles around which unions developed and organized often excluded women from equal access to work, from equal pay, and deprived them of an equal voice in union affairs.

This development continues to manifest itself in the internal workings of unions. For example, the way meetings are organized do not take into account the dual role that women play. Women often do not have time to engage in weekly meetings and weekend conventions because of time constraints of work in the reproductive sphere, mainly the home and
family. As well, seniority rules and the amount of experience required to take on union leadership roles often exclude women from participating for the same reasons - their primary role in reproductive labour. Due to the structure of union work, women often lack the opportunity to get to understand union procedure with little or no opportunity for becoming educated in the area. This makes it much more difficult for them to become involved in leadership roles. However, it should be stressed that home responsibilities, in and of themselves, are not the only barrier to participation. The union structure operates in a fashion which does not accommodate (e.g. meeting times), much less challenge (e.g. lack of support for national daycare policies), women’s dual role. Thus, structure presents a major barrier to women’s participation.

Some authors argue that it is because of the operation of unions that these trends exist. The operation of unions also makes it more difficult to break out of these processes (Briskin and McDermott, 1993). This point of view suggests that some unions operate as large centralized bureaucratic organizations and developed through and operate according to the needs of white, middle class males. Further, they argue that these unions operate the way business does, through mandated hierarchical management structures. While this may be beneficial for legitimizing the concerns of workers to employers, it may not be beneficial to the labour movement as a whole. Some authors have suggested that the process unions
operate under reduce them to capitalist institutions. Briskin (1984) claims that:

"Fundamentally the limitations of unions are connected not only to their own history, but to the fact that they are a part and a product of the society we live in - a capitalist society. Organizational and political developments inside the unions have paralleled those in other institutions: the government, the educational system and big business. In all capitalist institutions, there has been increasing centralization, bureaucratization and specialization. But given the mandate to defend the interest of workers, it is unfortunate that unions have accepted the constraint of business unionism." (1984:256)

Business unionism does not question the overall inequalities that exist based on class and gender. How does this in turn affect women in unions? Women in unions have called for a move away from business unionism to social unionism. This would entail a democratizing and humanizing of unions (Stinson & Richmond, 1993:151). Social Unionism is a process whereby there are connections made between workers' work lives and private lives. This is similar to the social democratic function of unions discussed by Godard. Cuneo (1993) is quick to note that a change to social unionism does not mean a move toward feminist unionism. He argues that

---

12 Business unionism is the term used to describe the operation of unions as business-like and that in order to be legitimate in a capitalist economy, they must operate as a capitalist institution. Social unionism on the other hand, is used to define a type of unionism that is socially based and whose concerns go beyond the individual workplace, but to the wider social order.
social unionism can be equally as patriarchal and bureaucratic as business unionism and that in order to fight patriarchal processes, women must engage themselves in leadership roles in order to use the structure to help themselves.

Historically, most Canadian unions have been concerned mainly with economic gains for their members. While they have been very successful in this area, issues that are more social and political have often gone unaddressed. The influx of women into the labour movement presents a need for a different perspective. The issue of women in the labour movement highlights how difficult it is to separate the work experience from the non-work experience. For instance, the issue of child care and work are so undeniably interconnected for women that one cannot discuss waged work without discussing the family.

One of the stumbling blocks women run into when becoming active in unions is the lack of process available for dealing with the interconnectedness between work and non-work experience. Business unionism is particularly unsuited to winning the demands of women (Field, 1984:293). The way issues are dealt with and the business of doing union work create barriers for women’s participation in unions. It has been argued that the development of unions fostered policies which constructed an institutional structure that, for the most part, excluded women. Women’s issues are often different from traditional work related issues and often don’t fit into the strict rules and practices in place. Further, feminist-
oriented bargaining requires a more open process whereby issues can be discussed in a different manner than the rigid structure present in unions today (Eriskin, 1993). Because unions operate under business unionism, this type of open-bargaining is rarely found within the structure of unions. As a result, there is little incentive for women to become involved because unions do not typically deal with their issues and are not viewed as an avenue that allows women to have their needs addressed. Historically and currently, unions have benefited men to a greater degree than they have benefited women.

'Women's issues' themselves may pose a threat to the existing work relations. For example, in Pay Equity, the Feminist Labour Challenge (1990) Cuneo discusses the difficulty surrounding pay equity. Even though the issue of pay equity is on the union agenda, the structure and form it takes reflects the problems that women face in our society, especially in dealing with capitalist and patriarchal social institutions. The major problem has to do with what the term 'pay equity' means. Does it mean equal pay for equal work? Does it mean equal pay for similar work? Or does it mean equal pay for work of equal value? Most feminists, and even some labour organizers, would argue for the third option. If this is so, it leads to a large problem in the way we view work and how institutions have developed based on this view. For instance, child care workers (predominately women) earn far
less in pay than do janitors (predominately men), yet the process of raising children is more valuable to a society than is a clean bathroom. It is more difficult for unions to take on issues such as value because they often do not see these as legitimate bargaining issues.

Cuneo (1993) notes that it is easier to gain liberal policy change, such as equal pay for equal jobs, but the changes that are more abstract and question the structure of the social organization are much more difficult to gain through patriarchal and capitalist institutions, such as unions.

**III. The Structure of Reproduction**

Barriers based on the structure of reproduction are a reflection of the way reproduction in a capitalist economy is organized and how gender relations are constructed and manifested in society at large. This study addresses how patriarchy structures women’s lives. Since patriarchy is social, it is evident in all of our social institutions and practices. It plays a role in the structure of the labour market and in turn impacts how women are able to involve themselves in union work.

Research findings in this area represent two contrasting points of view. The first argues that women do not have enough time to engage in union business because of their role in the
reproductive world (see Rose, 1986 for a discussion of this). The second argues that this is not the case and that, in fact, women’s responsibilities in the family do not directly affect their participation in union work. Rather it is a choice that women make not to be involved in union work (Chaison and Andiappan, 1987 & 1989).

In the literature, the most often identified barrier points to family responsibility as the reason women do not participate in union activity to the same degree as men. Despite the women’s movement and the consciousness of equal rights, women still remain primarily responsible for reproduction in the broadest sense. Women are responsible for the unpaid social, emotional, educational, and psychological reproduction of families and often perform those same jobs in the labour market. Women’s lives are structured around family commitments and personal relations. As a direct result, women are not able to attend meetings at various times, let alone take weekends away to attend education seminars and conventions. This is reflected in the composition of female unions leaders’ who tend to be unmarried, childless, and older (Jerry White, 1990a: Julie White, 1980). Unions have typically responded by blaming women and arguing that it is a woman’s responsibility to make arrangements for herself (Cuneo, 1990) or that this is a perceived barrier because in actual practice, union business doesn’t take up a substantial amount of time. These ideas reflect the patriarchal,
androcentric nature of unions by rejecting the realities of women’s lives. Women have been pressing unions to have meetings during work time with the employer or union picking up the tab. Child care policies are also being pursued but have been largely ineffective (BCGEU White Paper, 1991).

Women are forced to work a double work day. Women often work two jobs, one at home and one in the paid labour market. Because women are primarily responsible for the home, there is less time and commitment to be given to union work. This is supported to some degree by the literature. Cornfield et al found that the greater a woman’s household demands the lower is the level of her labour activism (1990:148).

However, other researchers have found contradictory results. Sutton (1980), for example, took a variety of aspects into account when studying women’s barriers to union participation. He tested union activism among married vs non-married women, job status of women (full vs part time), number of children and their ages, and whether the woman was the sole breadwinner of her family or was part of a dual income family. He found that ‘the data do not betray a connection between family and job commitment and unionization that bears particularly on women’ (Sutton, 1980:387). In fact, he found that married women who were part of dual income families were actually more involved than were women who were not married. This is contradictory to the commonly held belief that married women regard their incomes as secondary and are relatively
indifferent to unions. Chaison and Andiappan (1989) also found no statistically significant relationship between marital status and union position. However, what they did find in 1989, was that women perceived their role in the family to be a barrier to union activity and were thus reluctant to take part.

