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ABSTRACT

Labor unions are organizations whose main purpose is to represent all workers and protect their rights and interests. As such, labor unions are one of the most important channels to provide workers with a voice. In this research, the aim is to examine whether positively perceived employee voice in their labor unions will lead to higher satisfaction with collective bargaining results and employee compliance. In addition, it aimed to understand the relationship between perceived employee voice and a positive union-management environment. In addition, the relationship between a positive union-management environment and satisfaction with collective bargaining results and employee compliance was examined. According to the procedural justice theory, perceptions of fairness of decision-making processes by employees are believed to promote feelings of compliance. A positive union-management environment was tested as a mediator in the relationship between perceived employee voice and satisfaction with collective bargaining results and perceived employee voice and employee compliance. A quantitative study was conducted, and respondents were asked to complete a paper-and-pencil questionnaire related to their perceptions on employee voice, union-management environment, satisfaction with collective bargaining results and employee compliance. The data gathered from 205 union workers was analyzed with the use of SPSS and the Smart-PLS software. It was found that perceived employee voice had a positive effect on satisfaction with collective bargaining results and a positive union-management environment. In addition, a positive union-management environment was found to mediate the relationship between perceived employee voice and satisfaction with collective bargaining results. Perceived employee voice and a positive union-management environment did not show any relation to employee compliance.

Keywords: Labor Unions, Procedural Justice, Employee Voice, Union-Management Environment, Employee Compliance
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CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

This chapter is an overview of the study and it offers a background of the study, the problem that the researcher is addressing, the rationale of the study, the research questions, the purpose of the study, the scope of the study, the contribution of the study and definitions of terms.

Background of Study

The strike of 1954 was probably one of the most important economic and political events in the history of Honduras. Also known as the ‘banana strike’, it involved at least 38,000 workers in the country, and it took almost 3 months to settle (Euraque, 1996). It was thanks to this strike, that the first labor union was consolidated in the multinational company used for this study.

Since the formation of this first union, this multinational company has overseen countless strikes from its numerous labor unions. In fact, in the year 2010 alone, $1 million USD was lost on operations due to workers’ strikes (La Tribuna, 2010). Because of this, labor unions have gained a reputation of ‘doing more harm than good’ to organizations in Honduras. As a consequence, many organizations are attempting to close their labor unions. For instance, strikes and financial loss in some of the farms of the multinational company in this study, led the organization to attempt to close 13 farms, which would leave 3,500 families without a source of income. After a series of negotiations which took months to settle, not all of the 13 farms were closed; however, many workers were left without a job (EMI, 2011).

In order to stay competitive and prevent economic loss, organizations in Honduras are more conscious than ever of the need to have positive union-management relations. In addition, labor unions are needed more than ever by workers who demand fair wages and practices. A better understanding of union workers perceptions not only of the union-management environment, but of their voice in labor unions can not only benefit the workers themselves, but it can also benefit firms and companies established in Honduras. It might help organizations and labor unions work together in a completely distinct manner: instead of having a conflictive relationship that leads to strikes and layoffs, they
might realize that in the long run, a positive, cooperative environment might provide more benefits to both parties.

**Problem Statement**

A great number of organizations are opting to move into a non-union environment, which has lead to a decrease in union density around the world (Sano & Williamson, 2008). Latin America is no exception to this decline, and some countries have seen a steady decrease of unions in the past years (Wachendorfer, 1990).

In Honduras, a country in which the phrase ‘workers’ rights’ is still not respected, labor unions are fundamental to society. In fact, according to the US Annual Human Rights Report (2012) union workers in Honduras exercise with difficulty the right to engage in collective bargaining and the government failed to enforce applicable laws effectively. This led many employers to actually refuse to engage in collective bargaining with unions.

In the case where employers actually engage in collective bargaining, workers are mostly dissatisfied with the results and they demonstrate this dissatisfaction by not complying with organizational policies. In addition, this dissatisfaction leads to strikes, which can last from days to weeks. In some cases, private organizations have been forced to close their areas of operation for days because of strikes.

Unfortunately, up to this time, union-management relations in the country have a long history of disagreement. Consequently, there is very little knowledge on how organizations can collaborate with labor unions, and the benefits that a positive union-management environment and perceived employee voice can bring to the organization.

**Rationale of the Study**

Research on workers’ perceptions of employee voice, union-management environment, satisfaction with collective bargaining and employee compliance are quite few. Moreover, there are very few studies that have been conducted in Honduras that concentrate on union workers.

