Artz, Benjamin; Heywood, John S.

Working Paper

Unions, Worker Participation and Worker Well-Being

GLO Discussion Paper, No. 705

Provided in Cooperation with:
Global Labor Organization (GLO)

Suggested Citation: Artz, Benjamin; Heywood, John S. (2020) : Unions, Worker Participation and Worker Well-Being, GLO Discussion Paper, No. 705, Global Labor Organization (GLO), Essen

This Version is available at:
https://hdl.handle.net/10419/225636

Unions, Worker Participation and Worker Well-Being

Benjamin Artz & John S. Heywood

This chapter focuses on the lessons learned from four decades of studying the relationship between unions and job satisfaction. We discuss the original paradox that started the literature and trace the on-going debate over results that differ by sample and by estimation technique. We emphasize the cross-national evidence suggesting that the paradox of dissatisfied union members may be largely associated with Anglophone countries. Within Anglophone countries we explore exactly what is typically being measured and how unionization may influence both job characteristics and perceptions of given job characteristics. We explore differences in the influence of union membership on job satisfaction and on broader life satisfaction. We also review the literature on alternative forms of employee representation. We conclude by summarizing and suggesting avenues for future research.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction; Unions; Voice; Alternative Representation

JEL codes: J31, J32, J51

Acknowledgement: The authors thank Uwe Jirjahn for very helpful comments on earlier drafts of this chapter.

Benjamin Artz, Department of Economics, University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, Oshkosh Wisconsin – artzb@uwo.edu

John S. Heywood, Department of Economics, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wisconsin - heywood@uwm.edu

1. Introduction

The last two and a half decades have witnessed an explosion of interest by economists in worker job satisfaction. This explosion reflects that labor not only produces but also consumes on the job. Thus, a worker's earnings constitute only a portion of what generates utility and yet it is this broader utility from the job that represents the "full compensation" for work. As Hamermesh (2001, 2) puts it, job satisfaction is the only measure "that might be viewed as reflecting how (workers) react to the entire panoply of job characteristics" and as such "it can be viewed as a single metric that allows the worker to compare the current job to other labor market opportunities." Thus, at its best, job satisfaction represents a summary worker evaluation of what they receive from their job in terms of both earnings and on-the-job consumption. It is this full compensation that influences labor supply, worker effort and firm productivity.

While studying the influence of unions on job satisfaction has been a part of the general explosion of interest in job satisfaction, it started much earlier (Borjas 1979; Freeman 1978; Hamermesh 1977). This early interest stemmed from a basic paradox. Unions are associated with better earnings, better benefits, and arguably better methods for dealing with worker discontent and grievances. Unions also reduce wage inequality and typically result in more transparent workplace and managerial procedures (Pfeffer and Davis-Blake 1990). Yet, unions typically appear associated with lower job satisfaction. This seeming paradox gave rise to a wide variety of explanations and interest in these explanations continues to the present.

One might simply think that measures of job satisfaction do not capture utility on the job in the fashion that Hamermesh argues. It is after all a highly subjective concept about which different workers likely have different perceptions. Thus, perhaps one should not take the union satisfaction paradox very seriously. Yet, measures of job satisfaction have worked surprisingly

well in a variety of situations. For example, it proves a very good indicator of which workers are likely to leave a current job (Clark 2001). Krueger and Schkade (2008) as well as Frey and Stutzer (2002) emphasize the general reliability of subjective well-being measures such as job satisfaction in accurately characterizing worker well-being. Moreover, research has confirmed that happy workers are more productive (Oswald et al. 2015). Reflecting this apparent importance of measured job satisfaction, economists have genuinely struggled to establish the reasons behind the apparent relative union discontent.

Using meta regression analysis across five dozen studies, Laroche (2016) makes the correlation clear. Indeed, unions are associated with lower job satisfaction. This obviously is not a statement about causation and much of the more recent economics literature explores endogeneity and the exact nature of causation. It is here that many of the interesting results have been generated.

This essay first provides background on potential reasons for dissatisfied union members and the potential role that the representation and activism associated with unions might play. It next reviews the evidence on the extent to which that dissatisfaction apparent in simple cross-sections persists in more sophisticated estimation. In the third section it reviews the evidence that the apparent dissatisfaction may be unique to Anglophone countries. It does this by first examining specific country studies and then cross-country studies. It goes on to discuss works councils and then discusses alternative, often nonunion, forms of voice and representation. The fourth section discusses exactly what is measured in the many studies of job satisfaction and considers the potential to gain insight by studying broader measures of well-being. We conclude by presenting avenues for further exploration and identifies the continuing fault-lines that remain.

2. The relationship between unions and job satisfaction

The idea of union voice sits at the base of many explanations of union discontent. Trade unions provide a collective voice alternative to quitting (Freeman and Medoff 1984) and must encourage discontent as a prerequisite for successfully making demands of the firm (Booth 1995). The notion is, in part, that discontent is a bargaining tool. Identification of job aspects that are unsatisfactory and need fixing is a first step to engaging with employers to get them fixed. This tendency to express voice to improve a working environment is enhanced in a unionized setting as the worker's earnings cannot be easily improved by exit to another job. Thus, nonunion choice of exit and mobility is contrasted with union choice of not exiting and expressing dissatisfaction in order to improve working conditions.

Borjas (1979) suggests the discontent expressed by union members may not be 'genuine.' Instead, it may be only a 'device' designed so the workforce can be heard by employers. Freeman (1980), however, clearly suggests that the discontent is genuine, claiming that the voice function encourages workers to stay in jobs they may not otherwise like and improve their working conditions from the inside. Thus, one basic question is whether or not jobs improve as a result of the voice of apparent dissatisfaction.

Artz (2010, 2012) uses US longitudinal data and suggests there is no pattern of jobs getting better. Instead dissatisfaction actually grows as a worker's experience in a unionized job grows. Artz (2010, 2012) incorporates the notion that unionization may be an experience good (Gomez and Gunderson, 2004). Many of the characteristics of unionized work are only known

gradually over time.[1] Thus, pay and benefits may be known before starting but work rules, organization and the nature of relations can be known after working for some time. Artz (2010, 2012) finds that workers joining a union workplace for the first time report an initial increase in job satisfaction as they first experience the improved wages and benefits. Yet over time and with continued exposure to unionization, job satisfaction substantially declines. Consequently, the within-job reduction in union member satisfaction over time may be indicative of unchanging work conditions despite union efforts to improve them or, as we will suggest later, it may reflect changing frames of references as tenure in a unionized job continues.

While comparatively worse working conditions may be a cause for union workers' dissatisfaction (see Bender and Sloane, 1998 and Gordon and Denisi, 1995 among others), the literature also proposes an alternative view. Union worker dissatisfaction is perhaps a consequence of sorting. This view relies on the notion that workers joining unions have different characteristics than workers choosing non-union jobs. Perhaps workers choosing union jobs, for instance, expect better working conditions and employer behavior than workers choosing non-union jobs. Consequently, workers sorting into union jobs are more easily dissatisfied. Alternatively, workers who naturally complain are attracted to unionized jobs which provide them a forum for complaining. Rather than providing voice, unions attract those with the largest voices.

Psychologists have investigated who is more likely to join a union. Parkes and Razavi (2004) use government employees in the US to show that the personality traits of neuroticism (especially when combined with extraversion) and an external locus of control correlate with

[1] Nelson (1970) first formalized the definition of "experience goods" as goods which consumers cannot value without buying and consuming. Examples include haircuts, investment advice and restaurant meals. It is a counterpoint to 'search goods' whose utility or value are well known before buying.

joining a union.[2] Indeed, an active consulting business in the US advises employers on hiring decisions by providing personality tests that are designed to "predict voluntary non-union voting" among applicants (see BHI 2020). The consultants emphasize that employers should hire workers with high self-esteem and a strong belief in a just world. To the extent that researchers cannot fully control for personality traits, sorting may generate the incorrect finding that unions lower job satisfaction when actually unions merely attract those naturally less satisfied.

The evidence on this is not in agreement. Some of the disagreement seems to stem from methodology. Bryson et al. (2004, 2010) use instrumental variable approaches in cross-sectional data to contend that the sorting hypothesis likely explains union worker job dissatisfaction. That is, union workers would be dissatisfied with their jobs regardless of union status. However, instrumental variable estimates may still yield problematic estimates as good instruments are difficult to find. Instead, Green and Heywood (2015) and Heywood et al. (2002) using UK data provide fixed effects estimates in longitudinal data to provide evidence suggesting that union worker dissatisfaction remains after controlling for sorting. To the extent that personality traits are essentially fixed in the near term (Cobb-Clark and Schurer 2012), these fixed effect estimates may difference out the influence of sorting. This does not deny the possible role of worker sorting but argues that it cannot fully explain the dissatisfaction expressed by union members. Fixed effects estimates are also imperfect. They rely on unobserved worker heterogeneity to be fixed over time or at least not correlated with unionization. Instead, it may be the case that the unobserved worker heterogeneity is both time-varying and highly correlated with unionization making fixed effect estimates unreliable.