While the conclusions of impact of the family on union participation vary, both are connected to the structure of reproduction as it is experienced by women. As previously discussed, union structure, in its current bureaucratic, capitalist form, does not take into account women's double work day. Pragmatically, this makes it difficult for women to become involved in union work. Secondly, because unions have not represented women well in the past and are seen as male centred institutions, women (regardless of their marital/family status) see unions as ways to meet workplace issues such as wages and benefits, but not as ways to address concerns such as domestic violence and child care (Cuneo, 1990).

IV. Attitudinal Barriers

A related set of barriers is concerned with the area of sexist ideology, both within and outside unions, and how these attitudes affect unions and women's interaction within unions. Like all dominant ideologies, sexism serves a hegemonic purpose, rationalizing the existing order. Sexist attitudes
support and perpetuate a patriarchal order that disempowers women in general and within society’s institutions and movements, such as the labour movement.

Sexism is defined as ‘conclusions about the nature or potential of women and men drawn from inadequate and stereotypical sources such as biology and traditional roles’ (Baker and Roberts, 1981:20). The ideology in society in general that surrounds the sexes and their attributes and roles in society are reflected in union members’ attitudes about the roles women can and should hold in unions and the roles women envision themselves as having in union structure. Sexism is evident in the informal culture and in the governing structures. It has the effect of impairing women’s ability to learn activist / leadership skills among the rank and file, and impedes their union careers (Cuneo, 1993).

Ideology and attitude can be looked at in two ways. First by looking at attitudes toward women in general and secondly attitudes and images of unions. With regard to attitudes toward women and work in our society, many stereotypical attitudes persist. Men’s traditional role in society is that of breadwinner and worker. Women are defined by their domestic roles as caregiver, homemaker, and consumer, not worker. Although the women’s movement has challenged these roles, and women now make up a large percentage of the labour market, these perceptions have changed very little. Work is still viewed as something women with families do as a last
resort or as a secondary source of income and not as a primary factor in their lives (Kemp, 1994). Thus, when men and women are both employed in the wage labour market, men’s paid work is viewed as more important and productive than is women’s paid work. Attitudes such as these condition behaviours and thus structures the institutions as we know them.

Industrial relations research of the past has supported these ideas and justified them as a reason why women were not unionized. As Forrest notes, researchers have concluded that 'women are not union oriented, they dislike the thought of strikes, pickets, and violence....it is true that the future growth of the union movement is severely limited by the large number of women working for wages' (Forrest, 1993: 328). These attitudes are important because they affect the way male union members view female union members and will in turn affect how they support women’s issues within a union environment. The emotion surrounding some issues, such as sexual harassment, often divides union members along gender lines instead of bringing them together. It also affects the way women view themselves at work, where their priorities lay, and what their role in unions are perceived to be.

This relates to the attitudes about unions, their structure and membership behaviours. Unions themselves are seen as bastions of male culture (Jerry White, 1990a:65) and the image of unions remain male and blue collar. In society in general, leadership is recognized and equated with maleness,
and, as such, is recognized as a male prerogative. White (1980) identifies the important social component to union leadership as manifested in an 'old boys network' where union discussions carry on over drinks in a bar which are often characterized by off colour, sometimes sexist, remarks. Members are often recognized as having to be loud and boisterous in order to have their voices heard, characteristics that are not typically 'female'. When these images and processes are internalized by women they are ideologically discouraged from participating in unions. Women often have to confront myths about working women and sometimes male hostility and fear of women (Field, 1984:294). Cuneo, (1993) in a discussion of sexist behaviours of unions, reports many stories from women about their experiences in unions. These include stories of violence, harassment, double standards, and unfair processes.

V. Summary

The four barriers presented here are suggested to be the contributing factors to women's low involvement in unions. Since this study is concerned with the manifestations of these barriers in the MGEU, the next chapter will address this.
CHAPTER SIX: MANIFESTATIONS OF BARRIERS IN THE MGEU

This chapter will address how the barriers outlined in the previous chapter are manifested in the MGEU. The data analyzed here comes from a survey of female members of the MGEU on women's participation and involvement in their union.

I. Methodology

a. Data Collection

The study of women's participation in the MGEU was conducted by the present researcher at the request of the MGEU's Women's Committee. The Women's Committee was interested in researching this topic because of the apparent under-representation of female rank and file members in all areas of MGEU business.

The survey was overseen by a committee comprised of three members of the Women's Committee, one member from the research branch, and two from the University of Manitoba. The structure of the survey and method of data collection were proposed and designed by this committee which met over a period of approximately eight months in 1992. During this time the survey was constructed and revised in accordance with results obtained from pre-tests. This process was guided by the members of the MGEU Women's Committee.

To enable the researcher and union to establish broad patterns of behaviour which could be researched specifically
at a later date, a mail out survey method was used. This method made it possible to contact a large number of research participants. Two pre-trial tests were given before the final survey was mailed. One was given at the Women's Conference in April, 1992 and the other at the MGEU Annual Convention in October, 1992.

b. Research Population and Sample

The research population was comprised of all the female members of the MGEU. The total MGEU membership is approximately 24,000, 13,200 of which are female members. A sample of 3000 female members, 22% of the female members, (1,850 urban and 1,150 rural) was randomly selected from membership lists of the MGEU. The survey was mailed to participants, completed at their homes, and mailed back to the MGEU. Surveys were mailed in April 1993 and follow up letters were sent in May and June of 1993. By July 1993, 1,120 surveys were returned. Of these, 21 people could not be located, 12 were returned with no response, and 2 were unusable. This left a sample size of 1,085 and a response rate of 36%. This is 8% of the female members of the MGEU.

Thirty-six percent is a relatively low response rate and is of some concern for this study. Jackson (1995) reports that an average response rate for a mail out survey is about 50% (p. 115). Nachmias and Nachmias (1987) report that low response is a problem because non-respondents differ
considerably from respondents (p. 233). Our low response rate raises the question of whether there is a difference between those who responded and those who did not. If there is a difference, what does this difference mean when it comes to analyzing this data. As a result of the low response rate, the conclusions reached by this study must be interpreted cautiously.

An additional limitation of the data collection is the fact that only women were questioned. Some researchers suggest that there are substantial differences when it comes to men and women participating in union business (Kumar 1989 and Chaison & Andippan, 1987) and that the barriers to participation they face are different. Therefore, in this study, the lack of a male comparison group prevents an assessment of how men and women differ when it comes to union participation and a comparison of differing levels of involvement.

c. Survey Instrument Overview

The survey was constructed to gather information in five topic areas. Each area was of specific interest to the MGEU Women’s Committee.

Part A: Questions about current job situations and work histories.
Part B: Questions about involvement in the MGEU, including reasons for involvement and non-involvement
Part C: Questions about attitudes toward the MGEU
Part D: Questions about perceptions of equality in the MGEU
Part E: Demographic Questions
d. Statistical Techniques for Data Analysis

The data was analyzed using descriptive measures. These included a series of descriptive frequency distributions of all variables and contingency tables along with chi-square tests of significance.

This series of descriptive statistics allowed us to look at the distribution of various responses of the independent and dependent variables used in the analysis. Frequencies allowed us to see how specific variables were distributed in our sample. In order to measure the relationship between the independent and dependent variables, contingency tables were run. This descriptive measure of association was used to address how well each independent variable related to the dependent variable. A chi-square test of significance was used to determine if any of the relationships were statistically significant.

