ORGANIZING AND UNION RENEWAL:
WHAT DETERMINES UNION ORGANIZING TACTICS?

Jonathan Eaton
University of Toronto
Centre for Industrial Relations
jonathan.eaton@utoronto.ca

ABSTRACT

Organizing has been recognized as a key element of union renewal. The selection of organizing tactics by unions has, in turn, been identified as having a significant impact on the success of union representation campaigns in the United States and Canada. However there is little quantitative data describing the organizing tactics and strategies that Canadian unions are employing. This paper examines union tactics in certification campaigns, using a survey of union organizers in Ontario and British Columbia. Employing multivariate analysis, the author investigates the impact of theoretically important organizer and bargaining unit characteristics on the selection of union organizing tactics. These data suggest that there is little evidence that unions in Canada are adopting aggressive and creative organizing campaigns, or systematically tailoring their organizing tactics to reach out to disadvantaged groups within the labour market such as women and immigrant workers. The results of this analysis further indicate that organizer characteristics, particularly gender, do not have a significant impact on union strategy, after controlling for the effects of other variables believed to influence union organizing. These, in some respects surprising, results suggest that the determinants of Canadian union organizing tactics merit closer scrutiny.

ORGANIZING AND UNION RENEWAL: WHAT DETERMINES UNION ORGANIZING TACTICS?[1]

I INTRODUCTION

Union organizing is central to the discussion of union renewal. Yates (2002a: 31) suggests that the "one unifying theme" in unions' responses to the new political-economic climate has been the recognition that they must place renewed emphasis on organizing the unorganized. She writes that in the 1990s all the major unions in Ontario assigned greater strategic priority to organizing (Yates 2000b: 665). As Hurd (1998: 19) notes, however, while the importance of organizing has been "heralded in conference resolutions, speeches, and union newspapers," the rhetoric does not always translate readily into action. Central labour federations in Canada do not have the power to spearhead organizing initiatives; individual unions play the key strategic role (Yates 2000b; Kumar *et. al.* 1998). A recent survey of national unions by Kumar and Murray (2002) found that while a majority (53.4 percent) of unions stated that organizing and recruiting members was a priority, the average percentage of revenue devoted to organizing by the respondent unions was only 6.8 percent. Just 6.2 percent of Canadian unions reported that they dedicated more than 20 percent of their budget to organizing.[2]

The failure of the labour movement to fully commit to "do what it takes" to organize large numbers of new members has been noted by many of those concerned with the

[1] I am grateful to Professor Charlotte Yates for providing access to the survey data analyzed in this paper. Her research was made possible with support of the Social Science and Humanities Research Council (Grant #410-98-1302). Responsibility for any errors or omissions in the analysis rests solely with me.
[2] By comparison, the leadership of the AFL-CIO has challenged its affiliates to devote 30 percent of their resources to organizing (Voos 2000).

future of unions. Surveying the American scene, Bronfenbrenner (2001: 18) concludes: "The problem is not that the labor movement does not know what it takes to win. The problem is that the majority of unions organizing today still run weak, ineffectual campaigns that fail to build their strength for the long haul." Her research, discussed below, has demonstrated that union organizing success depends on using a multifaceted strategy including a broad range of union-building tactics. Other researchers have pointed to the need for unions to put organizers in place who better reflect the faces of the workers being organized – workers who are now more likely to be female, visible minorities, immigrants and youth.

This paper aims to contribute to this debate by examining the selection of union organizing tactics more closely. Using the results of a survey of organizing campaigns in Ontario over a two year period, and a parallel survey in British Columbia, the paper analyzes the factors that have a significant impact in determining the tactics used by unions. The analysis of these data presented in the remainder of this paper indicates that bargaining unit size is the most important determinate of union organizing tactics. Unions employ more active strategies and a wider range of tactics in organizing large bargaining units. While we tend to focus on variables that have a significant effect on key outcomes, it is equally important to understand factors that have *no* impact, especially when – as is the case in this analysis – they are expected to have an impact. In that vein, the results of this analysis indicate that factors, such as the gender of the organizer and the demographic composition of the targeted workforce, do not have a significant impact on union strategy, after controlling for the effects of other variables believed to influence

union organizing. These, in some respects surprising, results suggest that the determinants of Canadian union organizing tactics merit closer scrutiny.

II CONTEXT

i. The Importance of Union Organizing Tactics

Simply increasing organizing budgets and the number of organizing staff is not enough to overcome legal changes, employer resistance and worker fear (Peters 2002; Bronfenbrenner 1997). As Masters and Atkin (1999: 298) point out: "Spending more money on organizing, while necessary, does not produce success if it is spent on the failed practices of the recent past." Resources must be combined with effective strategy for there to be continued union membership growth (Yates 2000b). Unions must confront the challenge of organizing workers in growing, difficult-to-organize sectors such as private services. In addition, they face a demographic challenge: union membership is ageing and tends to be concentrated in declining or slow-growth sectors. Unions must reach beyond this declining base to organize the next generation of workers (Lowe and Rastin 2000; Lowe 1998). With immigration making up a major portion of employment growth in Canada, this new workforce is also increasingly diverse. In Toronto, for example, fully 43.7 percent of the population in 2001 was foreign born, and the proportion identified as visible minority had climbed to 36.8 percent (Statistics Canada 2003). Toronto's immigrant population originates from 169 different countries. This diversity poses practical and logistical challenges for union organizing.

Proactive union strategies such as building community alliances have been found to have a more positive effect on win rates than traditional union tactics such as leafleting (Peterson *et. al.* 1992). Bronfenbrenner's research of National Labor Relations Board election outcomes in the United States reveals that unions are more likely to win elections if they use "rank-and-file intensive tactics" such as person-to-person contact, active representative committees, and a creative combination of internal and external pressure tactics. Union strategy, she finds, has a significant impact even after controlling for employer tactics. Successful organizing is characterized by a focus on dignity and justice, representative leadership, personal contact, and building an active union presence in the workplace from the very beginning of the campaign (Bronfenbrenner *et. al*. 1998). This approach works because it generates the worker participation and commitment necessary to withstand aggressive anti-union campaigns by employers and to counteract negative aspects of the economic, political and legal climate (Bronfenbrenner 1997; Clawson and Clawson 1999). Unions must frequently engage public support and recruit organizational allies to turn organizing campaigns into a community battles over social justice (Nissen 1999).[3]

Traditional tactics such as leaflets and mailings are not necessarily negative. But, according to Bronfenbrenner (1998: 28), these tactics act as a proxy for traditional campaigns where the union's energy is focused on indirect means of communication rather than on the personal contact and leadership development necessary to build the

[3] At the same time, Hurd (1998) points out that a strategy that relies on tapping into the power of worker discontent is unlikely to be universally effective. Professional, technical, and clerical workers, for example, may be interested in independent representation but view continuous conflict as disruptive. Different objective conditions may require different appeals.

union and counteract the employer campaign. Person-to-person contact through tactics such as house calls and small group meetings, "is an essential and effective means for organizers to listen to workers' concerns, allay their fears, and mobilize them around the justice and dignity issues that matter enough to them to challenge the employer and win, regardless of the brutality and intensity of the employer campaign" (Bronfenbrenner 1998: 28).

While the success of this organizing strategy has been demonstrated, most American unions have not yet adopted this approach. The majority of unions in NLRB elections continue to run fairly weak campaigns, even when faced with aggressive employer opposition. Moreover, "the overwhelming majority of unions continue to pick and choose individual tactics, in most cases without any coherent plan or strategy, rather than pulling them together into a more comprehensive, multi-faceted strategy" (Bronfenbrenner and Hickey 2004). More research is needed, these authors suggest, to understand why comprehensive campaigns are found in only a limited number of cases.