[2] In related work Jirjahn and Lange (2010) show that German workers with negative reciprocity (a strong desire to punish someone who hurts) sort into workplaces covered by a works council. Their interpretation is that the works council provides these workers a tool to punish a hurtful employer.

Fixed effects results also vary depending upon nuanced considerations. For instance, Artz (2010) finds no overall negative relationship between union membership and job satisfaction in fixed effects estimates for US workers. Yet, this null result changes after recognizing the variation across workers' in their past exposure to unions. The fixed-effect estimate reflects within-worker changes in unionization. First-time union members are more satisfied than their nonunion counterparts. But those who have been union members in the past and are newly becoming union members again are less satisfied than their nonunion counterparts. Bryson and White (2016) uses fixed effects estimation in British data to find a crucial difference in how union coverage (collective bargaining agreements covering the workers) affects job satisfaction depending upon whether workers are union members, a distinction that is far less important in the US. Overall, they also find no effect of union coverage on job satisfaction. Yet after separating by union membership, non-members enjoy increased job satisfaction when covered by collective bargaining agreements, whereas union members are less satisfied with their jobs in covered workplaces. This seems to suggest that those committed to a union pay a satisfaction price while free-riders benefit.

As even such an abbreviated review demonstrates, the relationship between union membership and job satisfaction remains far from clear. Controlling for unmeasured heterogeneity in workers and unmeasured heterogeneity in job characteristics makes precision difficult. Moreover, as we will argue, if one could control fully for heterogeneity in worker perceptions and in jobs, it would be unclear what one would even take from a persistent correlation between job satisfaction and unionization. To understand this point one needs to be clear on what is typically being measured.

3. Variation in the Influence of Representation

Before returning to issues of fundamentally what is being measured, we briefly review the literature on how the influence of unionization and representation may vary by worker characteristics, by country, institution, and time.

3.1 Within Country Studies

Several studies find that female union workers seem to be less satisfied with their jobs than male union members. Powdthavee (2011) finds that female job satisfaction of covered union UK workers is significantly below that of uncovered workers. Even after controlling for the state of the industrial relations climate, Bender and Sloane (1998) use Scottish data to reveal that union membership's negative relationship with job satisfaction only retains its statistical significance among women. Artz (2012) suggests that accumulated experience in unions negatively affects the job satisfaction of US women more than that of men due to women's lower representation in union membership and leadership. Moreover, Artz shows that this gender difference narrows in the public sector where men and women more equally make up union membership. These findings are interesting given the consistent historical finding that women report *more* job satisfaction than men (Green et al. 2018). They suggest that the job satisfaction of women union members is particularly low.

Second, the broad occupation or economy sector may influence the relationship between union status and job satisfaction. Pfeffer and Davis-Blake (1990) examine differences between craft and industrial unions and between white and blue collar workers in the United States. White collar workers and members of craft unions report greater job satisfaction in unions. They posit that this results from their relatively higher likelihood of involvement and empowerment.

Yet, Bender and Sloane (1998) find no difference in job satisfaction between men in manual jobs with those in non-manual jobs. Moreover, including measures of the industrial relations climate in job satisfaction estimations generally removes the negative influence of unionization. Thus, they conclude that unions cause a deterioration in the employer-employee relations and communication that is the source of any negative union influence on job satisfaction. When that deterioration is controlled for, no difference in satisfaction remains.

Cotti et al. (2014) use the US National Study of the Changing Workplace to include a long list of health, stress and attitudinal controls. They find larger (weakly significant) job satisfaction associated with union membership. Importantly, they find that workplace flexibilities such as the ability to start and stop at different times, to work from home and easily get time off, increase job satisfaction. They conjecture that nonunion employers may use these flexibilities to discourage workers from joining unions as there is no difference in satisfaction between nonunion workers with these flexibilities and union workers without these flexibilities. This may be particularly relevant if the team technologies that increase the likelihood of unionization also increase the cost of providing such flexibilities as suggested by Duncan and Stafford (1980).[3] Finally, Cotti et al. (2014) find that public sector union members have lower job satisfaction than private sector union workers.

Artz and Kaya (2014) also find that union members in the US public sector have lower job satisfaction than in the private sector. They contend that perceptions of job security may play a role. The authors find that perceived job insecurity negatively relates to job satisfaction but does so by different magnitudes depending on union membership and sector. Public sector union workers are far less likely to perceive job insecurity, but for those that do, the perceived risk of

[3] We will return to the role of such flexibilities when discussing works councils.

job loss plays a substantially greater presence in determining a negative effect on job satisfaction among public sector union workers than those in the private sector. The authors posit that the relatively stable level of union density over time in the US public sector compared to the private sector generates high expectations of job security. Thus, when job loss is threatened and more likely to happen, public sector union job satisfaction decreases far more than in the private sector.

Third, regional differences with a country may influence the relationship between unionization and job satisfaction. Bryson and Davies (2019) examine the UK, a country in which unionization has been frequently thought to lower job satisfaction. Dividing the UK, they show that union members are much more dissatisfied relative to nonmembers within Scotland and North of England. This is reduced by accounting for unmeasured worker heterogeneity through fixed effects. This they take as evidence that worker heterogeneity is not random (it has a spatial element) and that it reflects the social context that shapes attitudes and so assessments of job satisfaction.

Finally, perceptions of fairness may be influenced by unionization and may be reflected in job satisfaction. Heywood (1992) argues that unionization in the US should cause workers to voice their job dissatisfaction and that part of that dissatisfaction will be a willingness to claim racial discrimination. He finds that both Black and non-Black union employees are more willing to claim racial discrimination than their otherwise equal non-union counterpart. Such claims are a necessary precursor for filing a lawsuit and this finding fits the evidence that US unions are associated with lower job satisfaction. It may again reflect that those who are dissatisfied sort into unions. This reverse causation is supported by a study by Rubin (2011) who finds that US federal employees who view their employer as making decisions "unfairly" are more likely to

voluntarily join unions. This happens in the "right to work" environment of federal unions in which bargaining rights are limited. Thus, it remains very unclear whether the act of individually joining the union results in improved workplace decisions.

3.2 Cross Country Variation

The association between union status and job satisfaction varies not only within regions of a single country but also from country to country. This is unsurprising as union densities, industrial relations climates, and institutional structures differ across countries. For instance, using data across 27 European countries, Pichler and Wallace (2009) find weak evidence that higher national union densities correlate with higher job satisfaction in general. The range of union densities across European countries varies widely, from approximately 11% of the population in Spain to more than 75% in Sweden and Denmark. The authors suggest that a greater prevalence of unionization in a country may correspond with negotiated improvements in working conditions, wages and other social factors. This notion suggests that greater unionization might generate positive spillovers for workers in non-union environments as well. Although, as France with its low union membership but high coverage shows, low density need not be the same as low union power. Thus, interpretation requires caution.

Interestingly, other researchers have replaced the job satisfaction measure with a broader measure of "life satisfaction." While this essay will provide more details later about the relationship between these two measures, the point for now is that Flavin et al. (2012) used the World Values Survey to examine the role of unions in fourteen major industrial democracies. They showed a strong relationship between union density and improved life satisfaction. "Moving from a country with a union density one standard deviation below the mean to a

country one standard deviation above leads to over a full standard deviation increase in a country's aggregated level of life satisfaction." Perhaps more to the point, they found that union members reported significantly higher life satisfaction than non-union members. Income moderates this finding. The union premium in life satisfaction is substantially larger at lower deciles of earnings within the country.

One the one hand, these cross-national patterns with life satisfaction match the study of job satisfaction just mentioned that used a different set of countries and a different survey. On the other hand, they stand in opposition to the tenor of the country specific studies that typically start with dissatisfied union members and then argue over whether the dissatisfaction is genuine, reflects sorting or can be explained by unmeasured influences. What is not clear is why the pattern of satisfaction should vary at the cross-national level or why it should be that union members within many of the countries are more satisfied despite the tenor of many published country specific studies.