A chi-square analysis allows us to look at the relationship between variables that are measured at the nominal level. Since our dependent variable 'involvement' is measured at the nominal level and our independent variables 'job status', 'job tenure', 'meeting times', 'dealing with union issues', 'familial responsibility', 'living arrangement', 'difficulty of involvement', and 'comfort level' are measured at either the nominal or ordinal level, the chi-square test is the most appropriate to use.

The chi-square is based on a comparison of observed
frequencies (which show up in our sample data) to expected frequencies (which should occur if there were no difference between categories in the population) (Jackson, 1995; 234). The formula used to calculate the chi-square reflects the amount of deviation (of the sample data) from the expected values. A test of significance tells us whether any difference found is due to sampling error or if it represents a relationship between the two variables. For the purposes of this study, a significance level of .05 was used. This means that there is less than a 5% chance that the magnitude of the relationship is the result of sampling fluctuations. Put differently, the difference observed would occur by chance less than 5% of the time. However, it is important to note that we do not misinterpret significance as a strength of association between variables or as substantive significance. I did not test for strength of association but rather whether or not an association exists between independent and dependent variables in this sample.

II. Operationalization of Variables and Hypotheses

a. Dependent Variable

The dependent variable designated in this analysis is the respondent's level of union participation in the MGEU. The following question was used to indicate the respondents level of involvement:
Q19. What do you consider to be your involvement with the MGEU? (Q19)

The dependent variable was measured by asking respondents to indicate their level of involvement on a five point scale. The five possible categories of involvement that respondents could indicate were (i) actively involved, (ii) partially involved, (iii) involved in past, (iv) would like to be involved, but haven’t yet, and (v) not involved.

This question was a ‘self-descriptive question’ in that the respondents were asked to identify what they considered to be their own level of participation. As such, it is limited by the fact that it does not define what active or partial involvement is. For example, does active involvement mean participating in ten hours a week of union work or does it require that one occupies a leadership position with the union? Because it was left up to the respondents to define their own behaviour, there exists a possibility that definitions for involvement may vary and thus the results may not be as accurate as they could have been if categories had been defined more precisely. I have attempted to deal with this problem by re-coding the variable.

A frequency of all categories of involvement is addressed in the descriptive analysis section. However, for all of the contingency tables, the variable was re-coded as follows. The INVOLVED category includes both ‘actively’ and ‘partially involved’. The NOT-INVOLVED category includes ‘would like to
be involved, but haven’t yet’ and ‘not involved’. The ‘was involved in past’ category is not included for the contingency tables. This is because those who responded that they were ‘involved in the past’ do not fit into either category of involvement. Since they are not currently involved, they do not fit the INVOLVED category. They also do not fit the NOT INVOLVED category because they have a history of involvement. Therefore it is conceivable that the reasons for indicating ‘not involved’ compared with indicating ‘involved in past’ could be considerably different. Since reasons for ‘no longer being involved’ were not asked, the inclusion of this category could make our results less reliable.

b. Independent Variables

The set of independent variables was developed in relation to the barriers to women’s involvement discussed in Chapter Five and the structure of the survey instrument itself. Various survey questions were used to operationalize barriers as outlined. Frequencies for these questions are presented and then contingency tables with a chi-square analysis were run for each variable. Each variable was run against the dependent variable ‘union involvement’. For the contingency tables, some independent variables were re-coded so that a smaller number of categories could be used. In the case of contingency tables, the smaller the number of categories used, the more reliable the results will be.
Eight independent variables were used. They include (i) Job Status, (ii) Job Tenure, (iii) Scheduled Meeting Times, (iv) Issues dealt with by MGEU, (v) Family Responsibilities, (vi) Living Arrangement, (vii) Difficulty of Involvement, and (viii) Comfort Level.

Variable One - Job Status

**Hypothesis one:** WOMEN WHO HOLD SECURE POSITIONS IN THE LABOUR MARKET WILL PARTICIPATE MORE OFTEN IN UNION BUSINESS THAN WOMEN WHO DO NOT.

Variable one is related to the larger issue of employment security. In the review of the structure of the labour market, I addressed the issues of the dual labour market and the ghettoization of women into certain job markets. This is related to the theoretical point made in chapter one that women’s engagement with the labour market on a large scale, is characterized by a push and pull phenomena. That is, women are pushed out of the labour market when their labour is required for reproduction and pulled in when their labour can be used as a cheap source. Because of this, women’s position in the labour market is marginalized. In this study, we are concerned with how that marginalization affects union participation. If women hold less secure places in the labour market, it is more likely that they will not participate in union business.

Based on job status, it is hypothesized that if a woman
holds secure or permanent employment she will participate more often in union business. If her job is not secure or permanent, she will participate less in union business. The following question was used to indicate job status. **What is your employment status? (Q5)** This variable was measured at the nominal level by asking if employment status was regular full-time, regular part-time, seasonal, term, or casual. For the contingency table, the question was re-coded into the following categories: (i) **SECURE**, which includes the categories 'regular full-time' and 'regular part-time' and (ii) **INSECURE**, which includes 'seasonal', 'term', and 'casual'.

**Variable Two - Job Tenure**

**Hypothesis Two:** WOMEN WHO HAVE BEEN EMPLOYED AT THEIR PRESENT JOB FOR OVER 6 YEARS WILL PARTICIPATE MORE OFTEN IN UNION BUSINESS THAN WOMEN WHO HAVE BEEN AT THEIR PRESENT JOB FOR LESS THAN 6 YEARS.

This question is also related to employment security. As mentioned above, because of the place that women occupy in the labour market, they tend to be more marginalized and hold less secure jobs than men. In addition to this, women also take time out of the labour force at various points in their careers to tend to reproductive tasks. If this is the case, job tenure could relate to union activity in a similar way as does job status. If women have longer job tenure, they have a
more secure job and will therefore be more committed to union activity. If they have less tenure, or hold a less secure job, they will not participate in union work.

The following question was used to indicate job tenure. How long have you been at your present job? (Q8) The variable used an ordinal level of measurement to ask how long respondents have been at their present job. The five categories from which respondents could choose were: from 0 to 1 year, from 1 to 5 years, from 6 to 15 years, from 16 to 25 years, or over 25 years. For the contingency table, this question was re-coded into the following categories - (i) LOW TENURE - those who have held their jobs for under six years which included the categories '0 to 1 year' and '1 to 5 years' and (ii) HIGH TENURE - those who have held their jobs for over six years which included categories '6 to 15 years', '16 to 25 years', and 'over 25 years'.

Variable Three - Meeting Times

Hypothesis three: WOMEN WHO INDICATE THAT THE MEETING TIMES OF UNION BUSINESS IS NOT CONVENIENT FOR THEM, WILL NOT BECOME INVOLVED IN UNION BUSINESS.

This variable relates to the structure and pragmatic operation of unions, and how this impacts on women's involvement in them. Historically, unions have been male based. As a result, unions have structured themselves along male lines. Meeting times, conferences, and schools are
scheduled during off work hours, over numerous days, and on weekends. This often conflicts with the realities of most women's lives who have a double work day - one in the workplace and one at home. This pragmatic daily operation of unions often make it difficult for women to become involved with them.

The following question was used to indicate convenience of union operation. The scheduled times for MGEU meetings are convenient for me. (Q43). This variable was measured on the ordinal level using a five point likert scale. Response categories ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree. For the purposes of the contingency table, this question was re-coded into two categories; (i) CONVENIENT which includes 'strongly agree' and 'agree' and (ii) INCONVENIENT which includes 'strongly disagree' and 'disagree'. The neutral category was dropped for the following reason. It is unclear where the neutral category would fit - i.e. does it mean that meetings are neither convenient or inconvenient for the respondent, or does it mean that they are sometimes convenient and sometimes inconvenient. As a result of this problem of interpretation, the category was dropped from the analysis.