Needless to say, none of the studies have been applied to labor unions from the agro-industrial sector in Honduras. This research is not only a first of its kind in
Honduras, contributing to Honduran literature which is in great need of such research, but also proves to be of great value for both organizations and labor unions.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to apply the Procedural Justice Theory to investigate the impact perceived employee voice in labor unions had on satisfaction with collective bargaining results and employee compliance. Moreover, it aimed to investigate the impact perceived employee voice in labor unions had on union-management environment. Furthermore, it aimed to understand the impact a positive union-management environment had on satisfaction with collective bargaining results and employee compliance. In addition, it investigated whether a positive union-management environment served as a mediator between perceived employee voice in labor unions and satisfaction with collective bargaining results and between employee voice in labor unions and employee compliance.

**Research Questions**

This study answers the following questions:

1. What is the relationship between perceived employee voice in labor unions and satisfaction with collective bargaining results?

2. What is the relationship between perceived employee voice in labor unions and employee compliance?

3. What is the relationship between perceived employee voice in labor unions and a positive union-management environment?

4. What is the relationship between a positive union-management environment and satisfaction of collective bargaining results?
5. What is the relationship between a positive union-management environment and employee compliance?

6. Does a positive union-management relationship mediate the relationship between perceived employee voice in labor unions and satisfaction of collective bargaining results?

7. Does a positive union-management relationship mediate the relationship between perceived employee voice in labor unions and employee compliance?

**Scope of the Study**

This research studied the relationship between perceived employee voice and a positive union-management environment. Additionally, it studied whether perceptions of the union-management environment had impact on the satisfaction with collective bargaining results, and employee compliance. This framework applied the theory on Procedural Justice to study satisfaction and compliance as outcomes of perceptions of employee voice in labor unions. Therefore, only those factors that have been found to affect procedural justice feelings are included as predictors, such as perceptions of employee voice and perceptions of union-management environment.

This study collected data from labor unions in the Central American country of Honduras. As a very small country whose economy is still developing, it wouldn’t be advisable to generalize the results of this study to other countries. In addition, given that Honduras’ economy is mostly based on agriculture, this study was conducted in a multinational company in the agro-industrial sector. Because the sample from this study came from a specific economic sector, it wouldn’t be advisable to generalize the results to other sectors of the economy.

Moreover, this study focuses on perceptions. It’s important to note that perceptions are not based on reality, but on individual’s view of circumstances (Kannan & Panimalar, 2013). In addition, only the perceptions of union workers are considered for this study, and there was no study of non-union workers for comparison.
Definition of Terms

Labor Unions
Labor unions are democratically operated entities established by workers, to represent workers in any company or state enterprise. The main purpose of these entities is to protect workers rights and interests (Napathorn & Chanprateep, 2011) by achieving “collective goals” (Shmoop Editorial Team, 2008). Some of the goals can be economic in nature, which includes increasing wages and benefits for the workers. Furthermore, there are other goals that go beyond economic purposes, such as providing better training for the workers and making the workplace safer (Tiburcio, 1998).

Union Worker
A union worker is defined as a worker who is member of a union and who has union representation at the workplace. A union workforce can bargain or negotiate its salary and wage rates through a union, as well as employee benefits, complaint procedures, safety procedures, and policy procedures (Richards-Gustafson, 2011).

Procedural Justice
Dogan (2008) defines procedural justice as the extent in which the employees perceive the dynamics of the decision process as fair. In other words, procedural justice is the perceived fairness and transparency in the decision-making procedures made by the organization. Blader and Tyler (2003) specified six principles to promote the perceptions of procedural justice: consistency, bias suppression, accuracy, correctability, representativeness and ethicality.

Perceptions
Halle (2013) defined perceptions as “the process through which we select, organize, and interpret the information gathered by our senses, in order to fully understand our environment”. In other words, individuals give meaning to their environment based on their perceptions. In addition, Kannan and Panimalar (2013) stated that an individual’s perception is not necessarily based on reality, but it is an outlook, an individual’s view of a situation.
Positive Union-Management Environment
Union-management environment is defined as the setting in which management and the labor union, directly or indirectly, interact (Trebilcock, 2001). Angle and Perry (1986) supported this definition, stating that union-management environment is the ‘setting in which labor unions and management interact over time’. A positive union-management environment can be described as how positive employees perceive this interaction.