One explanation for the cross-country pattern is higher union densities or other associated employment relations characteristic across countries that may influence the industrial relations climate that union members perceive. Obviously specific union-management relationships may depend on decades of political, judicial and social events that take place at both the national and local levels. Despite this, higher union densities are typically associated with sectoral or higher level bargaining that may improve local relations between firm management and workers. While we will discuss one study that uses an objective measure of industrial relations climate across countries, a wider variety of country-specific studies focus on the role played by workers' subjective evaluations of industrial relations climate. Using Canadian data, Renaud (2002) finds a negative association between union membership and job satisfaction until subjective working

conditions such as climate are included. Garcia-Serrano (2009) finds a similar negative relationship in Spanish data, but again, once controls for working conditions and industrial relations climate are included, the negative association vanishes. Bender and Sloane (1998) likewise find that worker evaluations of the industrial relations climate typically account for union workers' tendency to be less-satisfied with their jobs. Consequently, the authors suggest "…that union workers' relative dissatisfaction is in most cases entirely 'genuine' and stems from poor industrial relations or from unions forming where satisfaction would be low anyway." While these studies are within three specific countries, they might be extrapolated to industrial relations climates and working conditions across countries. In this view, countries with poor local industrial relations climates would tend to have union members with lower job satisfaction than comparable nonunion members. In countries with better industrial relations climates, union members would have similar or even higher job satisfaction.

The exact pattern across countries has been explored by Donegani and McKay (2012) using the European Social Survey. They show that most studies examining the paradox of dissatisfied union members use data from English speaking countries (UK, US and Canada) which share elements of culture and law. Moreover, they show that for most of the 18 countries they examine in both 2006 and 2010, trade union members generally express higher rather than lower job satisfaction when compared to nonunion members. They argue that the research focus should pivot to focus on why a few countries have less satisfied union members while at the same time most countries have more satisfied union members.

Hipp and Givan (2015) take up this call bringing to it many of the typical elements of comparative employment relations. Using the International Social Survey Program Survey they examine individual workers in 31 countries. They find "great variation" in the relationship

between union membership and job satisfaction; specific countries exhibit positive, negative or no relationship. When available, the authors match the individual level data with national indicators of union density, the level of bargaining, union coverage and the industrial relations climate (an index of the extent to which climate is cooperative rather than confrontational). These national level variables show that union density and coverage tend to largely offset each other.[4] The level of bargaining (the degree of centralization) plays no role but the industrial relations climate plays a strong role. When relations are more cooperative within a country, job satisfaction is higher. Importantly, when controlling for these national level employment relations variables, the authors find no role for individual union membership in determining job satisfaction. They argue that the heterogeneity in institutions may be more important than membership *per se* and in this way they mirror the individual country studies that show industrial climate to be more critical than membership. The authors end with their own call for more systematic research examining the interactions between union membership and the national-level characteristics of industrial relations systems.

In related work Van der Meer (2019) argues that continental western European countries differ critically from Anglophone countries. He emphasizes that the level of bargaining and frequent requirements to cooperate at the establishment level mean that the distrust between union members and employers is much less felt on the work-floor in European countries. He shows that various measures of worker empowerment improve satisfaction in both anglophone and European countries but that union members in anglophone countries remain relatively dissatisfied while membership plays no independent role in European countries.

[4] These results reflect estimates when the dependent variables is the single measure indicator of job satisfaction. Density is the share of workers that are union members. Coverage is the share of workers covered by a union contract. France, for example, has low density but high coverage.

3.3 Alternative Forms of Representation: Works Councils

While working conditions likely vary across countries, so does the institutional structure in which unions operate. To the extent that much of the original motivation for exploring job satisfaction was with a view of union voice, it is critical to recognize that union membership or the union itself may not be the institution most responsible for that voice. Thus, continental European countries make various use of works councils. With centralized or industrial level bargaining, these works councils are the day-to-day voice of workers with local management. Theoretically, they serve this function separately from the process of dividing the pie which is done away from the local establishment and by the union not the works council. Often, as in Germany, the works councils and local management are obligated to cooperate in various ways stipulated by statute. A strong theoretical tradition suggests that the separation of bargaining and voice can be efficient by not letting the process of dividing the pie interfere with how to make the pie as large as possible (Freeman and Lazear 1995).

This discussion raises the issue of how workers see the representative, voice function of works councils once it is separated, to at least some degree, from the contentious process of bargaining. Focusing on continental Western Europe, van de Meer (2019) shows that union membership plays no role in job satisfaction but that measures of empowerment, including perceptions by workers of their ability to influence working conditions, positively influence job satisfaction. To the extent the works councils are the voice mechanism that has this influence and that they are independent of unions, this tells a different tale about the role of representation. Representation when divided from bargaining may improve worker satisfaction.

In a direct examination of the role of works councils in Germany, Jirjahn and Tsertsvadze (2006) present evidence. Using the German Socio-Economic Panel, they show that full-time blue-collar workers report greater job satisfaction in workplaces with works councils. This again suggests a positive role for representation when divorced from bargaining. Yet, the evidence suggests there may be outsiders not well represented by works councils. Part-time workers are shown to be less satisfied in the presence of works councils. Collective representation in the workplace may necessarily reflect the interest of a median worker often to harm of more marginalized workers. [5]

Grund and Schmidt (2011) return to the German Socio-Economic Panel taking advantage of its longitudinal element. They examine two groups of workers: those who move from an establishment without a works council to an establishment with a works council and those who stay in the same establishment but experience a newly created works council. While the latter group of workers do not experience a significant change in job satisfaction, those who move report greater job satisfaction as a result of the works council. Unfortunately, the authors cannot trace the possibility of an accommodation affect in which this might diminish over time after the move as the critical works council variable is not routinely asked in the data source.

Bellmann et al. (2018) use alternative German data showing that at an establishment level, the presence of a works council is associated with increased average job satisfaction. They also trace out an individual level positive influence through the role of the works council in increasing the provision of training. Finally, they confirm that the positive influences of works councils of satisfaction are greater when bargaining is centralized.

[5] Furthermore, the authors found that works council presence is associated with lower job satisfaction for managers. This may reflect the notion that managers like to manage and see cooperation with works councils as reducing their managerial prerogative.

Finally, Kleiner and Lee (1997) present an interesting examination of South Korea. Works councils are mandated for larger firms and responsible for dealing with employee training, productivity concerns, health and safety issues and handling disputes. Yet, unlike the German example, collective bargaining is typically at the firm level. Thus, while the tasks of the union, when present, and the works council differ, they both operate at more nearly the same level. The results focusing on 500 randomly chosen workers at 10 major firms are striking. Unions are associated with decreased job satisfaction while effective works councils are associated with increased job satisfaction. Thus, the idea of voice and its influence on job satisfaction may depend on purpose of the voice: to improve compensation vs. to improve local working conditions. The first may be fraught with confrontation and distrust not associated with the second.

In an interesting example of the representativeness of voice, Heywood and Jirjahn (2009) show that the presence of a works council in Germany increases the likelihood of family friendly practices including flexible schedules, provision of childcare and enhanced parental leave.[6] Critically, when bargaining is separated from the works council, the share of women is shown to also increase the likelihood of these practices. This fits the notion that works councils with high shares of women give greater voice to the need for such practices and that this greater voice is heard. Later data from Germany leaves key results in place but presents heterogeneity. Jirjahn and Mohrenwieser (2020) find a significant influence of German works councils on work-family balance only for establishments covered by industry-level collective bargaining agreements, but

[6] This contrasts with the mixed role of unions in the UK. Budd and Mumford (2004) show unions are negatively associated with the availability of work-at-home arrangements and flexible working hours options and positively associated with the availability of parental leave, special paid leave, and job-sharing options. Detailed case studies also suggest substantial heterogeneity by country, industry and local representation. See Gregory and Milner (2009).

not for establishments covered by firm-level agreements or establishments not covered by collective bargaining.

There also exists quasi-experimental evidence on the role of representation from Burdin and Perotin (2019). The study considers a 2002 European Union directive that granted information, consultation and representation rights to employees on a range of employment and work organization issues. These requirements were similar to those of works councils and were new for four countries, Cyprus, Ireland, Poland and the UK. Difference-in-difference estimates using the European Company Study showed that the increased representation associated with the directive generated a significant increase in flexible working time arrangements in the newly treated countries relative to the controls.