Variable Four - Union Issues

Hypothesis four: Respondents who feel the MGEU is dealing with issues that are important to them will be involved more often than those who feel the MGEU is not dealing with their issues.
Hypothesis four is also related to union operation, but in a different way. Because unions are historically male based and their structure developed according to male definitions of work, unions issues have also come to be structured by male concerns. As our history of the MGEU shows, the civil service union also developed early on and was marked by a history of inequality and gender bias. Currently, most unions have not come to terms with the fact that up to one half of their membership are women and that women have some different concerns and issues from men. However, the issues that unions choose to have on the agenda remain primarily male centred. In addition, they do not question the structure of reproduction in our society. If women in the MGEU feel that the union does not offer them assistance in addressing issues that are important to them, it is possible that they will be less likely to become involved.

To assess if the MGEU deals with issues that are important to women members was asked in the following question. The MGEU deals with issues that are important to women. (Q41) This variable was measured on a five point likert scale. Responses varied from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Three categories will be used for the contingency table - (i) DEALS WITH ISSUES, which included 'strongly agree' and 'agree' (ii) NEUTRAL, and (iii) DOES NOT DEAL WITH ISSUES, which includes 'strongly disagree' and 'disagree'. The neutral category was left in for the analysis because there was not a
problem in interpreting what neutral means for this variable. It is assumed that neutral means that the MGEU deals with some, but not all issues that are important to women. Therefore, the neutral category is important because it indicates neither satisfaction or dissatisfaction with union operation.

Variable Five - Familial Responsibility

Hypothesis five: THE MORE TIME A WOMAN SPENDS INVOLVED IN FAMILIAL AND PARENTAL WORK, THE LESS LIKELY SHE WILL BE INVOLVED IN UNION WORK.

Hypothesis five is related to the larger category of domestic arrangement or how much time women spend on reproductive labour. As our literature review and theory indicate, women are primarily responsible for reproductive labour in the home yet also take part in the paid labour market. Women are pulled in two directions - into production for a wage and by their responsibility for reproduction in the broadest sense. Over the years, this dual responsibility has become entrenched for women. The pulling of women into both sectors leaves them little time to become involved in other things such as union work.

The following question was used to indicate familial responsibility. How much time does your parental and familial responsibilities take? (Q11) This variable was measured on a
nominal level with the following categories; (i) a lot of my
time, (ii) some of my time, (iii) few hours of my time, (iv) does not apply. For the contingency table, this is re-cod ed as follows; (i) HIGH RESPONSIBILITY which includes categories 'a lot of my time' and 'some of my time' and (ii) NO RESPONSIBILITY which includes categories 'few hours of my time' and 'does not apply'.

Variable Six - Living Arrangement

Hypothesis six: IF A WOMAN IS MARRIED OR LIVING IN A LONG TERM RELATIONSHIP, SHE IS LESS LIKELY TO BE INVOLVED IN UNION BUSINESS.

The literature shows that the variable of marital status or living arrangement is one that is disagreed upon. Researchers have found varying results when it comes to marital status and union involvement (See Sutton, 1980; Chaison and Andiappan, 1987; and Cornfield et al, 1990). The use of marital status or living arrangement is important because, theoretically, it often is argued that when a women marries, regardless of whether children are involved, her responsibility for reproductive labour increases. If this is the case, she will have less time for involvement with other things such as union work.

Type of living arrangement is indicated in the following question. What is your current living arrangement? (Q53) This was measured at the nominal level with the following
categories; (i) single, never married, (ii) married, and living with spouse, (iii) common law or live in partner, (iv) widowed, (v) divorced, and (vi) separated. For the purposes of the contingency table, this variable was re-coded as follows; (i) SINGLE which includes categories of 'single', 'widowed', 'divorced', and 'separated', (ii) MARRIED which includes the categories of 'married and living with partner' and 'common law or live in partner'.

Variable Seven - Difficulties of Involvement

Hypothesis seven: WOMEN WHO BELIEVE IT IS EASIER FOR A MAN TO REACH AN EXECUTIVE POSITION IN THE MGEU WILL NOT BE INVOLVED IN UNION BUSINESS.

Leadership roles have often been regarded as roles for men. In our social world, most leadership roles are indeed held by men. The same is true for union leadership whose leaders have with some prominent exceptions, predominately been men. How does this fact affect women's decisions to become involved in union work?

The following question was used to address this issue. It is easier for a man than a woman to reach an executive position in the union. (Q32) This variable was measured on a five point likert scale. Responses varied from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Three categories will be used for the contingency table - (i) DIFFICULT (TO BECOME INVOLVED) which
included 'strongly agree' and 'agree' (ii) NEUTRAL, and (iii) NOT DIFFICULT (TO BECOME INVOLVED) which includes 'strongly disagree' and 'disagree'. The neutral category was left in for the analysis because a neutral response would indicate that in some circumstances it may be easier while in others it may not be easier for a man to reach an executive position than for a woman. The agree category would indicate that it is always easier for a man while the disagree category would indicate that the difficulty or ease of obtaining an executive position is equal.

**Variable Eight - Comfort Level**

**Hypothesis eight:** IF WOMEN DO NOT FEEL COMFORTABLE IN UNION SETTINGS, THEY WILL NOT BE INVOLVED IN UNION BUSINESS.

The literature suggests that men and women have different levels of comfort when it comes taking part in union work. In general, it is regarded that the work women perform in the public sphere is secondary to their work in reproduction. Therefore, a woman's place is often described as being in the home and not in the workplace. Union work is often viewed as work male work. This view may result in women not feeling comfortable enough to become involved in union work. Comfort level was indicated through the following question. **Women do not feel comfortable in union settings. (Q28)** This variable was measured on a five point likert scale. Responses varied from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Three categories
will be used for the contingency table - (i) UNCOMFORTABLE which included 'strongly agree' and 'agree' (ii) NEUTRAL, and (iii) COMFORTABLE which includes 'strongly disagree' and 'disagree'. The neutral category was left in for the analysis because it indicates that those respondents indicate some women do not feel comfortable and others do.
As discussed in the data method section, the analysis of the results are presented using two descriptive methods, and a test of significance. The first is a series of frequency distributions on the independent and dependent variables. Secondly, to address the relationship between the independent and dependent variables, a series of contingency tables are presented. This bi-variate measure of association was used because I am interested in measuring the relationship between the possible barriers to union participation outlined in the independent variables with actual union involvement, the dependent variable. A series of cross-tabs or contingency tables allows us to examine the relationship between the independent variables outlined earlier and the dependent variable to see which ones act as a barrier to women’s participation in unions. A chi-square test of significance will tell us which relationships are statistically significant.

I. Dependent Variable: Involvement in the MGEU

The dependent variable in this study is the involvement level of women in the MGEU. Table 7.1 shows how the involvement of women in the union is distributed among the sample.
TABLE 7.1
What is your involvement in the MGEU?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVELY INVOLVED</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTIALLY INVOLVED</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAS INVOLVED IN PAST</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOULD LIKE TO BE INVOLVED</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT INVOLVED</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* missing responses = 32

One of the largest problems women face in unions is their lack of representation in positions of leadership. The survey results indicate a source of this problem - the lack of involvement of rank and file members in the general affairs of union business. Respondents overwhelmingly indicated that they were not involved in union business. In total, 81.6% of respondents indicated that they had never been involved in union business while only 18.4% indicated that they are or have been involved in the affairs of the MGEU.