Interest in the "organizing model" developed by unions in the United States has spread to Canada, as well as Britain, Australia and elsewhere (Carter and Cooper 2002; Hurd 1998). Yates (2000b) argues that in the face of a growing membership crisis and an increasingly hostile political-economic climate in Canada, unions have increased their investment in organizing and developed several innovative strategies to enhance success in recruitment. On the other hand, Peters (2002) concludes that, for the most part, Canadian unions still conduct very traditional campaigns that involve little personal

contact, and very few employ the external pressure tactics, ranging from civil disobedience to public pressure, necessary to counter aggressive employer campaigns. Supporting this conclusion, the majority of unions (61.5 percent) responding to the national survey by Kumar and Murray (2002) indicated that they had not been influenced by recent efforts by unions in the United States to renew their approaches to organizing and recruitment, while just 16.7 percent said that they had been influenced by these efforts. This evidence suggests that the diffusion of new organizing approaches has been slow.

ii. The Influence of Union Organizers and Workplace Demographics

Individual union organizers play a key role: they choose the tactics deployed in particular campaigns, they deliver the union message to potential members, and they mediate between the union and workers, government officials and managers (Reed 1989). Yet, as Reed (1990: 71) points out: "Union organizers are one of the least studied groups in the industrial relations system." Changes to union organizing strategy, according to Yates (2002a) and Bronfenbrenner (2001), begin with changing who does the organizing. For unions, this means both hiring organizers with diverse backgrounds and demographic characteristics and deploying more rank-and-file organizers. Yates (2002a: 33) asserts that: "Organizers who share similar experiences and backgrounds are more likely to be able to communicate (often also because of the need to organize workers in a language other than English), empathize and build relations of trust with workers like themselves." Yet just one in five unions (19.3 percent) surveyed by Kumar and Murray (2002)

reported that the gender, age and ethnic profile of their staff reflected the kinds of workers they were seeking to recruit.

Rooks (2003) notes that there is disagreement among labour researchers and practitioners about whether it is necessary to develop new organizing models to respond to increasing workforce diversity. Some argue that organizing drives in female-dominated workplaces must utilize different tactics, acknowledging that women tend to work collectively, prefer decentralized decision-making and non-hierarchical meeting structures, and are often uncomfortable directly confronting their employers. Others argue that to appeal to women workers it is not necessary to design new tactics, but instead to focus on the issues that resonate with women workers.[4] Either way, Rooks (2003: 38) concludes: "It is clear … that if unions want to communicate effectively with non-white workers in the low-wage service sector, they must hire (and retain) many more organizers who are female, immigrant, and people of color." Sciacchitano (2000: 75) adds that: "The fact that so many organizers are still white and male, in addition to being outsiders with a plan, ensures that race, gender, and especially class hierarchies reassert themselves and block the full sharing of information and ideas needed for long-term success."

Member organizers provide a partial solution to this dilemma. Utilizing rank-and-file organizers from current bargaining units has the advantage of allowing the union to deploy organizers that mirror the composition of the workforce being organized on the basis of gender, race, ethnicity, age, or work experience (Yates 2002a: 34). Member

[4] These perspectives are summarized by Rooks (2003: 38 – 39), Bronfenbrenner (2003b: 5), and Crain (1994: 229).

organizers may also provide a cheaper and more effective way to organize than parachuting large numbers of staff organizers in for campaigns (Rogers 1995). There is evidence that Canadian unions are attempting to seize this advantage. About two in five unions (41.4 percent) in the most recent national survey by Kumar and Murray (2002) agreed that unpaid activists played a major role in their organizing campaigns.

Crain (1994) investigated the question of whether worker gender – as distinct from worker occupation – influences organizing strategy. She argues that conventional union organizing strategy, premised on pursuing "hot shops" (where workers have indicated an interest in organizing) and the use of "blitz" techniques presents a barrier to women's unionization. She suggests that new tactics are emerging among unions organizing in sectors with larger percentages of female workers, typically in the service sector. Successful organizers in these sectors have focused on one-on-one methods of organizing, relying on large, representative, actively involved employee committees (Crain 1994: 229). However, Crain's survey of 199 union staff organizers affiliated with 29 different unions found that only a minority of the organizers surveyed – both male and female – agreed that "it is necessary to use different organizing tactics with female workers than are used with male workers." The survey respondents consistently described the gender of the workforce as the least important factor in determining the outcome of an organizing campaign (Crain 1994: 238). However, a majority of the 12 female field organizers who were interviewed by Crain (separately from the survey) reported that gender *was* relevant to their organizing style. These organizers stated that they were more likely to emphasize participation in workplace decision-making and so-called "women's

issues" as campaign themes in female workplaces.[5] Organizing directors reported that they made a conscious effort to match organizer and worker gender, but little else was done to frame organizing campaigns specifically for female workers.

Based on a detailed survey of organizer personal characteristics, Reed (1989; 1993) found that union organizers play an important role in determining the outcome of representation elections. A number of personal characteristics such as education (positive), race (non-white is positive) and work history (experience outside of the union is positive) are important correlates of union organizing success. Reed (1989) concludes that by hiring better-educated, socially mobile individuals who possess certain personality characteristics (such as high self-esteem), unions may greatly improve their organizing performance. He also suggests that researchers may be missing important insights into the organizing process by testing organizing outcome models that omit the characteristics and behaviour of the union organizer (Reed 1993: 201).

In contrast, Brofenbrenner (1997) concluded that organizer background variables played a much less important role in determining union election success than did most of the other elements assessed in her model (although her study did not include the range of organizer characteristics considered by Reed). Looking at the presence of women and minority organizers in particular, Bronfenbrenner (1997: 210) suggests that the willingness to hire such organizers may be correlated with more aggressive union tactics:

[5] Forrest (2001) suggests that both union organizers and industrial relations scholars have a tendency to fail to identify gender discrimination as a motivator to organize, simply because the exploitation of women is so systemic in nature and embedded in longstanding organizational practices that it is not recognized as *being* discrimination.

"Thus female and minority organizers not only are a proxy for unions that run more aggressive campaigns, but they also may have had to work much harder and be much better organizers than their white male counterparts in order to prove themselves to their fellow staff and to the leaders of their unions."

Echoing Reed (1989), Sherman and Voss (2000) suggest that one of the key characteristics of "fully innovative" organizing locals was the presence in the local of organizers with social movement experience gained outside the labour movement. And other researchers have argued that union staff recruited from social movements often infuse unions with energy, militant tactics, and strategic vision (Rooks 2003). Recruiting community activists often goes hand in hand with efforts to create an organizing staff that mirrors the demographics of the current or potential union members in terms of language and ethnic diversity (Yates 2002a; Bronfenbrenner 2003b).

There is clearly considerable academic and policy debate concerning the organizing strategies that unions might use, and are using, to renew themselves in the extremely challenging climate that they now face. The studies discussed above illustrate the research interest in the importance of organizing and recruitment to union renewal, the impact of union tactics, and the influence of individual union organizers on organizing success. Findings from the key studies are summarized in Table 1.

III ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

Most studies of union organizing tactics have focused on identifying the elements of organizing success. The certification outcome (win / loss) or the percentage of votes cast for the union are the dependent variables. Union and employer tactics, bargaining unit features and organizer characteristics are used as independent variables to help explain these outcomes (Bronfenbrenner 1997; Bronfenbrenner and Hickey 2004; Martinello and Yates 2004; Peterson *et. al*. 1992). The goal of this paper is to take a step back, and use the available data to assess the factors that are important in determining one of those key explanatory variables – union tactics – that ultimately affect organizing success.

The choice of a set of strategies and tactics by unions will depend on the relative costs and benefits, both of which are affected by environmental and organizational conditions (Masters and Atkins 1999). Union responses will depend on the dynamic conditions they face rather than just static characteristics of the workplace. Based on the literature on this topic, we would expect to find more aggressive union tactics in sectors of the economy that are more affected by globalization and intensified competition, particularly manufacturing (Martinello and Yates 2004), and in larger workplaces where the stakes for both sides are likely to be higher. In sectors of the economy where union density is already relatively high, such as in larger manufacturing workplaces, unions may require more aggressive bargaining tactics to achieve further gains. We would anticipate that tactics emphasizing one-on-one contact will be used more by female and minority organizers and in campaigns involving female-dominated workplaces (Crain 1994; Yates 2002a; Bronfenbrenner 2001; Bronfenbrenner 2003b). And we would expect that

innovative tactics will be used more by organizers who have experience as community activists (Sherman and Voss 2000; Reed 1989) or who have been exposed to new practices through union training programs.

IV DATA

The Survey of Union Organizers in Ontario was conducted by Professor Charlotte Yates in collaboration with the Ontario Federation of Labour (OFL). The survey aimed to gather information on each application for certification in Ontario from September 1, 1996 to August 31, 1998. A total of 1,281 surveys were mailed to organizers from unions across all sectors, including employee associations and unions that are not affiliated with the OFL (Yates 2000a). Of these, 677 were returned, for a response rate of 52.8 percent. There was a slight bias towards non-reporting for employee associations and small, non-affiliated unions, most of which were recorded as having just one or two applications for certification (Yates 2000b).[6] Certification applications that involved one union attempting to displace another ("raids") were not included in my analysis. Construction sector cases were also excluded, because construction is treated as a distinct sector under Ontario's labour legislation.