These findings suggest that representation provides a set of benefits more in line with the wishes of the typical workplace employee (Freeman and Medoff 1984). While this is valuable, it should not be assumed that these new family friendly benefits are "free." Heywood et al. (2005) show that increased provision of family friendly benefits often come with reduced earnings over time as would be expected from the theory of compensating differentials. Such reductions seem especially likely if firm performance does not increase as a result of adopting family friendly policies. [7]

The effort to identify voice functions for works councils remains fertile for further study. Such study can provide more detail on the forms and objectives of voice. The original argument was that union voice creates dissatisfaction in order to improve conditions at the bargaining

[7] See Lee and Kim (2010), Heiland and Macpherson (2005) and Giddings et al. (2013) for evidence suggesting that firm performance does not increase in response to providing family friendly policies.

table. Yet, unions do more than bargain. At the same time, workplace institutions such as works councils do not bargain but do provide collective voice.

3.4 Other Alternative Forms of Voice

While not having works councils, the British Joint Consultative Committees (JCCs) provide non-union employee representation and voice. JCCs include management and employee representatives tasked with consulting on mutual issues of workplace governance and concern. JCCs do not substitute for either unions' collective bargaining or management improving workplace participation through high involvement management (HIM) practices (Gomez et al. 2019). In total JCCs help make sure that 80% of workers and workplaces retain some formal path of expressing employee voice (Willman et al. 2006) despite a significant decline in union contributions to this effort (Bryson et al. 2019).

JCCs generally enjoy little legal support to offer employees control over the workplace beyond expressions of concern (Dobbins and Gunnigle 2009). Consequently, one might predict they have little to no effect on worker well-being. Instead, Wilkinson et al (2018) finds that JCCs have the single biggest positive impact on seven employment relations markers, including employee well-being. Similarly, Gomez et al. (2019) shows that JCCs are associated with improved job satisfaction. Critically JCCs moderate the negative impact of unions on job satisfaction. In this way, JCCs may provide a closer to the ground form of representation that despite the absence of legislative co-determination performs some functions that mimic works councils.

In addition to the actual functions of JCCs, their presence may signal "good" employers that emphasize cooperation in settling issues (Wilkinson et al. 2018). Union collective

bargaining alone may signal a combative workplace and reduced employee job satisfaction (Bender and Sloane 1998). As Gomez et al. (2019) and Wilkinson et al. (2018) utilize cross-sectional data, they cannot distinguish between worker sorting behavior and genuine improvements in job satisfaction caused by the JCC. Employees predisposed to high job satisfaction and cooperation may choose to work for employers offering JCCs. Determining the true influence of JCCs on job satisfaction will require suitable longitudinal examinations.

Management-led directives intended to improve worker participation and involvement may also create voice. These high-involvement management (HIM) practices may be instituted by employers independent of, or in concert with, employee voice structures like unions or JCCs (Wood and Bryson 2009). In the United States they must be careful not to run afoul of rules against "company unions" but this has still allowed many variations to be successfully implemented. What constitutes HIM practices and the nuances surrounding their definition varies, but they focus on increasing worker participation and involvement in the workplace through teams, problem-solving groups, information sharing, incentive pay, training and recruitment that together offer employees greater autonomy or control (Bockerman et al. 2012). Indeed, Bryson et al. (2006) show that enhanced voice in a non-union setting through HIM brings larger productivity increases in the UK than those possible in a unionized setting.

HIM practices are intended to increase the control that workers have over their jobs, but they also likely increase the demands of jobs. Karasek (1979) argues that increased worker control increases job satisfaction while higher job demands decreases job satisfaction. This makes the influence of HIM on worker well-being theoretically ambiguous. Bokerman et al. (2012) finds in Finnish data that HIM practices are positively associated with job satisfaction.

Mohr and Zoghi (2008) echo this result using Canadian data as do Macky and Boxall (2008) in New Zealand data.

In a stark contrast to earlier findings on US union voice, Bender et al. (2017) find that broader measures of involvement and voice, often generated from employer driven HIM are associated with a *reduced* likelihood of employees claiming both racial and gender discrimination. This result accords with the hypothesis that participation enhances perceptions of workplace fairness (Lind et al. 1990). Not only did voice increase jobs satisfaction but Bender et al. find that association between voice and reduced claims of discrimination persists even when controlling for overall job satisfaction.

Despite this support for the suggestion that broad participation or voice improves satisfaction, there are caveats. Macky and Boxall (2008) show that when HIM practices are accompanied by pressure to work longer hours, feelings of work overload or reduced personal time, it is not associated with increased job satisfaction. Wood et al. (2012) finds in British data that HIM practices encourage work effort but increase anxiety and decrease job satisfaction. As with JCCs, Mohr and Zoghi (2008) identify a possible selection bias; inherently more satisfied workers are more likely to participate in HIM practices. In addition, they show that continued participation in HIM practices does not predict future increases in job satisfaction again supporting their emphasis on selection and sorting.

Echoing the Wood et al. (2012) suggestion that HIM may overly increase effort, Artz and Heywood (2015) find in U.S. data that performance pay systems often part of HIM increase workers' risk of injury on the job. Bender et al. (2012) use European data to indicate a similar correlation between piece rate performance pay and injury risk. Bender and Theodossiou (2014) confirm in British data that workers are at greater risk of reporting worse health when paid by

performance. Even so, workers earning performance pay tend to earn more, which in part explains why performance pay may be linked to higher job satisfaction overall (Green and Heywood, 2008).

While there is danger that one part of HIM may hurt health and safety, other aspects of representation may improve it. In many countries health and safety committees exist for the purpose of monitoring and improving occupational health. Depending on the country, these can be in both non-union and union workplaces and may be nominally independent of union in the latter case. Thus, consultative safety committees in the UK are associated with reduced workplace accident frequency (Reilly et al. 1995). The committees prove to be associated with even further reduced frequency when a union appoints the worker members of the council. This interaction between unions and safety committees has been isolated in the US as well. Weil (1999) follows the introduction of a State of Oregon mandate for such committees. He demonstrates that the mandate significantly increased the difference between union and nonunion workplaces in safety and health enforcement, with enforcement dramatically going up in union workplaces but going upward only slightly in nonunion workplaces. Obviously better enforcement of health and safety violations should be anticipated to improve health and safety. These studies suggest that forms of representation can be complements and additive in their influence.

Yet, as we've seen before the evidence is not monolithic. Fenn and Ashby (2004) use later UK data and show that establishments with a higher proportion of unionized employees, and with health and safety committees, are associated with higher numbers of reported injuries and illnesses. Donaldo (2015) cites many US, UK and Canadian studies showing that union members are more likely to be involved in a non-fatal accident.

Critically, selection issues remain prominent. In a comparison of union and nonunion construction sites in Baltimore Dedobbeleer et al (1990) show that union worksites are safer but that this reflects, at least in good part, workers who are older and perhaps inherently less risky. Older, more experienced and safer workers sort into unionized construction. To complicate matters further, it is often very difficult for researchers to examine actual health and injuries as the data often reflect only *reported* health issues and injuries. Thus, Morse et al. (2003) compared US workers compensation claims for muscular injury with survey data to determine who among the injured actually submits an injury claim. They found that workers at unionized facilities were 5.7 times more likely to file workers compensation claims despite comparable rates of injury between union and nonunion facilities. This likely reflects a combination of union workers being more willing to voice complaints and a sense among union workers that the union will protect them against employer retaliation for filing a claim.

Jirjahn et al. (2019) examine works councils and show that German establishments with councils are significantly more likely to engage in health promotion beyond that legally required. These additional efforts to promote workplace health include on site health services, health-related training and advisory services for employees (such as for mental problems or nutrition) and financial support to employees for health promotion activities outside the establishment. The authors suggest that these additional expenditures associated with councils represent the provision of local public goods.

While definitive conclusions about health and safety are obviously difficult, getting researchers closer to the ground seems warranted. Eaton and Nocerino (2002) matched New Jersey survey data collected from work-site representatives with state-collected reports of injury and illnesses. They conclude that worker safety committees with larger scope, better training

and greater worker involvement are associated with worksites with fewer reported injuries and illnesses. This at least hints that more effective representation even if not directly through a union may be critical for occupational health.

3.5 Recent Changes in the Anglophone Pattern?

Finally, there is recent evidence that the Anglophone pattern of a negative relationship between unionization and job satisfaction (Laroche 2016) may be changing. This is different from the argument that proper controls, specification or experiments can explain that negative relationship away. It is, instead, the showing that more recent data shows a changing relationship. If correct, this suggests there may be important heterogeneity in the influence over time.