What can the data tell us about the dimensions of women's participation in the MGEU? Based on the theory outlined in this thesis, I will now turn to look at the distribution of the independent variables in the sample and then examine how they relate to the dependent variable and whether or not these relationships are significant.
II. Independent Variables

VARIABLE ONE: Job Status

The job status of the women in the sample is presented in Table 7.2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REGULAR FULL TIME</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGULAR PART TIME</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEASONAL, CASUAL, TERM</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*missing responses = 14

As the previous table shows, the majority of our sample are full time workers 66.7%. Almost quarter of the sample is made up of regular part time workers, while 10% are seasonal, contract, or casual workers.

Job Status and Involvement: Chi-Square Test

Hypothesis one: WOMEN WHO HOLD FULL TIME POSITIONS IN THE LABOUR MARKET WILL PARTICIPATE MORE OFTEN IN UNION BUSINESS THAN WOMEN WHO DO NOT.

The relationship between job status and involvement was not found to be significant. See table 7.3.
Table 7.3 shows that of those with secure jobs, 13.7% are involved in the union while 8.5% of those who have insecure jobs are involved. Therefore, of those involved, more have secure jobs than insecure jobs. Of those that are not involved, 91.5% have insecure jobs and 86.3% have secure jobs. Therefore, more of those who have insecure jobs are not involved. There is a difference of 5.2%. However, this difference was not found to be significant in this sample.

VARIABLE TWO: Job Tenure

The job tenure of the sample is presented in Table 7.4:
TABLE 7.4
How long have you been at your present job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 TO ONE YEAR</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 TO 5 YEARS</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 TO 15 YEARS</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 TO 25 YEARS</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 25 YEARS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*missing responses = 2

The majority of respondents have been at their present jobs between 6 and 15 years - 45.2%. An additional 40.3% have been at their present job under five years. The fewest respondents (14.3%) have been in their present job for over 16 years.

Job Tenure and Involvement: Chi-Square Test

Hypothesis two: WOMEN WHO HAVE BEEN EMPLOYED AT THEIR PRESENT JOB FOR OVER 6 YEARS WILL PARTICIPATE MORE OFTEN IN UNION BUSINESS THAN WOMEN WHO HAVE BEEN AT THEIR PRESENT JOB FOR LESS THAN 6 YEARS.

The relationship between job tenure and union involvement was found to be significant (p=.0406). See table 7.5.
Table 7.5 shows us that a higher percentage of people who are involved have been employed at their jobs for over 6 years. For those people who are not involved, a higher percentage have low rather than high job tenure (a difference of 4.5%). This difference was found to be significant and thus hypothesis two is supported.
The frequency of responses to convenience of meetings is presented in Table 7.6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*missing responses = 60

As table 7.6 indicates, 25% agree that the meetings are convenient for them while 31% indicate that meetings are not convenient for them. Of interest here is the neutral category where 40% of the sample indicate that meetings are neither convenient or inconvenient for them. As mentioned in Chapter Six, the neutral category was not used in the next two measures because of the problem interpreting the category.

Meeting Convenience and Union Involvement: Chi-Square Test

Hypothesis three: Women who indicate that the meeting times of union business is not convenient for them, will not become involved in union business.

The relationship between meeting convenience and union involvement was found to be significant (p=.0166). See table 7.7.
Table 7.7: MGEU Involvement by Meeting Convenience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT</th>
<th>Meetings are convenient</th>
<th>Meeting inconvenient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>involved</td>
<td>48 20.9</td>
<td>40 13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not-involved</td>
<td>182 79.1</td>
<td>265 86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>230 100</td>
<td>305 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 5.737  
Degrees of Freedom = 1  
Significance = .0166  
Number of Missing Observations = 550

Table 7.7 shows us that 21% of those that are involved said that meetings were convenient for them. Only 13% of those that were involved indicated that meetings were convenient and only 9.5% of those that were involved indicated that they were neutral in opinion. This table shows a difference of 7.8% between involvement and meeting convenience. This relationship was significant, supporting hypothesis three.

VARIABLE FOUR: Union Issues

The distribution of responses to MGEU dealing with important issues for women is presented in table 7.8:
More respondents agree that the MGEU deals with issues that are important to women, 34%, as opposed to only 14% who disagree that the MGEU deals with issues of importance to them. However, what is interesting is the neutral category where a majority of the respondents were found (51.3%).

Union Issues and Involvement: Chi-Square Test

**Hypothesis four:** Respondents who feel the MGEU is dealing with issues that are important to them will be involved more often than those who feel the MGEU is not dealing with their issues.

The relationship between union issues and union involvement was found to be significant (p=.0000). See table 7.9.
Table 7.9 indicates that of those who are involved, 22% of them believe the MGEU supports women's issues. Less of those who are involved believe that the MGEU does not support women's issues. The opposite is true for those who are not involved. Of those not involved, more believe that the MGEU does not support their issues than believe support their issues. Since this was found to be significant the hypothesis that women become involved in unions if the union deals with issues that are important to women was supported.

VARIABLE FIVE: Familial Responsibility
The distribution of familial responsibility in the sample is presented in table 7.10:
TABLE 7.10

HOW MUCH TIME DOES YOUR FAMILIAL
& PARENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES TAKE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a lot and some of my</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>69.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>few hours &amp; does not</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* missing responses = 22

The frequency indicates that 69% of the sample indicated that they spent a lot or some of their time involved in familial obligations. Thirty-one percent of the sample indicated that few hours or none of their time was allocated to familial responsibility.

Familial Responsibility & Union Involvement: Chi-Square Test

Hypothesis five: THE MORE TIME A WOMAN SPENDS INVOLVED IN FAMILIAL AND PARENTAL WORK, THE LESS LIKELY SHE WILL BE INVOLVED IN UNION WORK.

The relationship between familial responsibility and union involvement was not found to be significant.
### TABLE 7.11

**MGEU INvolvement by Familial Responsibility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT</th>
<th>High responsibility</th>
<th>no responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involved</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not-involved</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = .0682  
Degrees of Freedom = 1  
Significance = .7939  
Number of Missing Observations = 117

The cross-tab indicates that a very small difference exists between familial responsibility and union involvement for this sample. It was not found to be significant.

**VARIABLE SIX: Living Arrangement**

The distribution of the living arrangement of the sample is presented in table 7.12:
TABLE 7.12
WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT LIVING ARRANGEMENT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE, NEVER MARRIED</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARRIED, LIVING WITH SPOUSE</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMON LAW /LIVE IN PARTNER</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDOWED</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVORCED</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPARATED</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* missing responses = 15

Living Arrangement and Union Involvement: Chi-Square Test

Hypothesis six: IF A WOMAN IS MARRIED OR LIVING IN A LONG TERM RELATIONSHIP, SHE IS LESS LIKELY TO BE INVOLVED IN UNION BUSINESS.

The relationship between living arrangement and Union Involvement was found to be significant (p=.0008).
As table 7.13 shows, there is a higher percentage of single women who are involved than married women. The difference of 8.3% was found to be significant which supports hypothesis six.

**VARIABLE SEVEN: Difficulty of Involvement**

How the perception of difficulty of union involvement and advancement is distributed among the sample is presented in table 7.14:
TABLE 7.14

IT IS EASIER FOR A MAN TO REACH AN EXECUTIVE POSITION IN THE UNION THAN FOR A WOMAN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>41.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>34.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>19.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* missing responses = 69

As table 7.14 shows, 42% of the sample agrees that it is easier for a man to reach a union leadership level than for a women, while only 20% disagree.

Difficulty of Involvement & Union Involvement:

Chi-Square Test

Hypothesis seven: WOMEN WHO BELIEVE IT IS EASIER FOR A MAN TO REACH AN EXECUTIVE POSITION IN THE MGEU WILL NOT BE INVOLVED IN UNION BUSINESS.