Perceived Employee Voice in Labor Unions
Townsend, Wilkinson, and Burgess (2013) defined employee voice as an opportunity to ‘have a say’: a concept that is essential in most definitions of employee voice. Perceived employee voice in labor unions can be defined as employees’ perceptions of whether or not they ‘have a say’ in their respective labor unions.

Collective Bargaining
The Department for Professional Employees (2011) defined Collective Bargaining as:
“A form of employer–employee relations that allows employees to be heard in the workplace on issues that affect them. It offers workers the advantage of being able to speak with one voice. Professionals use collective bargaining to preserve workplace integrity and respect, and create safe, professional, and rewarding work environments.” (p.1)

Satisfaction with Collective Bargaining Results
Aydin and Ceylan (2009) defined employee satisfaction as “the combination of affective reactions to the differential perceptions of what the employee wants to receive with what he/she actually receives”. Utilizing this definition, satisfaction with collective bargaining results can be described as the differential perceptions of what the employee wants to receive through collective bargaining, with what he/she actually receives.
Employee Compliance

Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine and Bachrach (2000) defined employee compliance as employees’ internalization and acceptance of the organization’s rules, regulations and procedures. Acceptance will result in a conscious adherence to these regulations and procedures, even when no one is observing or monitoring the employee.
CHAPTER II  LITERATURE REVIEW

Labor Unions: An Introduction

Labor unions have played an extremely important role in shaping how we live and work. Unions can be an instrument of social change, but even when the labor unions play an important role in their respective societies; their activities always remain focused on their workplace.

Labor unions are organizations that are established by and for workers with the purpose of achieving collective goals related to their work environment (Shmoop Editorial Team, 2008). Many of the “collective” goals of labor unions are economic, such as: achieving higher wages and higher benefits for the workers. Moreover, there are other educational, cultural, recreational and social goals (Tiburcio, 1998) aimed at benefiting the employees. These goals go beyond economic purposes, such as making the workplace safer and protecting employees’ rights.

Labor unions were born in Great Britain and France, however, they have quickly extended throughout the world (Lescas, 2009). Long hours, poor living conditions, unsafe workplace conditions, low wages, and exploitation of the workers, are just some of the aspects that have contributed to the formation of countless labor unions throughout Latin America (Tiburcio, 1998). According to Santos (2012), labor unions are probably the most “legitimate expression of the organized working class”, and as such, are a fundamental aspect of workers’ life in Latin America.

Labor Unions in Honduras

The labor union movement in Honduras is traditionally considered one of the strongest in Central America (Merrill, 1995). However, despite their strength, the labor movement in Honduras is relatively young: labor unions were recognized by the government until 1954, after a worker strike that lasted more than three months (Posas, 1988).

According to Posas (1988), what were once small and short-lived labor unions have now become an important political force in Honduras. As a matter of fact, recent
statistics state there are approximately 450 labor unions in the country (Sepúlveda, 2003) and at least 15% of all Honduran workers are unionized (cited in La Prensa, 2012).

Labor unions in Honduras are established throughout an assembly that gathers at least the minimum number of workers that are required for its formation. For instance, if the company has more than 50 workers, the minimum number of workers required is 25, which have to represent at least 10% of the workers in the company. If the company has less than 50 workers, the minimum number of workers is 8, which have to represent at least 50% of all the workers in the company (Tiburcio, 1998).

Merrill (1995) states that historically, Honduran labor unions have strongly opposed ‘solidarismo’ or solidarity associations. These associations tend to emphasize ‘management-labor harmony’, by having management and labor workers representatives (Merrill, 1995). In the long run, this reluctance from union workers to cooperate with management might negatively affect not only Honduran companies, but also the workers themselves. Because of this, more companies in the country are aiming to build a positive relationship with labor unions.

**Labor Unions Research**

Labor union research is quite popular and varied. Research on labor unions includes: labor-management relations, workplace grievance resolutions, women’s participation in labor unions, and importance of labor unions in the workplace, among others. For the purpose of this research, the most relevant research topics will be listed.