Bryson and Blanchflower (2020) find that the negative union correlation with job satisfaction has changed signs in recent years. They present a series of cross-sectional results for the UK and for the US identifying the turnaround. Positive partial correlations between union membership and job satisfaction exist post-2008 in US data and post-2000 in UK. They also confirm a positive partial correlation post-2000 in European data. This suggests the emerge of an alignment across countries that did not exist earlier. The authors hesitate to identify a single cause. They hint that the change in the US may stem from birth cohort differences and improved perceptions of job security among union members. It also strikes us that many of the least satisfactory union jobs may have become nonunion changing the composition of jobs as well as of respondents. More research is required, but the study's results imply that union membership genuinely correlated negatively with job satisfaction in the past in anglophone countries is now positively correlated. If confirmed by other researchers, the reasons for the change must be thoroughly explored.

4. Exactly What is Being Measured?

Recognizing the heterogeneity in the influence of union membership is important. Yet, as suggested above, equally important is recognizing the heterogeneity in what that membership means and implies. Thus, in Anglophone countries membership proxies not just commitment to the union organization but more importantly, that the member is typically covered by a union contract when others are not, that the contract is negotiated locally (perhaps even at the establishment by co-workers) and that grievances and disagreements will be dealt with in substantially different fashions than for nonunion members even within the same firm. In this sense, one might anticipate that many more elements of on-the-job consumption vary with union membership in Anglophone countries. Thus, observations on union membership from different countries (Anglophone and not) may fundamentally not provide evidence on the same phenomenon.

4.1 Unobserved Job Characteristics

The fact that so many elements of on-the-job consumption vary with union status in Anglophone countries gives rise to the increasing effort to hold those elements constant. Yet, not all elements of on-the-job consumption will typically (or even conceivably) be included in estimates of union membership's influence on worker satisfaction. For instance, engagement with, and commitment to, the job may differ by union status. Hammer and Avgar (2005) regard commitment as the "extent to which an employee identifies with the employer, wants to remain with the organization, and is willing to exert extra effort on its behalf". Positive behavioral correlations with commitment include reduced quit intentions, increased attendance, and even

improved job performance (Hulin, 1991; Meyer and Allen, 1997). Engagement and commitment are difficult to measure but Hammer and Avgar (2005) suggest they may be higher for union members given their long job tenure. Yet, Lincoln and Boothe (1993) find that union members have lower organizational commitment in both their US and Japanese samples. If correct, a portion of the greater dissatisfaction of union members results because unions generate lower organizational commitment.

More generally, union jobs may have not only worse industrial relations climate but lower job content, autonomy and discretion (Kochan and Helfman 1981). There obviously exist many, many such job dimensions that influence on the job utility both negatively and positively and the point of unionization is often to improve or trade-off many of those dimensions through processes that by themselves influence on-the-job utility. Thus, even estimating the influence of membership within workers and within a constant job over time may miss unmeasured job characteristics that change over time and do so specifically with the advent of unionization (see Green and Heywood 2015 and Bessa et al. 2020). This makes estimation problematic. It is difficult to hold the job dimension exactly equal and examine satisfaction changes for workers in that job as it becomes unionized. Indeed, if one could perform such a magic counterfactual in which a consistent set of workers becomes unionized and every possible job dimension (wages, job content, discretion etc.) is held exactly constant, the change in job satisfaction must, virtually by tautology, be unchanged (Bessa et al. 2020).

This point deserves more attention in the literature. What the literature typically estimates, via virtually any method, includes the influence that unmeasured and unaccounted for job characteristics *associated with unionization* (or membership) have on job satisfaction. An endless pursuit of holding everything else constant will simply wash out many of the

characteristics that unions change. The resulting difference in satisfaction, if any, may be completely without usefulness. At a basic level what researchers may actually want to measure is the characteristics that unions change and how those changes influence satisfaction.

One practical implication is that more work should be done by researchers exploring by decomposition methods the role of specific job characteristics. In this way we might hope to first measure the characteristics more common in union jobs and then trace out how they improve or detract from satisfaction relative to nonunion jobs. The interesting work then begins. While the difference by union status in perceptions of characteristics can be captured by the coefficients, we should not take the differences in characteristics as irrelevant. Those characteristics changed by unions might well be considered part of the union influence on job satisfaction that we care about, and not those that we want to control for in looking for the role of correlated unmeasured characteristics.

The assumption in the forgoing discussion is that differences in perceptions across sectors are inherent. Said a different way, one imagines that workers retain the same preferences regardless of their sector. Thus, unions might change job characteristics and union members may differ in their perceptions of characteristics from nonunion members but unionization did not cause those different perceptions. Yet, unionization may, indeed, change preferences in many ways including changing frames of reference. Schwochau (1987) hypothesizes that union members fundamentally weigh different job attributes differently with a subsequent influence on the measured difference in job satisfaction. In this sense, the causal influence of unions can be on both job characteristics and on the perceptions of those job characteristics.

Again, a simple version is merely that union and non-union jobs attract heterogenous workers with different weightings and perceptions. More profoundly, the contention is that

unionization itself may change frames of reference and so preferences and weightings. This might happen in several ways, but two opposites would be that unionization causes members to value what the union job offers (wages and benefits) or that it causes members to take those for granted and causes members to value what is not offered (job content, discretion and so on). The longitudinal studies by Artz (2010, 2012) in the US and Powdthavee (2011) in the UK suggest that the former may be more nearly the case as workers immediately upon unionization express an increase in satisfaction that soon vanishes and becomes greater dissatisfaction with more union experience. Yet, despite similar findings, the interpretations differ. While we have emphasized the view of Artz that it is the union experience good that is getting known, Powdthavee argues that a growth in dissatisfaction in a previous non-union job is the reason for unionization. Thus, the initial increase upon unionization is simply making up for a particularly bad non-union job. This making up is seen as short-lived. Regardless of the exact type of change that unionization creates, these studies make clear that when undertaking typical decompositions, differences in coefficients that reflect differences in evaluating characteristics remain a potential combination of heterogeneity between workers attracted to the sectors and changes in perceptions caused by unionization.[8]

Again, what is often captured in typical estimates is the influence of unmeasured job characteristics correlated with unionization on job satisfaction. This becomes more complicated when recognizing that union workers may weigh different characteristics differently either because of unmeasured heterogeneity or because unionization generates different frames of reference and different resulting preferences. One approach that can provide modest light given the differing or changing weights, is to examine a specific characteristic of the job and ask the

[8] Schwochau (1987) confirms differences in coefficients by sector while earlier work by Berger et al. (1983) tests and does not find significant differences. Both use US worker data.

worker to evaluate his or her satisfaction with that characteristic. This eliminates the differential weighting by asking workers to evaluate their satisfaction with a specific characteristic or facet of their job.

Bryson and White (2016) find that UK union membership relates positively with workers' satisfaction with pay and with work hours, but negatively with job security and the work itself. This mirrors, in part, earlier work showing Canadian union members are more satisfied with their compensation but less satisfied with the work itself (Meng 1990) and also earlier work showing US union members are more satisfied with pay and less satisfied with both the work itself and with their supervisors. Green and Heywood (2015) and Powdthavee (2011) also echo the negative effects of union membership on both satisfaction with the work itself and with job security. Bender and Sloane (1998) confirm the negative relationship with job security and interestingly find a negative relationship with pay, but only among men working non-manual jobs. Consequently, there seems to be a modest consensus that union workers are relatively dissatisfied with job dimensions pertaining to the work itself, job security and supervision. Yet, differences persist across studies in the role of pay and work hours although the former seems to more commonly be a source of greater satisfaction for union members The point is not to whitewash the diversity in findings but to suggest that examination of specific dimensions may provide greater insight as it eliminates the role played by members and non-members differently weighting job dimensions.

Abraham et al. (2008) present an intriguing pattern using satisfaction with job dimensions for US workers. They return to the point that job dissatisfaction should predict an intention to quit. Dissatisfaction in the dimensions that they feel unions can most influence (compensation, benefits and the immediate supervisor) all play a role in predicting non-union members intention

to quit but not that of union members. Even though average dissatisfaction may be higher or lower on these dimensions, the variation among union members simply does not correlate with quitting intentions. This they take as evidence that dissatisfaction reflects voice mobilized to improve conditions. It suggests returning to the detailed longitudinal work by Artz (2010, 2012) and Powdthavee (2011) and examining the evolution of specific dimensions of job satisfaction (rather than the aggregate measure) as nonunion members becoming unionized. They may show varying consequences by job dimension consistent with the studies outlined above. As workers become unionized is their immediate response increased satisfaction with pay but decreased satisfaction with the job itself? How does satisfaction with specific job dimensions evolve over time as workers gain tenure in a unionized position?