The relationship between difficulty of involvement and involvement was not found to be significant.
TABLE 7.15

MGEU INVOLVEMENT BY DIFFICULTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT</th>
<th>difficult</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>not difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involved</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not-involved</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 4.07
Degrees of Freedom = 2
Significance = .1300
Number of Missing Observations = 158

Table 7.16 shows that there is very little difference in attitude of perception of ease in reaching a position of leadership in a union of those that are involved. This was not found to be significant indicating there is not relationship between involvement and attitude of ease.

VARIABLE EIGHT: Comfort Level

The comfort level of respondents is distributed among our sample as presented in table 7.16:
The distribution of this question among the sample is fairly even with about 28% agreeing that they do not feel comfortable in a union setting and 31% agreeing that they do. Again, the neutral category outweighs the others with 40% indicating that they are neutral when it comes to feeling comfortable in a union setting.

Comfort Level and Union Involvement: Chi-Square Test

**Hypothesis eight:** IF A WOMAN PERCEIVES THAT WOMEN DO NOT FEEL COMFORTABLE IN UNION SETTINGS, THEY WILL NOT BE INVOLVED IN UNION BUSINESS.

The relationship between comfort level and union involvement was found to be significant (p=.0000).
Table 7.17 shows us that there is a great deal of difference between whether or not a person would feel comfortable in participating in union business and their involvement. 76% of those that are not involved indicate that they would feel comfortable in the union and 92.9% of those that are not involved indicate that they would feel uncomfortable. This was found to be significant at the .0000 level which supports hypothesis eight.
III. Hypotheses Testing: Summary

The following table presents a synopsis of all of the chi-square tests of significance performed on the hypotheses outlined. Of the eight variables tested, five were accepted and three were not accepted.

**TABLE 7.16**
Hypotheses Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HYPOTHESES TO BE TESTED</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis one: Women who hold secure positions in the labour market will participate more often in union business than women who do not.</td>
<td>not accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis two: Women who have been employed at their present jobs for more than 6 years will be more involved in union business than those who have not.</td>
<td>accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis three: Women who indicate that meeting times of union business is not convenient for them will not become involved in union business.</td>
<td>accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis four: Respondents who feel the MGEU is dealing with issues that are important to them will be involved more often than those who feel the MGEU is not dealing with their issues.</td>
<td>accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>The more time a woman spends involved with familial work, the less likely she will be involved in union work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six</td>
<td>If a woman is married or living with partner, she is less likely to be involved in union business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seven</td>
<td>Women who believe it is easier for a man to reach an executive position in the MGEU will not be involved in union business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eight</td>
<td>If a woman perceives that she will not feel comfortable in a union setting, she will not become involved in union business.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a. Discussion

The primary theoretical framework of this research, socialist feminist theory, offers a means to understand women's low participation in unions. It is theorized that four main barriers to participation exist for women. These main barriers can be explained by looking at the way class and gender interact. This chapter will discuss the theoretical issues identified earlier in relation to the results of the study.

The first two variables that were tested, Job Tenure and Job Status, are related to barrier one outlined in Chapter Five - the Structure of the Labour Market. It was pointed out that women primarily hold part-time, part-year, low-waged jobs in insecure sectors of employment. This is a result of the way in which the need for women's labour for reproduction has structured the labour market. It was argued that the labour market has a gender base and is an expression of patriarchy in the workplace (Hartmann, 1976; Armstrong and Armstrong, 1984; Phillips and Phillips, 1983 & 1993; and Kemp, 1994). The present research investigates whether women's marginalized position in the labour market explains why they are not very involved in union work. When it comes to union involvement, it was argued that women's work in the secondary labour market is a major barrier to organizing women on a large, macro level or the organizing of women as a whole (Milkman, 1985). On a small
scale (women in individual workplaces), work issues of part-time workers do not get the priority that full-time workers issues do. Part-time and casual workers are the least secure and may not involve themselves in unions because they lack job security. It was hypothesized that the participation levels of women in unions is low because of their lack of job security.

Our data revealed that job status was not significant for union participation. Although the data showed that more women who held secure jobs were involved in union work (13.7%) than those who held insecure jobs (8.5%), this difference was not found to be statistically significant (see table 7.3). Job tenure (length of time spent at a given job) however, was a significant factor in explaining women's participation in unions. When women hold a secure position in the labour force they are more likely to become involved in union work. (Our sample indicated that 10% of low tenured women were involved but 15% of those with high tenure were involved). Those who have been at their jobs for longer periods of time are more likely to be protected by a union and will use that union power to keep and enhance their jobs. For those who are not secure or who have not been at their jobs for long periods of time, involvement in the union is not viewed as a way to help them keep their jobs. And, as Forrest (1993) notes, these are the jobs that are held primarily by women.

Variables three and four, meeting convenience and union
issues, are related to barrier two outlined in Chapter Five - Union Structure and Operation. Based on the theory, it is suggested that both patriarchy and capitalism have influenced the union movement and this influence is manifested in the operation of individual unions. This is seen in the way unions organize their work, what issues they consistently deal with, and how they organize their business operations. It is argued that patriarchy has affected the operation of unions because they have historically shaped their activities based on the male definition of work with male concerns becoming the defining issues for unions (Sangster, 1985; Milkman, 1985; and Quadagno, 1988). Capitalism has also affected the way unions operate, as seen in the concept of business unionism. Business unionism sets limits around the kinds of issues which are bargained over leaving other issues that question the inequality and sexist relations of the workforce going unchallenged (Cuneo, 1993; Briskin and McDermott, 1993; Briskin, 1984 & 1993; and Stinson and Richmond, 1993). Women's issues often do not fit into the strict practices of business unionism. Women therefore do not become involved in unions because they do not appear to offer them any advantage (Field, 1984).

Our data show support for the theoretical position that the structure of unions do not encourage women's participation in them. For instance, variable three showed a significant relationship between meeting convenience and union involvement.
(see table 7.7). What this indicates is that for women, the pragmatic operation of the MGEU is a barrier to their involvement. Eighty-seven percent of the women surveyed found meetings to be inconvenient and were not involved in union work. In addition, hypothesis four, which suggested that if a union deals with issues that are important to women more women will be involved, was strongly supported. Twenty-two percent of those who agreed that the MGEU deals with women's issues were involved in the union while only 9% of those who didn't agree were so involved. Overall, the data show support for the idea that the structure and operation of unions affects women's involvement in them. What is also interesting to note are the neutral categories for both questions. In the frequencies that were presented (tables 7.6 & 7.8) the neutral categories for both represented the largest percentage of respondents. What this strongly suggests is the indifference of women to union operation and work.

Variables five and six are related to barrier three - Structure of Reproduction. This deals with the way gender relations are constructed. The theory suggests that each society must have a way to organize their reproductive needs. In the patriarchal capitalist society that we live in it is women who are primarily responsible for reproductive labour. Regardless of whether or not they take part in the labour force, women's labour is directed primarily toward reproductive tasks while men's labour is primarily directed
toward productive tasks. This is entrenched in our culture and social practices. How does this social organization of reproduction affect women’s roles in unions? Because women’s primary responsibility is the home and family, there is the practical problem of time, with little of it available for union work. The literature has found differing results when it comes to confirming whether women’s time in reproduction is a significant barrier to union work (Sutton, 1980; Chaison and Andiappan, 1989; and Cornfield et al, 1990).

The data here did not support the argument that women with greater responsibility for familial work will be less involved in union work. Although the majority of our sample (69%) indicated that familial and parental responsibility take up a lot or some of their time, this did not influence involvement in unions (see table 7.11). This may support Sutton who suggests that women who have these responsibilities may be more committed to union business in order to keep their jobs and sustain their families.