The remaining 17 industry classifications identified by responses to the survey were recoded following the four economic sectors defined by the Economic Council of Canada (1990): Goods, Dynamic Services, Traditional Services and Nonmarket Services. The

[6] Martinello and Yates (2004) compared the survey results with the overall characteristics of certification applications filed with the Ontario Labour Relations Board over approximately the same two year period and found that the applications in the data are generally representative of applications filed in Ontario over this period.

Goods producing sector consists of primary industries (such as agriculture, forestry and mining) and secondary industries (such as manufacturing). The Dynamic Services sector includes four major industry divisions: transportation, communications, and utilities; wholesale trade; finance, insurance, and real estate; and business services. These industries are considered to be dynamic in nature because they are high-value-added industries that have become more and more involved in internationally competitive markets. Traditional Services include retail trade, accommodation and food, and personal services. Finally, Nonmarket Services include education, health, social services and public administration (Economic Council of Canada 1990: 2). About 20 percent of the organizing campaigns in this data set involved employers in the Goods sector, 17 percent were Dynamic Services, 29 percent were Traditional Services, and the largest number, 34 percent, were in Nonmarket Services.

The survey asked whether any of 19 different tactics were used in the course of specific certification campaigns. The respondents, who were the lead organizers in these certification campaigns, were asked to provide information on themselves, including their race/ethnicity, gender, age, years of experience, and training. The survey also asked questions about the bargaining unit being organized: its size, demographic makeup, industry sector, and a number of other features. The Yates survey data thus provide a particularly rich resource to explore union organizing tactics in greater depth.

Subsequently, the same survey was distributed in British Columbia with the assistance of the British Columbia Federation of Labour (BCFL). The B.C. survey asked responding

organizers about each application for certification in that province from May 1, 1997 to April 30, 1999. A total of 439 surveys were returned (Yates 2002b). During this time period, B.C. had a card-based certification system that was quite different from the mandatory-vote certification model found in Ontario. Given the differences in time period, location, and legal regime, simply pooling the data from the two surveys was not considered appropriate for the analysis in this paper. However, the results from B.C. are used descriptively to provide a comparison with the Ontario experience.

V RESULTS

The survey asked the union respondents whether a variety of union strategies were used in the period leading up to the application for certification, and in the period between the application and the vote. This paper focuses on union tactics in the first period, for two reasons. First, unions in almost all cases must achieve majority support before they apply for certification if they hope to win the vote. Yates (2000a) found that in a majority of cases, unions did not apply until they had at least 65 percent support. Anecdotal evidence suggests that most Ontario unions set a benchmark of signing up at least 60 percent of employees in a workplace before they will apply for certification. Unions tend to lose support between the application and the vote and must therefore use their most effective tactics to win support *before* the application. After the application, the focus shifts to retaining membership support, preparing the inside committee to face the employer's campaign, and "getting out the vote" to ensure that all possible pro-union votes actually get in the ballot box.[7] The other reason for focusing on union tactics in the pre-

[7] In Ontario, the certification vote must be held within five business days of the application. The Ontario Labour Relations Board has been effective in holding votes within this time limit. There is not a lengthy

application period is that there were a large number of non-responses to the question of post-application tactics, making comparison of the two periods difficult.[8]

Basic descriptive statistics on the union organizing tactics covered in this survey are presented in Table 2. It is apparent that, as in the United States (Bronfenbrenner 2001), few of the "new" approaches identified as important mobilizing tactics are being used by unions in Ontario (Yates 2000a). For example, only 5 percent attempt to engage public support through leafleting or letters, 3 percent of the campaigns use the media, and 2 percent involve solidarity work with community groups. The key tactics used in a majority of campaigns are phone calls (78 percent), inside committees (78 percent), small group meetings (77 percent), letters (52 percent), and leafleting at the workplace (50 percent). No other tactics are used in more than half of the campaigns in this data set.

Most organizing campaigns are initially reactive, in that they are initiated in response to an expression of interest by workers at a workplace. Fully 67 percent of the campaigns were initiated in response to calls from workers requesting that the union organize their workplace. This figure does not vary significantly among campaigns in the four economic sectors. The single most important organizing tactic used by Canadian unions is building an inside organizing committee reflecting the diversity of the workforce (Yates 2002a: 35). It is important that members of the inside committee feel a sense of ownership of the campaign. Tactics used in individual campaigns will thus depend to a

---

period of time, as there is in National Labor Relations Board elections in the United States, for campaigning between the application and the vote.

[8] Yates (2000a) concluded that union tactics tend to decline between the period leading up to the application and the period between the application and vote. Similarly, in British Columbia, union tactics were found to drop after the certification application in cases where a vote was necessary (Yates 2002b).

large extent on what the members of the inside committee want to do, and are capable of doing.

Table 3 provides the same descriptive information for the survey responses from British Columbia. These data indicate that, compared to Ontario, organizing in B.C. is more focused on the Nonmarket Services sector and small, female-dominated workplaces (Yates 2002b). Campaigns in British Columbia are less intense – with the notable exception of house calls, virtually all tactics are used less frequently in B.C. than in Ontario. The four tactics used in more than half of campaigns in B.C. are small group meetings (78 percent), house calls (61 percent), inside committees (59 percent), and phone calls (57 percent). Tactics such as solidarity days, social events, rallies or public forums, and solidarity coalitions with community groups are used in 5 percent or less of campaigns profiled by the survey. The more intense nature of campaigns in Ontario likely reflects the differences in labour legislation in the two provinces during the period covered by the survey. Unions in Ontario had to work harder to gain and maintain support due to the absence of a card-based certification system, such as the system that was then in place in B.C.

Organizers in Ontario continue to be mainly white (86 percent), over 40 (56 percent) and male (73 percent).[9] There is some evidence that Ontario unions are targeting female organizers to female-dominated workplaces. In workplaces where 75 percent or more of the employees were women, the proportion of lead organizers who were women rises to

[9] By comparison, a recent study by Bronfenbrenner (2003b) found that 21 percent of lead organizers in U.S. certification campaigns were female and 22 percent are workers of colour.

48 percent. As Table 4 indicates, campaigns in the Nonmarket Services sector had by far the highest proportion of female organizers (50 percent, compared to just 8 percent in the Goods sector). Organizers in the Goods sector were the most likely to be over 40 (77 percent). These results appear to match the finding by Reed (1990) that organizers working with unions organizing in the public, non-profit, and service sectors were more likely to be young and female than those working for manufacturing unions. Reed (1990: 77) concluded that a "new breed" of young, female and well-educated union organizer was entering the labour movement through service union organizing departments. Compared to Ontario, B.C. organizers are less likely to be white (80 percent) and male (55 percent), but more likely to be older than 40 (84 percent).

Canadian unions are making efforts to assign organizers who reflect the composition of the workplaces being organized. However, this goal is challenging due to limited resources and the consequent inability to hire new staff. Unions are attempting to bridge this gap by employing member / activists who are pulled out of their workplaces for set periods of time to participate in specific campaigns. Rank-and-file organizers were employed in 28 percent of the Ontario campaigns in this sample (compared to just 11 percent in B.C.). Providing training for these member organizers is a priority. For example, in early 2003 the United Steelworkers in Ontario completed its first-ever organizer training session specifically for women union members, involving over 50 members. Other unions have similar programs.

Almost one in three Ontario organizers (31 percent) counted experience in organizing through community activism, a social movement or political campaign as part of their training, but fewer than one in five (17 percent) had received formal training through courses provided by the Canadian Labour Congress, Ontario Federation of Labour or a local labour council. B.C. organizers were more likely to have experience as community activists (43 percent). Unions themselves are also providing training for their staff organizers: almost 31 percent of Ontario respondents had participated in union organizer training programs lasting longer than three days. About one in six (16 percent) of the organizers said that they had received no training at all.

While a majority of Ontario organizers were older than 40, over half (53 percent) of respondents had four or fewer years of experience as a union organizer. The average length of experience as an organizer was 5.7 years. Women tend to have much less organizing experience (an average of 3.9 years, compared to 6.4 years for men). In comparison, the organizers surveyed by Reed (1989: 196) in the United States had an average of over 11 years of organizing experience. It should be noted that the person asked to complete each survey was the *lead organizer*, defined as the individual who took primary responsibility for coordinating the organizing drive. In 56 percent of cases the lead organizer was the only union organizer working on the campaign – a reflection in part that the preponderance of organizing campaigns occurred in small workplaces. Just 5 percent of respondents had more than 15 years organizing experience.