Much of the research on labor unions is related the role labor unions play through organizational change. In a globalized world, organizations are experiencing significant changes related to technology or work structures, and many firms are even force to downsize. However, research suggests that labor unions can play a significant role through organization change. In fact, Tsai and Shih (2013) argue that labor unions negotiations are an important factor to consider when investigating the impact of organizational change or downsizing strategies on firm performance. The authors argue that labor unions actually lessen the impact of downsizing, because through their negotiations they improve job security and benefits.
In addition, much research related to labor unions is concerned with declining numbers in labor union membership. In fact, Martinez (2009) states that union decline has steadily increased during the last years. Much of the research related to union decline aims to understand what can be done to stop or to slow down this decline (Sano & Williamson, 2008). Moreover, Sano and Williamson (2008) suggest that workplace access, better bargaining arrangements, better relationships with employers and better benefits can be a way to reverse this union decline.

In response to this drop in union membership, researchers are turning to union-management environment. In fact, research suggests that the benefits a positive relationship between union and management can bring to an organization go beyond reversing union decline, but can also increase productivity, efficiency and service quality (Deery & Iverson, 2005). In addition, research findings suggest that collaboration between both parties can encourage employees to work according to the firm’s interests (Deery & Iverson, 2005) and have a strong influence on organizational performance (Weinstein, 2012).

Collective Bargaining is a topic that has gained attention during the past years. In fact, Belman and Block (2003) state that research on collective bargaining is extensive and controversial. Some research suggests that organizations move away from the traditional way of bargaining, into a way of bargaining that can provide benefits for both parties. In fact, Till-Retz, Holub, and Clements (2000) propose a new model of collective bargaining: a ‘mutual gains’ way of negotiating. Instead of the usual adversarial bargaining, through this new model of bargaining, both parties are equally committed to continuing their relationship, and both parties will equally propose solutions together (Till-Retz et al., 2000).

**Procedural Justice**

Employees’ perceptions about fairness in an organization are of increasing importance to researchers. Studies suggest that how employees perceive certain work-related aspects can be directly linked to how employees behave and act in an organization (Halle, 2013). For instance, Ince and Gul (2011) argue that employee perceptions about
the organization’s decisions and practices can influence whether employee exhibit organizational citizenship behaviors.

Halle (2013) described perceptions as “the process through which we select, organize, and interpret the information gathered by our senses, in order to fully understand our environment”. In other words, individuals give meaning to their environment based on their perceptions. Moreover, Kannan and Panimalar (2013) state that an individual’s perception is not necessarily based on reality, but it is an outlook, an individual’s view of a situation.

Organizational justice is concerned with the ways employees perceive and determine if they are treated fairly, and those determinations can have an effect on how employees behave. In fact, Ngodo (2008) states that organizational justice is a term that describes the role of fairness in the workplace. Furthermore, the author argues that researchers have determined two major perspectives on organizational justice: distributive justice and procedural justice.

McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) define procedural justice as the perceived fairness of processes used to determine decisions. In other words, procedural justice can be described as the employees’ perceptions on how fair and transparent the organization’s decision-making procedures are.

Perceptions on procedural justice are related to attitudes and behaviors towards all processes, policies, decision making and outcomes in the organization (Dogan, 2008). Actually, research suggests that in an organization where employees perceive that the processes that are utilized to determine the outcomes are fair and transparent, and that management is willing to accept their obligations under the collective bargaining agreements, then the union-management environment will be more positively perceived (Deery & Iverson, 2005) and there will be a better communication between management and labor unions (Yarrington, Townsend & Brown, 2007).

In addition, one of the most significant findings related to procedural justice is the positive effect it can have on employees. According to Törnbloom and Vermunt (2007) procedural justice is positively correlated with satisfaction in the workplace. Furthermore, studies show that there is a very strong relationship between procedural justice and trust and commitment in employees (Dogan, 2008). Moreover, Dogan (2008)
argues that the trust that procedural justice might bring to the workplace is an antecedent of voluntary cooperation. Dogan (2008) argue that procedural justice is a predictor for organizational citizenship behaviors such as conscientiousness, compliance, altruism and courtesy. Although these behaviors are not identical to voluntary cooperation, they do demonstrate the ability of employees to overrule personal self-interest in behalf of the organization.

Furthermore, Doyle, Gallery and Coyle (2009) argue that individuals who perceive that they have been treated fairly feel entitled to comply and adhere. O’Hear (2008) agrees: the author states that perceptions of fairness will promote feelings of cooperation and compliance. Thus, it can be argued that if employees in an organization feel that the decisions in an organization were reached through fair procedures, then these employees will feel more obligated to comply with the organization’s regulations.