Bessa et al. (2020) take a creative and productive approach to job dimensions. They examine how a commonly experienced change in a job dimension influences the job satisfaction of union and nonunion members. Thus, they view how a specific job dimension influences overall satisfaction rather than exploring satisfaction with a specific job dimension. They show that policy changes that reduced public sector pensions in the UK reduced the overall job satisfaction of union and nonunion members in essentially identical magnitudes. Said differently, the evaluation of the exogenous change in pension benefits is perceived similarly by union and nonunion members. As a consequence, any influence of unions on job satisfaction is entirely due to the dimensions that they change relative to nonunion workplaces. In the words of the authors "union membership does not have a causal impact of job satisfaction."

More circumspectly, they might say that union membership within the public sector does not influence the evaluation of this specific job dimension. If this result transfers to most other job dimensions in both the public and private sectors, it would imply that union and nonunion

members evaluate job dimensions similarly. This would go far toward suggesting that different frames of reference and weighting are simply not important. It also undercuts the idea of "voice" being created by unionization. It returns the focus to what job dimensions do unions change both positively and negatively and what would be the commonly shared evaluation (shared by union and nonunion members) of those changes. Relative satisfaction would then reflect the sum of measured and unmeasured differences in job dimensions recognizing that unionization may have created those differences.

Yet drawing such a conclusion still requires a good deal of spade work. The likelihood that in short order we will find a reasonably full set of reasonably exogenous changes in job characteristics that similarly influence union and nonunion workers seems remote. Nonetheless, any such additional natural experiment should surely be exploited.

4.2 Job Satisfaction vs. Life Satisfaction

The role of job satisfaction in overall life satisfaction should be discussed. One study examining the influence of union membership on life satisfaction was discussed earlier (Flavin et al. 2012) but without recognizing the potential relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction. There are surely many spill-overs from the job to other aspects of personal, family and social life. Moreover, unionization may influence those spill-overs (see the chapter in this volume by Laszlo Goerke "Unions and Workers' Well-being"). The issue for this presentation is how using a measure of overall well-being may place job satisfaction and unions in a broader and more illuminating context.

Thus, if union membership reduces job satisfaction, it may still increase life satisfaction. The extra compensation may not be worth the inferior job characteristics until one leaves work and recognizes what it can do for the family. Similarly, the supervisor may be terrible but the co-workers with whom one feels solidarity, plays sports with and socializes with at the union hall may compensate. Such examples obviously raise the issue how job satisfaction and life satisfaction are related. Applied psychology has contrasted several views of causation. In the first job satisfaction is largely a component of life satisfaction such that increased job satisfaction also increases life satisfaction. In the second, life satisfaction reflects a general predisposition of the individual and this predisposition is inherently transferred from overall life satisfaction to specific domains such as job satisfaction. There is also the possibility that they measure sufficiently different concepts that the same characteristic may influence the satisfaction measures independently. Substantial statistical effort has gone into identifying if causation exists and, if so, which direction of causation, or perhaps both simultaneously, is accurate (see Sironi, 2019 and Cannas et al. 2019 for reviews).

Germaine to the interest of this chapter, the contested relationship between job and life satisfaction has left room for researchers to examine the role that specific job characteristics play in directly determining life satisfaction. Often these characteristics are motivated by broad social determinants of well-being. Thus, building from the recognition that social capital and trust is critical for everyday feelings of well-being, Helliwell and Huang (2010) examine how such nonfinancial characteristics of the workplace influence life satisfaction. The work characteristics they examine play a huge role, especially workplace trust. Using three different North American data sources, they show that a one-third-standard-deviation increase in trust in management generates the same increase in life satisfaction as an increase of income of more than one-third.

Such a large role for trust in management chimes in with the earlier recognition that union members have lower trust in management and especially so when management opposes unionization as is typical in anglophone countries (Bryson 2001). Indeed, Helliwell and Huang (2010) confirm a very much smaller degree of trust among union members in their data. They further show that union members find trust in management generally less important than nonunion members presumably because they feel the union will protect their interests. This raises the intriguing possibility that as unions are increasingly less successful in protecting those interests, the profound distrust of management will become a prime source of member dissatisfaction in Anglophone countries.

Holland et al. (2012) provide a supporting Australian study again focusing on the issue of trust in management. They show that both union voice arrangements and perceived managerial opposition to unions are negatively related to trust in management. Again, as trust may be critical to well-being, this argues that collective voice against an opposed management lowers trust and likely reduces well-being.

Flavin and Shufeldt (2016) returned to the World Values Survey and limited their examination to only the United Sates. They show that union members have higher life satisfaction than do nonmembers. The controls they use are overly parsimonious relative to the typical job satisfaction regressions but the rationale for their results is interesting. In addition to any material improvement, they stress that unions provide greater opportunity for human interaction and social capital away from the job. Unions, in their view, also generate more active, involved and committed citizens. These aspects of social development have been long recognized to increase life satisfaction. The obvious point of this reasoning is that many of the

aspects of life that improve because of unionization are not strictly on the job and may not be captured by job satisfaction.

As reviewed by Hadziabdic and Baccaro (2020), a long line of research does show that unionized workers across countries are typically more active politically. In their own research these authors uniquely exploit longitudinal data to divide the association between unionization and political participation into a selection effect (a voice institution attracts those already more active politically) and a "molding" or "maturation" effect in which years with the union increases the level of activity. In the two countries studied, Britain and Switzerland, they show the selection effect dominates. They conclude "unions mostly attract like-minded workers, while the ability of the membership experience to modify the political attitudes of workers is on average more limited (page 29)." This evidence seemingly casts doubt on some of the life satisfaction claims. If more active and committed citizens have higher life satisfaction, it may well be that unions largely attract such citizens and play only a modest role in creating them.

5. Summary

Academic interest in the paradox of the dissatisfied union member is more than four decades old. It has been held up as fundamental in the process of what unions do. They motivate members to complain, agitate and demand improvements in their working conditions and standard of living. The union as a representative body funnels this dissatisfaction into material benefits for its members. This explains the simultaneous occurrence of dissatisfied members who stay on the job and never become more satisfied.

The purpose of this essay, in part, has been to examine how prevalent and pervasive this original explanation remains. It seems clear that unions in continental Europe do not play this same voice function. They manage to bargain without generating an unexplained job dissatisfaction. More interesting, the collectively representative local voice expressed by works councils seems at least benign and, if anything, to improve job satisfaction for many workers. It also seems to play a representative function in transferring interests, such as in family friendly jobs, into reality. The paradox seems, indeed, to be largely confined to Anglophone countries.

Within Anglophone countries union members do seem to have lower job satisfaction when conditioning on sensible controls. Yet, the source of the apparent dissatisfaction remains debated. One view is that it simply reflects worse working conditions even if they are often not completely measured. For example, when properly conditioned on both the higher wage for which the union is responsible and the worse employment relations climate for which the union is responsible (perhaps because of management's dislike of unions), no difference in satisfaction might remain. This would not mean there was no influence for unions but rather that when those influences were fully controlled for and there was no remaining influence. In this view all workers judge the world in the same way and if we could properly control for every union-nonunion difference in job characteristics, we should be able to explain any initial dissatisfaction

Alternatively, it has been thought that a distribution of satisfaction is given and that the more dissatisfied sort into union jobs in order to vent their inherent dissatisfaction. Yet, this simple view of sorting has not been routinely confirmed as many fixed effect estimates continued to show unionization associated with dissatisfaction. The dynamics behind such results are also interesting as they suggest initial increases in satisfaction upon taking a unionized job followed by slow deterioration in satisfaction. This pattern potentially fits with a third view that

unionization may change workers frames of reference and their weighting of job characteristics in a fashion that causes overall differences in job satisfaction to emerge. We highlight again, here in the conclusion, the recent study showing that union and nonunion UK government employees had virtually identical changes in job satisfaction when facing the same change in pension terms. To the extent this is general it argues that frames of reference and weighting appear very similar.

We also note the view that measures of job satisfaction are insufficient to pick-up the full influence of being a union member. On the one hand, benefits from membership spill over into other aspects of life away from the job and these may result in unionization increasing overall life satisfaction. On the other hand, unionization may so diminish social capital within the employment relations by undermining cooperation and trust, that life satisfaction falls.

Perhaps equally profound is the increased emphasis on whether the spillover benefits such as being more engaged and socially active are genuine. Our sense is that many of these benefits have been largely identified in cross-sectional comparisons and that much more work is need with longitudinal data to determine the size of these benefits controlling for obvious selection influences. Thus, in most countries representation brings material benefits and provides a voice to influence change by representing the desires of members. The success of that change vs. sorting on the original preferences often remains in doubt.