Organizing is an intense, demanding activity in an increasingly challenging environment. The large number of organizers with relatively little experience in the job suggests that burnout and high turnover – a well documented problem for American unions (Rooks 2003; Foerster 2003; Feekin and Widenor 2003) – may be an issue that Canadian unions must confront. As Yates (2002b: 14) notes: "Tired, over-worked and under-resourced organizers cannot plan and follow through systematically with an organizing plan. Often-times organizers end up using ad hoc measures or are only able to partially follow through with a plan of organizing action." She points out that employers, who hire management consultants or who dedicate part of a management team to opposing a union organizing drive, are less likely to confront these problems. A further issue identified by Rooks (2003) and Crain (1994) is that women and people of colour are the most likely to be alienated by this pattern of organizing work, undermining labour's efforts to diversify the movement.

Martinello and Yates (2004) found that applications in the manufacturing industry are hotly contested with high levels of resources expended by both sides, whereas organizing drives in the health industry "appear to be fairly polite affairs with meetings, letters and leaflets; and much lower incidence of the other tactics." Cross tabulation of the union organizing tactics by economic sector reinforces this conclusion (Table 5). First, there are tactics that are used in all sectors in the majority of campaigns, such as inside committees, small group meetings and phoning workers. On the other extreme, there are leading-edge tactics that very few unions are using in any sector, such as videos, rallies and public forums, and involving community groups.

In between these two extremes there is a set of tactics, such as house calls, rank-and-file organizers and solidarity days, that tend to be used more in the Goods sector than in the services sectors, particularly the Nonmarket Services sector. These are all tactics that involve more aggressive outreach to workers. On the other hand, mailing letters, a relatively passive form of campaigning, is used about the same in the Goods sector (54.6 percent) and the Nonmarket Services sector (54.7 percent). Leafleting at the workplace is another relatively passive tactic, but this one is used in Goods sector workplaces (75 percent) significantly more than Nonmarket services (40 percent). This may reflect the reality that manufacturing workplaces are more likely to present locations suitable for distributing leaflets (i.e. plant gates) than workplaces in the three service-related sectors. Three tactics – phone calls, education of workers, and newsletters – are used more in Traditional Services than in the other sectors.

As Table 6 illustrates, "bread-and-butter" concerns such as job security and wages top the list of issues that Ontario unions emphasize during certification campaigns. In contrast, race or sex discrimination was emphasized as an issue in just 4 percent of campaigns. For the most part, there was little difference in the issues emphasized by male and female lead organizers. Just one issue, "voice in decision making," was pushed significantly more by women (40 percent) than men (25 percent). Male organizers, on the other hand, are significantly more likely than female organizers to focus on the issues of fairness, health and safety, pensions, and forced overtime. These survey results thus provide little

support for the proposition that certain issues, such as equality, are promoted more vigorously by women organizers.

Binary logistic regression was conducted to provide a multivariate test of the relationship between organizer and bargaining unit variables and the tactics that unions use. This was done for each of the 12 union tactics used in more than 5 percent of Ontario certification applications. Two sets of independent variables were included in the model: lead organizer characteristics and bargaining unit features. The factors describing the individual lead organizers are: staff organizing experience (in years) and dummy variables representing race, gender, age,[10] training from the CLC or OFL, and experience as a community organizer. The bargaining unit variables are: economic sector; bargaining unit size; proportion of women;[11] and a dummy variable for workplaces where more than 20 percent of the employees spoke a language other than English as their primary language.[12] The results of these logistic regressions are presented in Table 7.

[10] The survey asked organizers to report their age when the organizing drive took place by checking one of four categories (18-24, 25-40, 41-50 or over 50). There were just two organizers (0.4 percent) who were under 25, and only 14 percent were over 50. The issue that appeared to be of interest was whether different tactics were being used by the approximately 44 percent of organizers who were younger than 40. Therefore, I collapsed the four age categories into two, to create a dummy variable for organizers older than 40.

[11] Following Bronfenbrenner (2003b), in order to capture the differences in tactics in workplaces where women were more or less concentrated, the data is broken down into four gender groups based on the percentage of women in the unit: less than 25 percent, 25 to 49 percent, 50 to 74 percent, and 75 to 100 percent. "Predominantly female units" are those with 75 percent or more women.

[12] The survey asked if more than 20 percent of the workforce involved in the organizing campaign spoke a language other than English. It did not ask respondents to estimate the percentage of non-English speakers in the workplace. There were a fairly large number of missing values for the questions regarding the proportion of women and non-English workers (22 and 29 missing observations, respectively, out of 499). In order to avoid losing data through listwise deletion, a separate "unknown" category was created for each of these variables.

Size is a critical factor. At least one of the size dummy variables is a significant and positive factor for all the twelve union tactic variables. The results suggest that unions will employ more tactics in larger bargaining units. The magnitude of the size effect can be seen particularly in the largest bargaining units. For example, campaigns in units of over 200 workers are 53 percentage points more likely to use electronic communication than campaigns in units of 20 or fewer workers.

A number of organizer characteristics are also significant. For example, organizers who have participated in CLC or OFL training programs are significantly more likely to use inside committees, phone calls, letters, and leaflets. The presence of organizers with this type of training increases the probability of these individual tactics being used by 11 to 22 percentage points. This suggests that participation in these training programs leads to positive results for unions in terms of achieving more active campaigns. In contrast, training as a community activist is a significant factor for only one tactic (solidarity days).

Younger organizers are significantly more likely to use phone calls, letters, leaflets, and house calls, suggesting that they may try to "hustle" more to prove themselves to fellow union staff and the union leadership (Bronfenbrenner 1997). They are less likely, however, to organize solidarity days, an emblematic feature of the organizing model described in the union renewal literature. This observation must be tempered by the fact that solidarity days are so rarely used overall; they are found in just 8 percent of the campaigns in this sample. While the participation of young organizers appears positive,

experience as an organizer is also important. This characteristic is a positive and significant predictor for the use of phone calls, inside committees, letters, leaflets, and large group meetings. This finding underlines the potential danger to unions of high turnover among organizers, as less-experienced new organizers will tend to run less active campaigns.

Racial minority organizers are significantly more likely to use letters and leaflets, and marginally more likely to use solidarity days, but significantly less likely to use large group meetings, education for workers, and newsletters. The impact of this organizer characteristic appears at best uneven. It is clear, however, that organizer gender does not follow predicted results. Female organizers are more likely than male organizers to engage in only one of the twelve union tactics examined (i.e. letters), which represents a relatively passive form of organizing. On the other hand they are significantly less likely to use the more innovative tactics of employing rank-and-file organizers, newsletters, and electronic communication. For the remaining tactics, organizer gender has no significant impact.

Some tactics, notably inside committees, leaflets, house calls, and solidarity days, are significantly more likely to be used in the Goods sector than in the Nonmarket Services sector (which serves as the excluded reference category in the regression model). This supports the conclusion that more active tactics are being employed in more competitive sectors, where unions are likely to have to overcome a greater degree of employer resistance to certification. Campaigns in the Goods sector are, for example, 37 percentage

points more likely to use solidarity days, compared to the Nonmarket Services sector. The one tactic that is consistently used more in the Nonmarket Services sector is electronic communication, a result which may reflect that workers in this sector were much more likely to have access to e-mail during the period covered by the survey (1996 – 1998).

Bronfenbrenner (2003b) found that American unions organizing in predominantly female units are much more likely to utilize comprehensive tactics than unions organizing in units where women are the minority.[13] In contrast, the results of the survey of union organizers in Ontario suggest that union tactics in this province do not vary a great deal based on the gender composition of the workplace. These variables are not significant predictors for the large majority of union tactics. In a few cases their impact is negative; unions use electronic communication and leaflets significantly less in predominantly female workplaces. Just one active tactic (i.e., house calls) is significantly and positively associated with workplaces that have a large number of non-English-speaking workers. Letters are significantly less likely to be used in these workplaces. This may reflect the difficulty of relying on written communication in a situation where a large number of workers do not speak English.

[13] Brofenbrenner notes (2003b: 34) that this finding in part reflects the fact that the unions who utilize a comprehensive strategy on a consistent basis, SEIU, HERE, and UNITE, are also unions that concentrate their organizing efforts in industries where women predominate. All three of these unions went through considerable transformations in Ontario over the 1990s, and it is possible that the adoption of innovative organizing approaches from their American counterparts has been lagged and uneven. According to the Ontario Labour Relations Board *Annual Reports* for 1996-97 and 1997-98, these three unions collectively accounted for 7.5 percent of all certification applications in time period under review.