However, employees’ perceptions of fairness are not only based on the final decision, but on how that decision was reached. Blader and Tyler (2003) argue that an individual’s perception of fairness of the decision-making process doesn’t depend solely on the outcome of the decisions, but on the attributes of the process to reach the outcome. Furthermore, O’Hear (2008) argues that one of these attributes includes employee voice: whether the individual perceives that he/she had the opportunity to give out his/her opinions and suggestions. In fact, the author argues that perceptions of voice can actually promote the acceptance of decisions that otherwise would be believed to be unfair.

**Satisfaction with Collective Bargaining Results**

As discussed earlier, Wilkinson et al., (2004) proposed that union workers could communicate their views and opinions of work related issues to management through collective bargaining. Before understanding satisfaction with collective bargaining results, it’s important to understand the nature of collective bargaining.

The Department for Professional Employees (2011) defined Collective Bargaining as:

“Collective bargaining is a form of employer–employee relations that allows employees to be heard in the workplace on issues that affect them. It offers
workers the advantage of being able to speak with one voice. Professionals use collective bargaining to preserve workplace integrity and respect, and create safe, professional, and rewarding work environments.” (p. 1)

Aydin and Ceylan (2009) define employee satisfaction as “the combination of affective reactions to the differential perceptions of what the employee wants to receive with what he/she actually receives”. Utilizing this definition, satisfaction with collective bargaining results can be described as the differential perceptions of what the employee wants to receive through collective bargaining, with what he/she actually receives. It is important to note, that employees’ perceptions of what the employees wants to receive and perceptions of what he/she actually receives, are influenced by the employees’ own unique needs, values, and expectations (Castro & Martins, 2010).

Collective bargaining deals with an extensive variety of issues. According to Budd, Warino and Patton (2004) the most important issues that collective bargaining covers are hours of work, wages, benefits and terms of employment. It is through collective bargaining that union workers can earn higher wages, have access to benefits (such as health insurance and pensions) and negotiate over issues regarding a safer work environment.

The pattern of collective bargaining can be different in different countries. However, the main steps in the collective bargaining process are usually the following: present the demands of employees to the employer, followed by discussions and negotiations on a ‘give or take basis’ to fulfill the demands (Benites & Larco, 2004). In the long run, collective bargaining will lead up to the conclusion of a collective agreement. According to Gernigon, Odero, and Guido (2000) collective agreements are written agreements between an employee and its employer regarding working conditions. Collective agreements have a strong, binding nature, and even contracts of employment that contradict the collective agreement can be regarded as null and be replaced by the new conditions of the collective agreement (Gernigon et al., 2000).

In addition, according to Budd, Warino and Patton (2004) a typical organization is ruled by principles of authority and subordination. However, throughout the bargaining process, the union members are no longer in a position of subordination towards the
management. By no longer being in this position of subordination, union workers will have the opportunity not only to speak out their concerns and opinions, but actually to propose ideas and solutions to the management. By doing so, the union workers have the chance to change their work environment and their work conditions for the better.

Collective bargaining can provide the opportunity for employees to give opinions about their work conditions and collective agreements can be the tools for management to act according to these opinions. In addition, collective bargaining can be a process which can benefit both parties: management and labor unions. As a matter of fact, Belman and Block (2003) suggested that collective bargaining can provide a mechanism through which both union and management can propose, discuss and agree on certain situations. Through a “win-win” collective bargaining, an organization open to collective bargaining is more likely to be efficient than one in which decisions are only taken by management (Till-Retz, Holub, & Clements, 2000).

**Employee Compliance**

Lee, Kim and Kim (2013) argued that nowadays, constant changes in organizational environments results in greater importance in organizational flexibility and adaptation. In turn, in order to for an organization to be flexible and adapt to changing situations, it calls for voluntary and engaged behaviors from the organization’s employees. Concerning this matter, more researchers are gaining interest in employee compliance.

Employee compliance indicates employees’ intentions to follow the organizational rules (Lee et al., 2013). Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine and Bachrach (2000) supported this definition. The authors argue that compliance captures employees’ internalization and acceptance of the organization’s rules, regulations and procedures. Acceptance will result in a conscious adherence to these regulations and procedures, even when no one is observing or monitoring the employee.