The hypothesis that women who were in a committed relationship were less likely to become involved in union work was supported by the data. Our data showed that 19% of the single women sampled were involved while only 11% of the married women sampled were involved in union work. This difference was found to be statistically significant. This supports the authors who claim that female union activists tend to be unmarried (White, 1990a; White, 1980).
This data indicate that one's status does affect involvement but the actual time allocated to reproductive tasks does not act as a barrier to involvement. In future studies, it would be interesting to control for other factors such as job security (both status and tenure), ages of children, and length of time in arrangement along with living arrangement impact on union involvement.

Variables seven and eight are related to barrier four - attitudes toward unions and gender. These two variables look at attitudes that people hold with regard to gender and unions. It was theorized that these perceptions affect how people behave when it comes to choosing which activities to involve themselves with and which activities one perceives as worthwhile. As is historically evident, union work is often associated with male roles not female roles. Thus the attitudes that people hold when it comes to union work is often male biased. It is argued that this impairs women's willingness to learn activist leadership skills and impedes their union careers (Cuneo, 1993). We asked our survey respondents what attitudes were held about unions and gender and tested for the impact on union involvement.

Our hypotheses questioned attitudes on two levels: first, how easy or difficult one thought it would be to reach an executive position in the union and, secondly, how comfortable women feel in union settings. Both were meant to address whether traditional attitudes about the male centredness of
the union or unions would affect women's involvement in them.

While most agreed that it was easier for a man to reach an executive position in the union than a woman (42% agreed and 20% disagreed) this did not have an effect on union involvement. Eighteen percent (18%) of those who didn't hold this attitude were involved as opposed to 12% who held the attitude being involved. This suggests that, although the majority of women believed that it was easier for a man to reach an executive position than a woman, it would not deter their involvement in the union. Levels of involvement may also be of question here. Although women may believe it is easier for a man to reach an executive position, women may still participate at lower levels of union work, not aspiring for higher level positions.

Hypothesis eight which suggested that women do not feel comfortable in union settings was strongly supported by the data. Twenty-four percent of those who indicated women feel comfortable in unions were involved in them, whereas only 7% who believed women were not comfortable were involved. This difference is quite large and was found to be statistically significant. Therefore, this data supports the position that if women believe unions are a place for them and they feel comfortable being a part of the union process, they are more likely to become involved. This comfort level will increase the probability that women will learn activist and leadership skills and become vital parts of union leadership.
b. Policy Implications

These results have some practical impact for the MGEU itself. It points to a few things that can be done by the MGEU if they want to increase participation of their women members. The categories that showed a significant relationship to involvement and which the MGEU can attempt to alter are; (1) meeting times, (2) issues important to women, and (3) women's comfort level with union work. Asking women members what would be appropriate times and locations for them to attend union work may result in an increase in their participation. In addition, dealing with the issues that women members suggest are most important to them may also increase participation. Increasing the comfort level of women in unions may be achieved in a few ways. Perhaps role modelling is one important way. If the MGEU were to adopt an affirmative action policy, more women would be represented in the unions, providing role models for others and increasing women’s comfort level with unions. Although not studied here, affirmative action positions may have an added bonus of getting more women’s issues on the agenda for change which will also increase women’s participation in unions in general.
c. Conclusions

Unions play an extremely important role in industrial society. Up to the present time however, unions have largely reflected the capitalist patriarchal nature of our society. Unions are male dominated and, like their surrounding society, patriarchal in nature. The influx of women into the labour force has put pressure on unions to change. Feminists have challenged the definition of work and what it means. By doing so, they have challenged how unions operate. Although it has been difficult and the work is far from complete, unions have come to the realization that they can no longer ignore women. Women represent close to half of the labour force and are a great source of economic power. Their prominent position in the labour force demands that unions address their issues. Unions must change their structure. The barriers that women face when it comes to union work are plentiful and point to the need for some social transformations. They must become concerned with women’s issues, women’s distinctive role in society, and how this conditions their role in the labour market. They must look outside the workplace to the changing capitalist order and how it affects women in gender specific ways. Unions must struggle alongside women co-workers, reorganize paid work, and increase community social support so that job and family responsibilities are less burdensome and more easily shared. This requires a politics that affirms women’s involvement as full and equal members and leaders of
unions and that welcomes the transformations that will make such involvement possible (Feldberg, 1987). Equality for women can become a new source of vitality and growth at time when unions need all the strength they can muster. The feminization of the labour movement could become the basis for a full-scale alliance between working women (with their own distinct consciousness) and organized labour. The overlap between class and gender is greater than ever before and it carries with it the seeds of liberation and power (Balser, 1987:22).
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### APPENDIX A

#### ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFL-CIO</td>
<td>American Federation of Labour - Congress of Industrial Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFL</td>
<td>Alberta Federation of Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUPE</td>
<td>Alberta Union of Public Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCGEU</td>
<td>British Colombia Government Employees Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCFL</td>
<td>British Colombia Federation of Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAW</td>
<td>Canadian Auto Workers Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC</td>
<td>Canadian Labour Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSN</td>
<td>Confederation des Syndicats Nationaux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPE</td>
<td>Canadian Union of Public Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWC</td>
<td>Communication Workers of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAS</td>
<td>Federation des affaires sociales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERE</td>
<td>Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees International Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL</td>
<td>Manitoba Federation of Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGEU</td>
<td>Manitoba Government Employees Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPE</td>
<td>National Association of Public Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBFL</td>
<td>New Brunswick Federation of Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLFL</td>
<td>Newfoundland Federation of Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSFL</td>
<td>Nova Scotia Federation of Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSGEU</td>
<td>Nova Scotia Government Employees Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUPGE</td>
<td>National Union of Provincial Government Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFL</td>
<td>Ontario Federation of Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLBEU</td>
<td>Ontario Liquor Board Employees Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEIU</td>
<td>Office and Professional Employees International Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPSEU</td>
<td>Ontario Public Service Employees Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSSTF</td>
<td>Ontario Secondary School Teachers Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEI</td>
<td>Prince Edward Island Federation of Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEIUPSE</td>
<td>Prince Edward Island Union of Public Service Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSAC</td>
<td>Public Service Alliance of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QFL</td>
<td>Quebec Federation of Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFL</td>
<td>Saskatchewan Federation of Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGGEU</td>
<td>Saskatchewan Government Employees Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFCW</td>
<td>United Food and Commercial Workers International Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNA</td>
<td>United Nurses of Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USWA</td>
<td>United Steelworkers of America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX B

MGEU INVOLVEMENT SURVEY

INSTRUCTIONS: Please fill in the blank provided or circle the number that corresponds to your answer. If you do not know the answer or prefer not to answer a question, please leave it blank.

PART A  The following are questions regarding yourself and your job.

1) What is your occupation? __________________________

2) What is your job title? __________________________

3) Which do you work for?

   Government Department ......................... 1
   Crown Corporation .................. 2
   Other ................................................. 3

4) What is your work location?

   Urban .................................................. 1
   Rural .................................................. 2
   Northern ............................................. 3

5) What is your employment status?

   Regular full time .................................. 1
   Regular part time .................................. 2
   Seasonal ............................................. 3
   Term .................................................. 4
   Casual ................................................ 5

6) Who is your workplace primarily composed of?

   Men .................................................... 1
   Women ................................................ 2
   Mixed ................................................. 3
7) Who are the majority of supervisors in your workplace composed of?

Men ........................................ 1  
Women ..................................... 2  
Mixed ...................................... 3  

8) How long have you been at your present job?

0 to 1 years ................................ 1  
1 to 5 years .............................. 2  
6 to 15 years ............................ 3  
16 to 25 years ........................... 4  
over 25 years ............................ 5  

9) How long have you been in the labor force? (include all part and full time positions)

0 to 1 years ................................ 1  
1 to 5 years .............................. 2  
6 to 15 years ............................ 3  
16 to 25 years ........................... 4  
over 25 years ............................ 5  

10) Have you taken time out of the labor force, not including paid maternity leave, to care for children?