Logistic regression of union tactics using the same independent variables for the British Columbia data (Table 8) indicate that once again bargaining unit size is the most consistent predictor of union tactics. At least one of the size dummy variables is significant (and in each case positive) for nine of the twelve organizing tactics. As in Ontario, organizer training from the CLC or provincial labour federation appears to have an important impact. Organizers with this training in B.C. are significantly more likely to use small group meetings, letters, large group meetings, newsletters, education for workers, and electronic communication – although they are less likely to use housecalls. Again, as in Ontario, organizer and worker gender appear to have little impact on the selection of union organizing tactics. Just one tactic (small group meetings) is used significantly more by female organizers, and one tactic (rank-and-file organizers) is used significantly more in predominantly female workplaces.

These findings are reinforced by Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression, in which the number of tactics employed by the union is the dependent variable. As Table 9 indicates, the number of tactics employed by unions in Ontario increases significantly in larger workplaces. From a mean of 5, the number of tactics used jumps by almost 4 when the workplace being organized has over 200 employees. Organizer experience, youth, and training from the CLC or OFL also have significant and positive impacts on the number of tactics used. There are also marginally significant increases in the number of tactics used associated with workplaces in the Goods and Traditional Services sectors, compared with Nonmarket services. The gender and language composition of the targeted workplace and the race and gender of the union organizer do not have a significant

impact on the number of tactics used. The OLS regression results for British Columbia (Table 10) are similar. One interesting distinction is that in B.C. organizer age over 40 is (marginally) associated with more active campaigns, whereas in Ontario the reverse is true.

These results must be interpreted with some caution. First, the union choice of tactics depends to a large extent on what management is doing: a more active campaign by the union organizers tends to be met with more active resistance from employers and vice versa (Martinello and Yates 2004). However, management tactics are not part of my dataset and were not included in this analysis. Second, this survey covers a two year period (from 1996 to 1998 in Ontario and 1997 to 1999 in B.C). Unions assert that employer campaigns have become more sophisticated and aggressive since that time.[14] In British Columbia the climate for organizing changed dramatically following the election of a Liberal government in 2001 and subsequent changes to labour legislation, which replaced card recognition with mandatory certification votes (Yates 2002b). Ideally, the survey should be conducted again in each province to assess how union tactics have evolved in light of these trends.

VI CONCLUSION

Subject to the qualifications note above, a number of tentative conclusions can be reached. The most important determinant of union organizing tactics is clearly the size of the bargaining unit being organized. This is consistent with optimizing choices by the

[14] See for example USWA 2004. Bronfenbrenner (2003a: 45) found that over the 1990s "employer campaigns have dramatically increased in intensity and effectiveness."

union (Martinello and Yates 2004). On the other hand, it does not appear that unions are tailoring their campaigns based on the gender or linguistic composition of the workplace. There is some evidence that certain organizer characteristics do make a difference. Organizers in Ontario who are younger, have received training through the CLC or OFL, and have worked longer as organizers are more likely to use a range of tactics such as inside committees, phone calls, letters, leaflets, and house calls. Contrary to expectations, the gender of union organizers does not appear to have a significant effect on union tactics. In three instances where significance was found for this variable, female organizers were found to be less, not more, likely to use tactics involving personal contact.

It is possible, as Forrest (2001) suggests, that gender plays a role in union organizing that is not captured by conventional survey methods. For example it may be that women organizers are using approaches that are not adequately described by the 19 tactics listed on this survey. It is also possible that Ontario unions are stuck in certain organizing practices that the infusion of a more diverse group of organizing staff has not yet been sufficient to alter. The participation of *more than one* female organizer was reported in only 31 of 499 campaigns (6 percent). Thus the involvement of women may have not yet reached the critical mass needed to influence union tactics overall. Finally, it should also be noted that gender may have an impact on *outcomes*, even if the tactics used are the same. Yates (2002b) and Bronfenbrenner (2003a) found that female organizers were significantly more successful than male organizers in organizing female-majority workplaces.

A positive finding for unions is that certain organizer characteristics such as organizing experience, youth, and training through labour federations, can result in more active campaigns. Unions must find a way to build on all of these resources. Employing more effective organizing approaches is critical to unions' success – in fact their survival. Unions must find new strategies to organize more workers in an increasingly difficult environment. A deeper examination of all of the factors that determine their tactical choices in diverse circumstances, based on both survey evidence and in-depth case studies, is a promising topic for future research.

Table 1 Research Studies on Union Organizing Tactics

Author	Topic	Data	Method	Major Findings
Bronfenbrenner and Hickey (2004)	Effectiveness of union organizing tactics	Survey and documentary evidence from 412 NLRB election campaigns held in 1998 and 1999 in U.S.	Logistic regression	Unions that use a broad range of tactics as part of a multi-faceted comprehensive strategy display greater organizing success across all industries
Yates and Martinello (2004)	Union and employer tactics in certification campaigns	Survey responses from 237 organizing campaigns in Ontario between 1996 and 1998	Cluster analysis; Logistic regression	Union strategies emphasizing personal communication are the most effective
Yates (2000)	Impact of gender and selected union tactics on the outcome of organizing drives	Survey responses from 677 organizing campaigns in Ontario between 1996 and 1998	OLS Regression	For every 1% increase in female membership, 1% increase in likelihood of union winning certification vote
Crain (1994)	Influence of gender on union strategy	199 surveys from organizers affiliated with 29 unions; 8 personal interviews and 22 telephone interviews with organizing directors / field organizers in U.S.	Descriptive	Most survey respondents did not view worker gender as influential in shaping organizing style. However, in interviews, some service sector union organizers and organizers of "pink collar" workers reported using non-conventional organizational styles for female-dominated workplaces
Peterson, Lee and Finnegan (1992)	Effects of employer and union organizing tactics on organizing outcomes	149 survey responses from organizing staff of one large AFL-CIO international union in U.S.	Logistic regression	Proactive union tactics (working with community leaders, negotiating accretion agreements) positively associated with union organizing success
Reed (1989; 1993)	Influence of union organizer characteristics on election outcomes	Survey questionnaires completed by 64 organizers in U.S.	Two-stage weighted least squares;[a] logit	Personality and demographic characteristics of organizers are important determinants of pro-union votes and achievement of first contract

[a] Reed (1989: 112) indicates that a two-stage weighted least squares procedure was used (where the dependent variable was a dummy variable set to equal one if the union won the election), because the more commonly used logistic estimator could not calculate parameter estimates for certain variables.

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics – Survey of Ontario Organizers

Union Organizing Tactics	Mean	Standard deviation	**Lead Organizer Characteristics**	Mean	Standard deviation
Telephone workers	.78	.41	Experience as an organizer (years)	5.72	5.92
Use inside organizing committee	.78	.42	Ethic background (non-white = 1)	.14	.35
Have small group meetings	.77	.42	Gender (female = 1)	.27	.45
Mail letters to workers' homes	.52	.50	Training from CLC or OFL = 1	.17	.37
Distribute leaflets at work	.50	.50	Experience as a community activist = 1	.31	.46
Make house calls to workers homes	.45	.50	Age (over 40 = 1)	.56	.50
Have large group general meetings	.44	.50			
Use rank-and-file organizers from other bargaining units	.28	.45	**Bargaining Unit Characteristics**		
Offer education (e.g. OH&S) to workers	.19	.39	Total number of eligible voters	72.36	147.20
Newsletters	.17	.38	Sector		
Use e-mail, web site, electronic communication	.09	.29	Goods	.20	.40
Have solidarity (button or T-shirt) day	.08	.27	Dynamic Services	.17	.38
Leaflets or letters to public and/or clients	.05	.21	Traditional Services	.29	.45
Videos	.04	.19	Nonmarket Services	.34	.48
Social events	.04	.19	Percent women in unit	49.73	37.10
Print, radio, or television media	.03	.18	Large number (20%+) non-English speaking (= 1)	.27	.45
Involve other unions or solidarity groups	.03	.17			
Rallies, public forums and/or debates	.03	.17			
Involve community groups	.02	.15			

Survey of union organizers in Ontario (Yates)

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics – Survey of B.C. Organizers