As is clear, much of the debate over the last forty years has moved away for dissatisfaction reflecting a union voice designed to change the workplace. There may, however, be a reasonable path back to studying that view. The examination of satisfaction with specific job characteristics has produced a weak consensus and additional work is warranted. Yet, what has not been examined sufficiently is whether the satisfaction or dissatisfaction with these facets is related to union bargaining objectives. As an example, when the union is trying to retain jobs

and press for security does satisfaction with job security fall? Similarly, when the union pushes strong wage demands, does job satisfaction with earnings fall? Answering such questions would seemingly require very local case studies but might provide another avenue in a long history of research on the influence of unionization on job satisfaction.

References:

Abraham, S.E., Friedman B.A. and Thomas, R.K. (2008). "The relationship among union membership, facets of satisfaction and intent to leave: further evidence on the voice face of unions'. *Empl. Responsib. Rights J.* 20: 1 - 11.

Artz B (2010) The Impact of Union Experience on Job Satisfaction. Ind. Relat. 49:387–405.

—— (2012) Does the Impact of Union Experience on Job Satisfaction Differ by Gender. Ind. Lab. Relat. Rev. 65: 225–43.

Artz, B., and Heywood, J.S. (2015) Performance pay and workplace injury: panel evidence. *Economica*, Vol. 82, pp. 1241 – 1260

Artz B, Kaya I (2014) Job Insecurity and Job Satisfaction in the United States: the Case of Public Sector Union Workers. Ind. Relat. J. 45:103-120.

Bellmann L, Hübler O, Leber U (2019) Works Council and Training Effects on Satisfaction. Appl. Econ. Let. 26: 1177-1181.

Bender, K.A., Green, C.P., and Heywood, J.S. (2012) Piece rates and workplace injury: does survey evidence support Adam Smith? *Journal of Population Economics,* Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 569-590.

Bender KA, Heywood JS, Kidd MP (2017) Claims of Employment Discrimination and Worker Voice. Ind. Relat. J. 48: 133-153.

Bender KA, Sloan P (1998) Job Satisfaction, Trade Unions, and Exit-Voice Revisited. Ind. Lab. Relat. Rev. 51: 222–40.

Bender, K.A. and Theodossiou, I. (2014) The unintended consequences of the rat race: the detrimental effects of performance pay on health. *Oxford Economic Papers,* Vol. 66, No. 3, pp. 824-847.

Berger CJ, Olson, CA, Boudreau JW (1983) Effects of Unions on Job satisfaction: The Role of Work-Related Values and Perceived Rewards. J. Organ. Behav. 32:289-324

Bessa I, Charlwood A, Valizade, D (2020) Do Unions Cause Job Dissatisfaction? Evidence from a Quasi-Experiment in the United Kingdom. Br. J. Ind. Relat. doi.org/10.1111/bjir.12543

BHI Predicitng Voluntary Union Membership. BHI Human Resources Consulting. http://media.hypersites.com/clients/1028/filemanager/docs/pdfs/Predicting%20Voluntary%20Union%20Membership.pdf viewed August 2, 2020.

Blanchflower DG, Bryson A (2020) Now Unions Increase Job Satisfaction and Well-being. *NBER Working Paper*, No. 27720.

Bockerman, P., Bryson, A., and Ilmakunnas, P. (2012) Does high involvement management improve wellbeing? *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization,* Vol. 84, No. 2, pp. 660-680.

Booth A (1995) The Economics of the Trade Union. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Borjas G (1979) Job Satisfaction, Wages and Unions. *J. Hum. Resour* 8: 436–55.

Bryson A (2001) The Foundation of 'Partnership'? Union Effects on Employee Trust in Management. Natl Inst Econ Rev 176:91–104.

Bryson A, Charlwood A, Forth J (2006) Worker Voice, Managerial Response and Labor Productivity: An Empirical Investigation. Ind. Relat. J. 37: 438–455.

Bryson A, Davies R (2019) Accounting for Geographic Variance in the Union Satisfaction Gap. Ind. Relat. J. 50:104 – 125.

Bryson A, White M (2016) Not So Dissatisfied After All? The Impact of Union Coverage on Job Satisfaction. Oxf. Econ. Pap. 68:898-919.

Bryson A, Cappellari L, Lucifora C (2004) Does Union Membership Really Reduce Job Satisfaction? Br. J. Ind. Relat. 42:439-459

Bryson A, Cappellari L, Lucifora C (2010) Why So Unhappy? The Effects of Unionization on Job Satisfaction, Oxf. Bull. Econ. and Stat. 72: 357-380.

Bryson, A., Freeman, R., Gomez, R., Willman, P. (2019) The twin track model of employee voice: An Anglo-American Perspective on Union Decline and The Rise of Alternative Forms of Voice. In: Holland P., Teicher, J., Donaghey, J. (eds) *Employee Voice at Work. Work, Organization, and Employment.* Spring, Singapore.

Budd JW, Mumford K (2004) Trade Unions and Family-Friendly Policies in Britain. Ind. Lab. Relat. Rev. 57: 204–222.

Burdin G, Pérotin V (2019) Employee Representation and Flexible Working Time. Labour Econ. 61: 101755.

Cannas M, Sergi BS, Sironi E, Mentel U (2019) Job Satisfaction and Subjective Well-Being in Europe. Econ. Socio. 12: 183-196.

Clark A. (2001).What really matters in a job? Hedonic measurement using Quit Data. Labour Econ. 8: 223–42.

Cotti CD, Haley MR, Miller, LA (2014) Flexibilities, Job Satisfaction and Union Membership in the US Workforce. Br. J. Ind. Relat. 52: 403-425.

Dedobbeleer N, Champagne F, German P (1990) Safety Performance among Union and Nonunion Workers in the Construction Industry. J. Occ. Med. 32; 1099-1103.

Dobbins, A., and Gunnigle, P. (2009) Can voluntary workplace partnership deliver sustainable mutual gains? *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 47, No. 3, pp. 546-570.

Donaldo A (2015) Why Do Unionized Workers Have More Nonfatal Occupational Injuries? Ind. Lab. Relat. Rev. 68: 153-185.

Donegani C, McKay S (2012) Is There a Paradox of Lower Job Satisfaction Among Trade Union Members? European Evidence. Transfer 18: 471-489.

Duncan G, Stafford F. (1980) Do Union Members Receive Compensating Differentials? *Am. Econ. Rev.* 70: 355 – 371.

Eaton A, Nocerino T (2002) The Effectiveness of Health and Safety Committees: Results of a Survey of Public-Sector Workplaces. Ind. Relat. 39: 265-290.

Fenn P, Ashby S (2004) Workplace Risk, Establishment Size and Union Density. Br. J. Ind. Relat. 42: 461-480.

Flavin P, Shufelt, G (2016) Labor Union Membership and Life Satisfaction in the United States. Labor Stud. J. 41: 171-184.

Flavin P, Pacek AC, Radcliff B (2012) Labor Unions and Life Satisfaction: Evidence from New Data. *Soc. Indic. Res.* 98: 435–449.

Freeman RB (1978) Job Satisfaction as an Economic Variable. *Am. Econ. Rev.* 68:135–41.

Freeman RB, Lazear EP (1995) An Economic Analysis of Works Councils. In Rogers J, Streeck W (eds) Work Councils: Consultation, Representation, and Cooperation in Industrial Relations. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 27–52.

Freeman RB, Medoff JL (1984) What Do Unions Do? New York: Basic Books.

Frey BS, Stutzer A (2002) What Can Economists Learn from Happiness Research? J. Econ. Lit. 40:402-435.

Garcia-Serrano C (2009) Job Satisfaction, Union Membership and Collective Bargaining. Eur. J. Ind. Relat. 15: 91-111.

Giddings L, Anderson D, Birkeland K (2013) Is It Profitable to Offer Paid Leave? A Case Study of the Legal Profession. J. Leg. Ethical and Regul. Issues 16: 73 – 99.

Gomez, R., Barry, M., Bryson, A., Kaufman, B.E., Lomas, G., and Wilkinson, A. (2019) The "good workplace": The role of joint consultative committees, union and HR policies in employee ratings of workplaces in Britain. *Journal of Participation and Employee Ownership,* Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 60 – 90.

Gomez R, Gunderson M (2004) The Experience Good Model of Trade Union Membership. In Wunnava PV (ed) The Changing Role of Unions. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 92-112.