Compliance behaviors can benefit the organization in many ways. Emami, Alizadeh, Nazari and Darvishi (2012) argued that high rates of ‘regulation following’ keep the organization running efficiently. Furthermore, the authors argued that employees who tend to adhere to the organizations regulations tend to be more productive. When
employees adhere to regulations, they tend to spend less time in unnecessary breaks or chatter, and tend to be more productive in their work environments. In addition, research suggests that employees who comply to the organization’s regulations have lower rates of absenteeism, which translates into lower costs for contracting ‘temps’ to fill in for absent workers or fewer people needed on payroll (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006).

Most of the time, people assume that all employees comply with their organizations’ regulations. However, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine and Bachrach (2000) argued that even though all employees in an organization are expected to follow the organization’s regulations at all times, many do not. Therefore, an employee who follows the regulations even when no one is watching is an invaluable asset to an organization.

**Perceived Employee Voice in Labor Unions**

In today’s workplace, both employers and employees have a shared interest in the success and growth of the organization. Employee voice might be the mechanism that can be used by managers to understand performance problems and for employees to know how improvements can be made. As a matter of fact, employee voice is a term that has become more common in human resources literature in recent years (Dundon, Wilkinson, Marchington & Ackers, 2004). This variety of literature has made employee voice a very broad term which holds extensive definitions from a wide range of authors (Townsend, Wilkinson & Burgess, 2013).

In fact, employee voice is a term that can be used with different applications and in different contexts. Nevertheless, researchers argue that this predicament can be overcome by simply defining employee voice as an opportunity to ‘have a say’: a concept that is essential in most definitions of employee voice (Townsend et al., 2013).

Perceived employee voice in labor unions can be defined as employees’ perceptions of whether or not they ‘have a say’ in labor unions. Moreover, Hames (2012) argued that perceptions of voice relate to the acceptability or the consequences of speaking out and providing input in an organization. Particularly, perceived employee voice is derived from how employees perceive the behaviors of their superiors, and whether they provide an opportunity for employees to provide input (Hames, 2012).
Usually, organizations have a range of formal and informal mechanisms for employees to voice out their views and opinions. Freeman and Medoff (2004) argue that labor unions are the best agents to provide employee voice. Townsend et al. (2013) argue that unions, through their collective actions, are an opportunity to air out grievances and opinions. In their 2002 report, “Management choice and employee voice”, the Institute of Personnel and Development argue that the most widely used voice mechanisms include: two-way communications, attitude surveys, joint consultation, suggestion schemes and collective representation.

However, none of these mechanisms are useful if voice is not perceived as being heard. Emmott (2012) argued that for voice to be an effective mechanism in an organization, it is really needs to be ‘fed’ into the organization’s decision making process. In fact, for union workers to have a positive perception of their voice in their labor unions, they have to perceive that their views and opinions are listened to and acted upon. If employees perceive that their voice is not acted upon, then their perceptions of voice in the organization will be negative. Budd (2012) argued that if an employee perceives that their voice never achieves or leads to something, then employees will not desire to exercise voice.

Potter (2006) argued that countless procedural justice studies evidence the positive effects of employee voice. In fact, Purcell (2010) argues that listening to employee voice can drive employee engagement. If employees perceive that their voice will promote a positive change in the organization, then this will encourage them to engage and participate in their organization. Moreover, research suggests that when employees perceive themselves as having a voice and they perceive that their voice will have an impact on organizational decisions, then employees will have higher levels of organizational commitment (Farndale, Van Ruiten, Kelliher & Hope-Hailey, 2011). In addition, Hames (2012) argued that employees satisfied with their perceptions of their voice, will have higher levels of affective commitment and lower levels of exit. In fact, employees with a positive perception of voice are not only more willing to make contributions, but also show loyalty to the organization and the organization’s goals (Chartered Institute of Personnel & Development, 2005).
In addition, perceived employee voice has been found to affect satisfaction with collective bargaining results. In fact, Belman and Block (2003) argued that collective organization and collective bargaining are of extreme importance, as they can provide a means in which employees can voice out any grievances and negotiate an arrangement with their employer. Collective bargaining can provide the opportunity for employees to give opinions about their work conditions and collective agreements can be the tools for management to act according to these opinions. In addition, collective bargaining can be a process which can benefit both parties: management and labor unions. As a matter of fact, Belman and Block (2003) suggested that collective bargaining can provide a mechanism through which both union and management can propose, discuss and agree on certain situations. Through a “win-win” collective bargaining, an organization open to collective bargaining is more likely to be efficient than one in which decisions are only taken by management (Till-Retz, Holub, & Clements, 2000). In addition, if employees’ perceive that their voices are being heard and acted upon in collective bargaining negotiations; they’re more likely to be satisfied with collective bargaining results. Additionally, Spencer (1986) argued that positive perceptions of employee voice can directly relate to satisfaction in the workplace.