Union Organizing Tactics	Mean	Standard deviation	**Lead Organizer Characteristics**	Mean	Standard deviation
Have small group meetings	.78	.41	Experience as an organizer (years)	5.67	5.45
Make house calls to workers homes	.61	.49	Ethic background (white = 1)	.20	.40
Use inside organizing committee	.59	.49	Gender (female = 1)	.45	.50
Telephone workers	.57	.50	Training from CLC or BCFL	.22	.42
Mail letters to workers' homes	.34	.47	Experience as a community activist	.43	.50
Have large group general meetings	.34	.47	Age (over 40 = 1)	.84	.37
Distribute leaflets at work	.25	.44			
Newsletters	.13	.34	**Bargaining Unit Characteristics**		
Use rank-and-file organizers from other bargaining units	.11	.31	Total number of eligible voters	35.42	63.96
Offer education (e.g. OH&S) to workers	.07	.25	Sector		
Other unions or solidarity groups	.05	.23	Goods	.12	.32
Social events	.05	.21	Dynamic Services	.11	.31
Use e-mail, web site, electronic communication	.04	.19	Traditional Services	.32	.47
Leaflets or letters to public and/or clients	.03	.18	Nonmarket Services	.45	.50
Print, radio, or television media	.02	.13	Percent women in unit	64.72	37.60
Have solidarity (button or T-shirt) day	.02	.15	Large number (20%+) non-English speaking (= 1)	.25	.43
Involve community groups	.01	.10			
Videos	.01	.10			
Rallies, public forums and/or debates	.01	.10			

Survey of union organizers in British Columbia (Yates)

Table 4 Organizer characteristics by sector (%) – Ontario

	Goods	**Dynamic Services**	**Traditional Services**	**Nonmarket Services**	**All sectors**	**X^2**
Female	8	11	22	50	27	76.61***
Non-white	23	12	19	7	14	15.44***
Over 40	77	55	46	54	56	24.26***
Training OFL, CLC	17	9	11	26	17	16.10***
Community Activist	21	17	19	55	31	66.84***

Survey of union organizers in Ontario (Yates)
* p<0.10; ** p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 5 Proportion of campaigns using tactic, by sector (%) – Ontario

	Goods	**Dynamic Services**	**Traditional Services**	**Nonmarket Services**	**All sectors**	χ^2
Inside committees	**93**	62	75	79	78	25.06***
Phone calls	79	67	**85**	79	78	10.01**
Small group meetings	**83**	67	80	75	77	8.24**
Letters	55	41	52	55	52	4.78
Leaflets at work	**75**	42	49	40	50	31.05***
House calls	**60**	47	56	27	45	37.83***
Large group meetings	50	31	32	**56**	44	24.75***
Rank-and-file organizers	**37**	17	29	28	28	9.15**
Education	18	13	**29**	14	19	14.50***
Newsletters	16	6	**24**	19	17	12.30***
e-mail, web	8	7	6	12	9	3.81
Solidarity days	**16**	10	9	3	8	13.71***
Leaflets, letters to public	6	5	7	2	5	5.62
Videos	2	**8**	4	2	4	6.96*
Social events	5	2	4	4	4	1.01
Print, radio, TV media	5	2	4	3	3	1.26
Involve other unions	1	3	4	4	3	1.73
Rallies, public forums	0	2	3	5	3	4.94
Involve community groups	0	1	3	4	2	3.98

Survey of union organizers in Ontario (Yates)
* p<0.10; ** p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 6 Proportion of campaigns emphasizing selected issues (%) – Ontario

Issue	Male Organizers	Female Organizers	Total	χ^2
Job Security	56	63	58	1.67
Wages	55	52	54	.38
Fairness	49	40	47	3.06*
Voice in Decision Making	25	40	29	9.79***
Dignity / Justice	26	30	27	.74
Grievance Procedures	26	20	24	1.80
Favouritism	18	16	18	.25
Scheduling Hours	18	16	17	.13
Health and Safety	13	7	11	3.55*
Pension and Retirement	14	3	11	11.42***
Arbitrary Supervisor Power	10	11	10	.11
Discipline	7	4	6	1.38
Forced Overtime	7	0	5	10.40***
Training	6	3	5	1.74
Service Quality	4	7	5	1.65
Race or Sex Discrimination	5	2	4	1.35
Promotional Opportunities	3	2	3	.26
Sick Leave	2	2	2	.16
Vacation	3	2	2	.04
Holidays	1	1	1	.14

Survey of union organizers in Ontario (Yates)
* p<0.10; ** p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 7 Logistic regression coefficients, standard errors for Binary Logistic Regression: Determinants of Union Organizing Tactics – Ontario

	Phone calls		Inside Committees		Small group meetings		Letters		Leaflets		House calls	
Mean probability	.784		.776		.767		.516		.496		.450	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Experience as organizer (years)	.038*	.021	.052**	.023	-.011	.020	.060***	.019	.034*	.019	-.009	.019
Non-white organizer	.717	.437	-.047	.389	.181	.373	1.287***	.346	1.114***	.340	-.196	.322
Female organizer	-.090	.314	-.052	.307	-.039	.296	.709***	.273	.086	.277	-.146	.270
Organizer over 40	-.943***	.269	-.196	.292	-.116	.249	-.924***	.232	-.428*	.235	-.677***	.230
Organizer training from CLC, OFL	1.435***	.425	.832**	.378	.075	.320	.517*	.285	.914***	.296	.111	.287
Organizer training as community activist	-.167	.288	.146	.292	.312	.282	-.006	.254	.258	.262	-.287	.252
Size of barg. unit *(1-20)*												
21 to 50	.816***	.310	1.016***	.291	.406	.280	.905***	.262	.664**	.264	.581**	.261
51 to 100	.601*	.357	1.753***	.440	.284	.321	1.152***	.301	1.081***	.300	.600**	.293
101 to 200	.316	.456	.914*	.500	.696	.473	1.739***	.421	1.543***	.419	1.131***	.394
Over 200	6.875	11.051	1.710**	.775	2.302**	1.040	2.155***	.557	2.565***	.601	1.680***	.488
Sector *(Nonmarket services)*												
Goods	-.373	.428	.980*	.512	.517	.413	-.196	.365	1.066***	.384	1.156***	.363
Dynamic services	-.652*	.372	-.560	.356	-.228	.344	-.211	.344	.420	.353	.807**	.342
Traditional services	.110	.365	-.290	.333	.415	.330	-.165	.300	.252	.305	1.032***	.301
% women in unit *(0-24)*												
25 to 49 %	.146	.450	.558	.473	.033	.426	.522	.389	.317	.403	.248	.376
50 to 74 %	.254	.397	.721*	.376	.049	.350	-.415	.315	-.526*	.318	-.248	.308
75 to 100 %	-.428	.340	.284	.330	-.047	.320	-.032	.296	-.841***	.307	-.191	.299
Unknown	-.084	.599	-.270	.629	-1.222**	.553	-2.548***	.849	-1.115*	.627	-.501	.552
Language > 20% non-English	.127	.315	-.053	.305	.065	.284	-.673***	.259	-.141	.264	.794***	.246
%non-Eng. unknown	-.541	.497	.499	.567	.878	.648	.248	.499	.174	.481	.167	.448
N	479		480		478		478		470		477	
Model χ^2 (p value)	65.883 .000		78.705 .000		32.738 .026		107.658 .000		115.629 .000		87.356 .000	

* p<0.10; ** p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 7 (continued) Logistic regression coefficients, standard errors for Binary Logistic Regression: Determinants of Union Organizing Tactics – Ontario