Yes ......................................... 1  
No ........................................... 2  
Does not apply .......................... 3  
If yes, how long? __________
11) How much time does your parental and familial responsibilities take?

- Alot of my time: 1
- Some of my time: 2
- Few hours of my time: 3
- Does not apply: 4

12) How do you choose to spend your time that is not absorbed by your job and your family?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Zero Hours</th>
<th>1 to 5 Hrs</th>
<th>6 to 10 Hrs</th>
<th>11 Hrs Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>church</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal hobby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART B In the following section you will be asked to answer questions regarding the MGEU and your involvement.

13) How long have you been a member of the MGEU?

- 0 to 1 years: 1
- 1 to 5 years: 2
- 6 to 15 years: 3
- 16 to 25 years: 4
- Over 25 years: 5
14) Do you attend union meetings?
   Yes, regularly ........................................ 1
   Yes, sometimes ...................................... 2
   No ....................................................... 3

15) Do you read 'Contact' magazine?
   Always .................................................. 1
   Frequently ............................................ 2
   Sometimes ............................................. 3
   Rarely .................................................. 4
   Never .................................................. 5

16) Have you attended a MGEU school?
   Yes ....................................................... 1
   No ....................................................... 2

17) What has been your involvement with the MGEU?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shop Steward</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Committee Member</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention Delegate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18) With what level of the MGEU have you been or are you involved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19) What do you consider to be your involvement with the MGEU?

- Actively involved ........................................ 1
- Partially involved ........................................ 2
- Was involved in past .................................... 3
- Would like to be involved, but haven't yet ... 4
- Not involved ............................................... 5

20) If involved, indicate the reasons for becoming involved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) a friend approached me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) a union representative approached me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) encouraged by Women's Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) talked into it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) through a grievance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) out of anger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) for protection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) out of a sense of justice and fair play</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) other (please indicate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List the three (3) most important reasons for becoming involved.

1) 
2) 
3)
21) Indicate as 'yes' those statements that sometimes or always prevent you from participating or becoming involved with the MGEU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) family takes up too much time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) involved with other things</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) job takes up too much time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) no interest in union business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) time of meetings not convenient</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) cannot find adequate childcare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) lack of knowledge about unions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) I'm afraid it will affect job security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) my partner (spouse) does not approve</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) do not feel comfortable or welcome</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) language barrier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) physical disability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) cultural or religious barrier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List the three most important reasons that prevent you from participating.

1) ____________________________
2) ____________________________
3) ____________________________

22) Are you aware of the child care policy for members attending union business?

Yes ........................................ 1 CONTINUE TO QUESTION 23
No ............................................ 2 GO TO QUESTION 24

23) Have you ever made use of this policy? (e.g. have you ever been reimbursed for child care expenses)

Yes ........................................... 1
No ............................................ 2
24) If on-site child care facilities were available during union business, would you become more involved?

Yes .......................................................... 1
No .......................................................... 2
Does not apply ............................................. 3

25) If women held stronger leadership roles in the union, would you become more involved?

Yes .......................................................... 1
No .......................................................... 2

26) What do you consider to be your knowledge about the MGEU structure and procedure?

Very Good ................................................. 1
Good .......................................................... 2
Satisfactory .................................................. 3
Fair .............................................................. 4
Poor ............................................................ 5
PART C Different people have different views and ways of looking at unions. In this section you will be asked to give your views. Please answer these questions on the basis of your experience and the experience of the women you know, with regards to the MGEU.

27) Most people at union events are men.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28) Women do not feel comfortable in union settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29) I do not feel comfortable in union settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30) After official union business, women feel comfortable participating in the social events of the union.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31) After official union business, I feel comfortable participating in the social events of the union.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32) It is easier for a man to reach an executive position in the union, than it is for a woman.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33) Men, because of their aggressiveness, are better suited to union leadership roles than women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34) My fellow union members believe that women are just as capable as men to assume positions of responsibility in the union.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35) Unions are necessary and vital to the security and well-being of workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36) When it comes to union business, most women feel their voices are not heard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37) I would feel more confident in the union addressing my issues if women were better represented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
38) Women view their union representatives as supportive of them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39) I view my union representative as supportive of me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40) Most women I work with know who their union representatives are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41) The MGEU deals with issues that are important to women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42) The MGEU has done numerous things to make me feel happy and secure in my job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43) The scheduled times for MGEU meetings are convenient for me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
44) The location of MGEU meetings are accessible for me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45) I find MGEU meetings informative and helpful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART D In the following section you will be asked to give your opinion on equality in the MGEU.

46) Do you believe that women are under-represented in the elected positions in the MGEU?

Yes .............................................. 1
No .................................................. 2

47) Do you agree there are barriers for women to participation in the MGEU?

Yes .............................................. 1 GO TO QUESTION 48
No .................................................. 2 GO TO QUESTION 49

48) Should the MGEU take steps to eliminate these barriers?

Yes .............................................. 1
No .................................................. 2
49) Should the MGEU take steps to ensure the adequate representation of women in elected positions?

Yes ............................................................... 1
No ............................................................... 2

50) Does the MGEU need to take steps to ensure fairness of representation for men and women?

Yes ............................................................... 1
No ............................................................... 2

PART E  The following are a few questions that will help us in our data analysis.

51) What is your age?

16 to 20 ............................................................... 1
21 to 25 ............................................................... 2
26 to 35 ............................................................... 3
36 to 45 ............................................................... 4
46 to 55 ............................................................... 5
55 & over ............................................................ 6

52) What is your highest level of education attained?

Less than High School ............................................. 1
Some High School ................................................. 2
High School Graduate .......................................... 3
Non-University, Post-Secondary ......................... 4
Some University ................................................... 5
University Bachelors Degree .............................. 6
Graduate School .................................................... 7
53) What is your current living arrangement?

Single (never married) ........................................... 1
Married (& living with spouse) .............................. 2
Common law or live in partner ............................. 3
Widowed ............................................................... 4
Divorced .............................................................. 5
Separated ............................................................. 6

How long have you been in this current arrangement? __________

54) Are you a parent, guardian or caregiver to any children under 18 years of age?

No ................................................................. 1 GO TO QUESTION 57
Yes ................................................................. 2 CONTINUE TO QUESTION 55

55) How many of these children are...? (please fill in blank with a number)

Under one year of age  ___________________________
Between the ages of 1 and five  ___________________
Between the ages of 6 and 11  ___________________
Between the ages of 12 and 16  ________________
Between the ages of 17 and 18  ________________

56) How many of these children live with you...? (please fill in blank with a number)

all of the time  _______________
part of the time  ______________
never live with me  ______________
57) Do you have any dependents living with you other than children?

    Yes ........................................ 1
    No ........................................ 2

58) What is your personal yearly income?

    Less than $10,000 .......................... 1
    10,000 to 19,999 .......................... 2
    20,000 to 29,999 .......................... 3
    30,000 to 39,999 .......................... 4
    40,000 to 49,999 .......................... 5
    50,000 to 59,999 .......................... 6
    over 60,000 ................................ 7

59) Do you see yourself as a member of a minority group?

    Yes ........................................ 1  Please Specify: ________________________________
    No ........................................ 2

In the space below, please indicate any additional information or comments you feel may be important to this area of inquiry. If you need more space, please use a separate sheet and attach it to the survey.


THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME INVOLVED IN FILLING OUT THIS SURVEY!!!!!! PLEASE PLACE SURVEY IN ENCLOSED ENVELOPE AND MAIL.

RM/amy