Gordon M, DeNisi A (1995) A Re-examination of the Relationship Between Union Membership and Job Satisfaction. Ind. Lab. Relat. Rev. 48:222–36.

Green, C.P. and Heywood, J.S. (2008) Does performance pay increase job satisfaction? *Economica,* Vol. 75, pp. 710-728.

Green CP, Heywood JS (2015) Dissatisfied Union Workers: Sorting Revisited. Br. J. Ind. Relat. 53: 580–600.

Green CP, Heywood JS, Kler P, Leeves G (2018) Paradox Lost: The Disappearing Female Job Satisfaction Premium. Br. J. Ind. Relat. 56: 484-502.

Gregory A, Milner S (2009) Trade Unions and Work-life Balance: Changing Times in France and the UK? Brit. J. Ind. Relat. 47: 122-46.

Grund C, Schmitt A (2011) Works Councils, Wages and Job Satisfaction. Appl. Econ. 45:299-310.

Hadziabdic S, Baccaro L (2020) Switch or a Process? Disentangling the Effects of Union Membership on Political Attitudes in Switzerland and the UK. Ind. Relat. Forthcoming, doi.org/10.1111/irel.12264

Hamermesh, DS (1977) Economic Aspects of Job Satisfaction. In Ashenfelter O, Oates W (eds) Essays in Labor Market Analysis. Wiley, New York, 53–72.

—— (2001). 'The changing distribution of job satisfaction. J. Hum. Resour. 36: 1–30.

Hammer TH, Avgar A (2005) The Impact of Unions on Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Turnover. J. Lab. Res. 26: 241-266.

Heiland F, Macpherson DA (2005) Do Family-Friendly Firms Perform Better? Working Paper, Florida State University,

Helliwell JF, Huang H (2010) How's the job? Well-being and Social Capital in the Workplace. Ind. Lab. Relat. Rev. 63: 205–227

—— (2011) Well-Being and Trust in the Workplace. J Happiness Stud 12:747–767

Heywood JS (1992) Racial Discrimination and Union Voice. Ind. Relat. 31: 500-508.

Heywood JS, Jirjahn U (2009) Family Friendly Practices and Worker Representation in Germany. Ind. Relat. 48:121 -145.

Heywood JS, Siebert WS, Wei X (2007) The Implicit Wage Costs of Family Friendly Work Practices. Oxf. Econ. Pap. 59: 275–300.

Heywood JS, Siebert WS, Wei X (2002) Worker Sorting and Job Satisfaction: The Case of Union and Government Jobs. Ind. Lab. Relat. Rev. 55:595–609.

Hipp L, Givan RK (2015) What Do Unions Do? A Cross-National Re-examination of the Relationship between Unionization and Job Satisfaction. *Soc. Forces* 94:349–377.

Holland P, Cooper BK, Pyman A (2012) Trust in management: The role of employee voice arrangements and perceived managerial opposition to unions. Hum. Resour. Manag. J. 22: 77–391.

Hulin C (1991) Adaptation, Persistence and Commitment in Organizations. In Dunnette MD, Hough LM (eds) Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 445-506.

Jirjahn U, Lange V (2015) Reciprocity and Workers' Tastes for Representation. J. Lab. Res. 36: 118 – 209.

Jirjahn U, Morhenweiser J (2020) Works Councils and Organization Gender Policies in Germany. Brit. J. Ind. Relat. Forthcoming, doi.org/10.1111/bjir.12545

Jirjahn U, Mohrenweiser J, Smith SC (2019) Works Councils and Workplace Health Promotion in Germany. IZA Working paper #12113.

Jirjahn U, Tsertsvadze G (2006) Betriebsräte und Arbeitszufriedenheit. Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik 226: 537-561.

Karasek RA (1979) Job Demands, Job Decision Latitude, and Mental Strain: Implications for Job Redesign. Adm. S. Q. 24: 285-308.

Kleiner MM, Lee YM (1997) Works Councils and Unionization: Lessons from South Korea. Ind. Relat. 36: 1-16.

Kochan TA, Helfman DA (1981) The Effects of Collective Bargaining on Economic and Behavioural Job Outcomes. In R. Ehrenberg R (ed) Research in Labor Economics. JAI Press, Greenwich, 321-365.

Krueger AB, Schkade DA (2008) The Reliability of Subjective Well-being Measures. J. Public Econ. 92: 1833-1845

Laroche P (2016) A Meta-analysis of the Union-Job Satisfaction Relationship. Br. J. Ind. Relat. 54:709–741.

Lee BH, Kim JS (2010) Is Family-friendly Management Good for Firms? The Diffusion and Performance of Family-friendly Workplaces in South Korea. J. Ind, Relat. 52: 459-475.

Lincoln JR, Boothe J (1993) Unions and Work Attitudes in the United States and Japan. Ind. Relat. 32:159-187.

Lind E, Kanfer R, Earley P (1990) Voice, Control and Procedural Justice: Instrumental and Noninstrumental Concerns in Fairness Judgments', J. Pers. Soc. Psychol. 59: 952 – 959.

Meng, R. (1990). The relationship between unions and job satisfaction'. Appl. Econ. 22: 1635-1649.

Meyer, JP, Allen, NJ (1997) Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research and Application. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Macky, K. and Boxall, P. (2008) High-involvement work processes, work intensification and employee well-being: A study of New Zealand worker experiences. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources,* Vol. 46, pp. 38-55.

Mohr RD, Zoghi C (2008) High-Involvement Management Work Design and Job Satisfaction. Ind. Lab. Relat. Rev. 61: 275-296.

Morse T, Punnett L, Warren N, Dillon C, Warren A (2003) The Relationship of Unions to Prevalence and Claim Filing for Work-Related Upper-Extremity Musculoskeletal Disorders. Am J. Ind. Med. 44: 83 – 93.

Nelson, P. (1970) Information and Consumer Behavior. J. Political Econ.78: 311- 329.

Oswald A, Proto E, Sgroi D (2015) Happiness and Productivity. J Lab. Econ. 33: 789-822.

Parkes KR, Razavi TBD (2004) Personality and Attitudinal Variables as Predictors of Voluntary Union Membership. Pers. Individ. Diff. 37: 333- 347.

Pfeffer J, Davis-Blake A (1990) Unions and Job Satisfaction: Sn Alternative View. Work Occup. 17:259-283.

Pichler F, Wallace C (2009) What are the reasons for differences in job satisfaction across Europe? Individual, compositional and institutional explanations. Eur. Socio. Rev. 25: 535-549.

Powdthavee N (2011) Anticipation, Free Rider Problems and Adaptation to Trade Unions: Re-examining the Curious Case of Dissatisfied Union Members. Ind. Lab. Relat. Rev. 64: 1000–1019.

Reilly B, Paci P, Holl P (1995) Unions, Safety Committees and Workplace Injuries. Br. J. Ind. Relat. 33: 275-288.

Renaud S (2002) Rethinking the Union Membership/Job Satisfaction Relationship: Some Empirical Evidence in Canada. Int. J. of Manpow. 23:137-150.

Rubin EV (2011) Exploring the Link Between Procedural Fairness and Union Membership in the Federal Government. Rev. Public Pers. Adm. 31: 128 – 142.

Schwochau S (1987) Union Effects on Job Attitudes. Ind. Lab. Relat. Rev. 40: 209-224.

Sironi, E (2019) Job Satisfaction as a Determinant of Employees' Optimal Well-being in an Instrumental Variable Approach. Quality & Quantity 53:1721-1742

Van de Meer, PH (2019) What Makes Workers Happy: Empowerment, Unions or Both? Eur J. Ind. Relat. 25: 363 –376.

Weil D (1999) Are Mandated Health and Safety Committees Substitutes for or Supplements to Labor Unions? Ind. Lab. Relate Rev. 52: 339-360.

Wilkinson A, Barry M, Gomez R, Kaufman BE (2018) Taking the Pulse at Work: An Employment Relations Scorecard for Australia. J. Ind. Relat. 60: 145-175.

Willman P, Bryson A, Gomez R (2006) The Sound of Silence: Which Employers Choose No Employee Voice and Why? Socio-Econ. Rev. 4: 283-299.

Wood SA, Bryson A (2009) High Involvement Management. In: The Evolution of the Modern Workplace, eds. Brown W, Bryson A, Forth J, Whitfield K. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 151-175.

Wood, SA, van Veldhoven M, Croon M, de Menezes LM (2012) Enriched Job Design, High Involvement Management and Organizational Performance: The Mediating Roles of Job Satisfaction and Well-Being. Hum. Relat. 65: 419-445.