	Large group meetings		Rank-and-file organizers		Education for workers		Newsletters		E-mail, web site		Solidarity day	
Mean probability	.436		.279		.187		.174		.089		.082	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Experience as organizer (years)	.040**	.019	.005	.020	.016	.023	-.001	.026	-.099**	.042	-.005	.038
Non-white organizer	-.821**	.334	-.570	.355	-.825*	.443	-.803*	.450	.509	.554	.859*	.510
Female organizer	.126	.263	-.487*	.291	-.158	.344	-.735**	.349	-1.576***	.582	-.164	.608
Organizer over 40	.148	.227	.013	.242	.017	.284	-.223	.291	-.028	.391	1.116**	.480
Organizer training from CLC, OFL	-.225	.281	-.042	.296	-.138	.352	-.100	.359	.089	.462	-.878	.724
Organizer training as community activist	.038	.247	-.055	.268	-.188	.318	.106	.324	.324	.423	1.166**	.480
Size of barg. unit *(1-20)*												
21 to 50	.561**	.262	.424	.288	.462	.333	.905**	.367	1.046**	.528	.077	.595
51 to 100	1.257***	.296	.735**	.316	.810**	.359	.898**	.461	1.293**	.602	.630	.658
101 to 200	1.720***	.389	1.727***	.396	.673	.494	1.803***	.461	2.302***	.636	1.806***	.670
Over 200	2.326***	.522	1.645***	.469	1.601***	.506	2.014***	.517	2.814***	.670	2.165***	.754
Sector *(Nonmarket services)*												
Goods	-.474	.359	.304	.376	.137	.462	-.526	.463	-1.459**	.622	2.206**	.870
Dynamic services	-.845**	.344	-.509	.390	.024	.461	-1.268**	.557	-1.125*	.634	2.454***	.842
Traditional services	-.904***	.299	.281	.318	.985***	.362	.349	.363	-.954*	.536	2.017**	.818
% women in unit *(0-24)*												
25 to 49 %	.258	.366	.074	.382	-.158	.470	-.690	.527	-1.159*	.666	1.077*	.571
50 to 74 %	-.164	.317	-.426	.347	.064	.362	-.158	.389	-1.433**	.577	-1.028	.753
75 to 100 %	.271	.298	.494	.320	.047	.368	-.178	.390	-1.484***	.552	.485	.570
Unknown	-.095	.600	-.126	.653	-1.131	1.087	.294	.735	-.850	1.177	-7.363	20.723
Language > 20% non-English	.071	.250	-.197	.266	-.558*	.326	.290	.302	-.401	.441	.265	.480
%non-Eng. Unknown	.013	.480	-.503	.554	.342	.520	.184	.608	.713	.722	1.751***	.652
N	474		472		477		477		478		474	
Model χ^2 (p value)	78.529 .000		45.077 .001		35.727 .011		50.130 .000		53.076 .000		85.489 .000	

* p<0.10; ** p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 8 Logistic regression coefficients, standard errors for Binary Logistic Regression: Determinants of Union Organizing Tactics – B.C.

	Small group meetings		House calls		Inside committees		Phone calls		Letters		Large group meetings	
Mean probability	.781		.615		.591		.568		.342		.342	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Experience as organizer (years)	.020	.032	.037	.028	-.019	.035	.098***	.033	.160***	.032	-.003	.028
Non-white organizer	-.989***	.379	.090	.341	.672	.432	.622	.398	-.180	.388	.616*	.323
Female organizer	1.178**	.456	.378	.386	-1.363***	.458	-.029	.431	.339	.435	.371	.392
Organizer over 40	1.018**	.426	.413	.381	-.329	.489	.103	.419	.061	.458	.627	.410
Organizer training from CLC, BCFL	1.200***	.392	-.618**	.308	.451	.421	.418	.366	.783**	.347	.606*	.312
Organizer training as community activist	-.443	.351	-.605*	.314	1.270***	.384	.543	.351	.211	.344	-.243	.308
Size of barg. unit *(1-20)*												
21 to 50	.511	.355	1.013***	.320	1.486***	.489	.567	.346	-.009	.354	.383	.309
51 to 100	1.866***	.557	1.561***	.421	1.328**	.408	1.499***	.544	1.937***	.474	.360	.414
101 to 200	7.311	14.148	2.387***	.741	1.180	.892	2.359**	1.196	1.871**	.881	.600	.629
Over 200	.071	.998	7.849	14.730	-1.056	1.025	.142	1.234	-1.004	1.085	1.146	.917
Sector *(Nonmarket services)*												
Goods	.223	.603	-.342	.565	-.309	.691	-.320	.664	-.070	.627	.212	.552
Dynamic services	1.201*	.628	-.457	.542	.086	.647	-.662	.629	.697	.588	-.090	.548
Traditional services	.625	.449	-1.306***	.398	.867*	.464	-1.050**	.454	.585	.436	-.470	.398
% women in unit *(0-24)*												
25 to 49 %	.589	.742	.389	.604	1.761*	1.040	.658	.779	.518	.699	-.453	.657
50 to 74 %	.781	.538	.569	.454	.556	.641	1.853***	.626	.499	.483	-.415	.468
75 to 100 %	.134	.476	.083	.422	-.266	.564	-.136	.466	-.186	.468	.363	.423
Unknown	.483	.642	-.681	.546	-.212	.676	1.279**	.626	2.783***	.620	-.082	.541
Language > 20% non-English	-.114	.380	.826**	.346	.017	.447	-.765*	.400	-.232	.391	-.090	.347
%non-Eng. unknown	.767*	.421	.677**	.332	-1.286***	.398	-2.897***	.412	-1.722***	.439	.345	.311
N	390		390		390		390		390		390	
Model χ^2 (p value)	60.447 .000		87.663 .000		248.219 .000		221.513 .000		193.983 .000		36.626 .000	

* p<0.10; ** p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 8 (continued) Logistic regression coefficients, standard errors for Binary Logistic Regression: Determinants of Union Organizing Tactics – B.C.

	Leaflets		Newsletters		Rank-and-file organizers		Education for workers		E-mail, web site		Solidarity day	
Mean probability	.254		.132		.111		.066		.037		.024	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Experience as organizer (years)	.124***	.032	-.019	.038	.062	.042	-.045	.047	.065	.091	.095	.091
Non-white organizer	.254	.389	-.525	.485	.154	.513	-.844	.622	.106	.971	.521	1.235
Female organizer	.241	.463	.716	.625	-.276	.589	.814	.628	.613	1.349	-7.648	29.375
Organizer over 40	-.746*	.452	1.898***	.658	-.784	.567	.743	.653	7.885	46.722	-1.214	1.577
Organizer training from CLC, BCFL	-.085	.341	1.809***	.399	.545	.409	1.248***	.469	1.786**	.841	.680	.921
Organizer training as community activist	.111	.350	.618	.454	.052	.459	.859	.535	2.066	1.269	1.283	1.433
Size of barg. unit *(1-20)*												
21 to 50	.717**	.360	-.050	.455	.131	.480	-.575	.576	1.233	1.087	.910	1.308
51 to 100	1.786***	.428	.456	.545	.680	.539	.581	.630	2.233**	1.070	.331	1.353
101 to 200	3.421***	.874	1.327*	.715	.729	.703	-.647	1.184	.890	1.531	.348	1.623
Over 200	2.214**	1.013	2.124**	1.066	1.546	1.070	-5.680	23.562	1.843	1.609	5.097***	1.910
Sector *(Nonmarket services)*												
Goods	.286	.621	1.531**	.774	1.823**	.777	1.755*	.935	-10.152	46.657	2.129	1.688
Dynamic services	.282	.596	1.330*	.757	.937	.812	.925	.978	-.119	1.292	-1.146	2.291
Traditional services	-.264	.464	1.003*	.606	1.239**	.609	1.345*	.686	-2.469*	1.369	1.331	1.639
% women in unit *(0-24)*												
25 to 49 %	.460	.646	-.440	.725	1.493**	.717	-.649	1.161	11.083	39.276	.857	1.539
50 to 74 %	-.337	.477	-.407	.548	1.122*	.621	-.430	.794	8.382	39.269	-.368	1.478
75 to 100 %	-.466	.472	-.460	.531	1.357**	.621	.176	.674	8.120	39.267	1.165	1.180
Unknown	.778	.601	-.727	.831	1.698**	.806	1.498*	.909	9.485	39.282	1.354	1.647
Language > 20% non-English	.222	.375	.005	.455	.041	.470	.277	.525	.665	1.050	1.585	1.149
%non-Eng. unknown	-.870**	.437	-.795	.556	.031	.558	-1.575*	.834	-.346	1.063	1.413	1.400
N	390		390		378		390		390		390	
Model χ^2 (p value)	127.330 .000		67.892 .000		42.623 .001		36.310 .010		62.257 .000		31.665 .034	

* p<0.10; ** p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 9 OLS Regression for Number of Union Tactics Used in Certification Campaigns – Ontario
Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors
(mean = 5.015)

	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error
Experience as organizer (years)	.034**	.016
Non-white organizer	.114	.270
Female organizer	-.106	.228
Organizer over 40	-.564***	.192
Organizer training from CLC, OFL	.456*	.237
Organizer training as community activist	.189	.213
Size of barg. unit *(1-20)*		
21 to 50	1.205***	.221
51 to 100	1.753***	.249
101 to 200	2.492***	.337
Over 200	3.771***	.387
Sector *(Nonmarket services)*		
Goods	.522*	.314
Dynamic services	-.391	.292
Traditional services	.436*	.256
% women in unit *(0-24)*		
25 to 49 %	.171	.317
50 to 74 %	-.398	.261
75 to 100 %	-.216	.259
Unknown	-1.366***	.469
Language > 20% non-English	-.069	.214
%non-Eng. unknown	.351	.390
R^2	.352	
N	446	

* p<0.10; ** p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 10 OLS Regression for Number of Union Tactics Used in Certification Campaigns – British Columbia
Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors
(mean = 3.866)

	Regression Coefficient	Standard Error
Experience as organizer (years)	.073***	.019
Non-white organizer	.008	.227
Female organizer	.360	.259
Organizer over 40	.438*	.259
Organizer training from CLC, BCFL	.956***	.204
Organizer training as community activist	.244	.206
Size of barg. unit *(1-20)*		
21 to 50	.806***	.203
51 to 100	1.914***	.269
101 to 200	2.378***	.402
Over 200	2.196***	.364
Sector *(Nonmarket services)*		
Goods	.352	.364
Dynamic services	.399	.359
Traditional services	.031	.261
% women in unit *(0-24)*		
25 to 49 %	.659*	.379
50 to 74 %	.382	.291
75 to 100 %	.094	.283
Unknown	.899**	.360
Language > 20% non-English	.177	.228
%non-Eng. unknown	-.738***	.219
R^2	.483	
N	378	

* p<0.10; ** p<0.05; ***p<0.01

REFERENCES

Bronfenbrenner, Kate (1997). "The Role of Union Strategies in NLRB Certification Elections". Ind*ustrial and Labor Relations Review*, vol. 50(2): 195 – 221.

Bronfenbrenner, Kate, Sheldon Friedman, Richard W. Hurd, Rudolph A. Oswald and Ronald L. Seeber (1998). *Organizing to Win: New Research on Union Strategies*. Ithaca: ILR Press.

Bronfenbrenner, Kate (2001). "'Changing to Organize': Unions know what has to be done. Now they have to do it". *The Nation*, September 3/10, 2001, 16.

Bronfenbrenner, Kate (2003a). "The American labour movement and the resurgence in union organizing", in Peter Fairbrother and Charlotte Yates (eds.), *Trade Unions in Renewal: A Comparative Study*. London: Continuum.

Bronfenbrenner, Kate (2003b). "Organizing Women: The Nature and Process of Union Organizing Efforts among US Women Workers since the mid-1990s". Paper presented at the Cornell ILR Conference on Women and Unites, Ithaca, NY, November 22.

Bronfenbrenner, Kate and Robert Hickey (2004). "Changing to Organize: A National Assessment of Union Strategies". In Ruth Milkman and Kim Voss (eds.), *Rebuilding Labor: Organizers and Organizing in the New Union Movement*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Carter, Bob and Rae Cooper (2002). "The Organizing Model and the Management of Change: A Comparative Study of Unions in Australia and Britain". *Relations Industrielles / Industrial Relations*, vol. 57(4): 712 – 742.

Clawson, Dan and Mary Ann Clawson (1999). "What Has Happened to the US Labor Movement? Union Decline and Union Renewal". *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 25: 95 – 119.

Crain, Marion (1994). "Gender and Union Organizing". *Industrial and Labour Relations Review*, vol. 47(2): 227 – 248.

Economic Council of Canada (1990), *Employment in the Service Economy*.

Feekin, Lynn and Marcus Widenor (2003). "Helping New Organizers Survive and Thrive in the Field: The Essential Role of Training and Mentoring". *Labor Studies Journal*, vol. 28(3): 63 – 84.

Foerster, Amy (2003). "Labor's Youth Brigade: What Can the Organizing Institute and Its Graduates Tell Us About the Future of Organized Labor?". *Labor Studies Journal*, vol. 28(3): 1 – 31.

Forrest, Anne (2001). "Connecting Women with Unions: What Are the Issues?". *Relations Industrielles / Industrial Relations*, vol. 56(4): 647 – 673.

Hurd, Richard W. (1998). "Contesting the Dinosaur Image: The Labor Movement's Search for a Future". *Labour Studies Journal*, vol. 22(4): 5 – 30.

Kumar, Pradeep, Gregor Murray and Sylvain Schetagne. (1998). "Adapting to Change: Union Priorities in the 1990s". *Workplace Gazette*, vol. 1(3): 84 – 98.

Kumar, Pradeep and Gregor Murray (2002). "Innovation and Change in Labour Organizations in Canada: Results of the National 2000-2001 HRDC Survey". Online: http://www.labour-travail.hrdc-drhc.gc.ca/doc/wid-dimt/eng.

Kumar, Pradeep and Gregor Murray (2003). "Strategic dilemma: the state of union renewal in Canada", in Peter Fairbrother and Charlotte Yates (eds.), *Trade Unions in Renewal: A Comparative Study*. London: Continuum.

Lowe, Graham S. (1998). "The Future or Work: Implications for Unions". *Relations Industrielles / Industrial Relations*, vol. 53(2): 235 – 255.

Lowe, Graham S. and Sandra Rastin (2000). "Organizing the Next Generation: Influences on Young Workers' Willingness to Join Unions in Canada". *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, vol. 38(2): 203 – 222.

Martinello, Felice and Charlotte Yates (2004). "Union and Employer Tactics In Ontario Organizing Campaigns" in David Lewin and Bruce Kaufman (eds.), *Advances in Industrial and Labor Relations Volume 13*, New York: Elsevier.

Masters, Marick F. and Robert S. Atkin (1999). "Union Strategies for Revival: A Conceptual Framework and Literature Review". *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, vol. 17: 283 – 314.

Nissen, Bruce (ed.) (1999). *Which Direction for Organized Labor? Essays on Organizing, Outreach, and Internal Transformation*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Peters, John (2002, December). "A Fine Balance: Canadian Unions Confront Globalization". Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

Peterson, Richard B., Thomas W. Lee and Barbara Finnegan (1992). "Strategies and Tactics in Union Organizing Campaigns". *Industrial Relations*, vol. 31(2): 370 – 380.

Reed, Thomas F. (1989). "Do Union Organizers Matter? Individual Differences, Campaign Practices, and Representation Election Outcomes*". Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, vol. 43(1): 103 – 119.

Reed, Thomas F. (1990). "Profiles of Union Organizers From Manufacturing and Service Unions". *Journal of Labour Research*, vol. 11(1): 73 – 80.

Reed, Thomas F. (1993). "Securing a Union Contract: Impact of the Union Organizer". *Industrial Relations*, vol. 32(2): 188 – 203.

Rogers, Joel (1995). "A Strategy for Labor". *Industrial Relations*, vol. 34(3): 367 – 381.

Rooks, Daisy (2003). "The Cowboy Mentality: Organizers and Occupational Commitment in the New Labor Movement". *Labor Studies Journal*, vol. 28(3): 33 – 62.

Sciacchitano, Katherine (2000). "Unions, Organizing, and Democracy: Living in One's Time, Building for the Future". *Dissent*, Spring: 75 – 81.

Sherman, Rachel and Kim Voss (2000). "Organize or Die: Labor's New Tactics and Immigrant Workers". In Ruth Milkman (ed.), *Organizing Immigrants*, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Statistics Canada (2003, January 21). "Canada's ethnocultural portrait: The changing mosaic". Online: http://www12.statcan.ca/english/census01/products/analytic/companion/etoimm/contents.cfm.

Voos, Paula A. (2000). "Progressive Perspectives on Union Renewal". *Work and Occupations*, vol. 27: 244 – 253.

Yates, Charlotte (2000a, February 24). "Union Organizing: What Works? & What Doesn't?" Paper presented to the Ontario Federation of Labour conference on organizing.

Yates, Charlotte (2000b). "Staying the Decline in Union Membership: Union Organizing in Ontario, 1985-1999". *Relations Industrielles / Industrial Relations*, vol. 55(4): 640 – 671.

Yates, Charlotte (2002a). "Expanding Labour's Horizons: Union Organizing and Strategic Change in Canada". *Just Labour*, vol. 1: 31 – 40.

Yates, Charlotte (2002b). "Union Organizing in British Columbia: The First Report based on a Survey of Union Organizers in British Columbia". Report prepared for the British Columbia Federation of Labour.

Yates, Charlotte (2003). "The revival of industrial unions in Canada: the extension and adaptation of industrial union practices to the new economy", in Peter Fairbrother and Charlotte Yates (eds.), *Trade Unions in Renewal: A Comparative Study*. London: Continuum.