Furthermore, perceived employee voice has also been found to be an antecedent of employee compliance. For instance, Potter (2006) suggested that perceived employee voice can increase fairness perceptions of the decision-making process and satisfaction with the outcomes. These perceptions of fairness will lead to acceptance of decisions and promote feelings of compliance. Furthermore, O’Hear (2008) argued that perceptions of having a voice in decision-making procedures will promote perceptions of fairness and acceptance of decisions and promote feelings of compliance. In addition, perceptions of having a voice can lead to positive perceptions of the union-environment, which in turn, can lead to compliance.

Likewise, another benefit of perceived employee voice has been more positive perceptions of an organization’s environment. In fact, Yarrington, Townsend and Brown (2007) argued that organizations with mutual commitment, where genuine employee voice is encouraged, are associated with higher levels of trust and good communication, and in turn, this is associated with good management-union relationships. Moreover,
according to Pyman, Holland, Teicher and Cooper (2010) voice mechanisms have been
found to have a positive association with more favorable perceptions of industrial
relations climate. To investigate the influence of perceived employee voice in labor
unions, the researcher assumes the following hypotheses:

*Hypothesis 1:* Perceived employee voice in labor unions will positively affect satisfaction
with collective bargaining results.

*Hypothesis 2:* Perceived employee voice in labor unions will positively affect employee
compliance.

*Hypothesis 3:* Perceived employee voice in labor unions will positively affect a positive
union-management environment.

**Positive Union-Management Environment**

Union-management environment is defined as the setting in which management
and the labor union, directly or indirectly, interact (Trebilcock, 2001). Angle and Perry
(1986) support this definition, stating that union-management environment is the ‘setting
in which labor unions and management interact over time’. A positive union-management
environment can be described as how positively employees perceive this interaction. In a
globalized world, in response to heightened levels of competition, companies have been
forced to revise the interaction between labor unions and management, and even to
restructure their work practices (Deery & Iverson, 2005).

According to Weinstein (2012) union-management relations and environment
tend to be perceived as ‘adversarial’. However, this perceived tension between both
parties can have negative impacts in the long run: for instance, it can erode trust,
intensifying the division between management and the union. Because of this, more
organizations are now trying to promote a positive, supportive union-management
environment. However, how can a positive union-management environment be created
and nurtured?
Research suggests that there is one major antecedent to a positive union-management environment: attitudes (Deery & Iverson, 2005). Employees’ attitudes in the workplace can have a major impact on their work environment, and even a drastic impact on the success and productivity of an organization (Ray, 2013). Not surprisingly, employees’ attitudes can have a significant impact on a positive union-management environment. McShane and Glinow (2003) defined attitudes as a cluster of beliefs, feelings, and behavioral intentions towards a person, object, or event. Moreover, psychologists state that attitudes are a learned tendency to evaluate things in a certain way (Cherry, 2013). In other words, attitudes are judgments, which tend to be stable over time.

Attitudes are affected by the person’s beliefs about an object or situation. Employees have attitudes about many aspects of their jobs, their careers, and of course, the organizations they work for. The attitudes that employees have towards each other can affect how they perceive the union-management environment.

Angle and Perry (1986) argued that as labor and management interact with each other, they will interpret the perceptions, intentions, attitudes, and motivations that underlie in the other party’s actions, and engage in “sense-making behaviors”. In fact, scholars state that they can characterize union-management relations by the relative amount of conflict or cooperation that resides in the two parties’ orientation towards one another (Angle & Perry, 1986).

Moreover, Voos (1989) argues that a positive union-management environment has been associated with particular “managerial attitudes”. Some attitudes, such as ‘willingness to communicate in an open and fair way with the labor union’, ‘acceptance to include union input into the company’s decisions’ and even a ‘reluctance to weaken the employees’ alliance to the company’s labor union’ can all lead to a positive union-management environment in the organization. In other words, the first step towards having a positive union-management environment can start by management and their attitudes and willingness to communicate more openly and fairly with the union workers.

A positive union-management environment can also be affected by the union’s attitudes. Researchers argue that if labor union workers adopt a more “problem-solving” or “integrative” attitude emphasizing the common interests of both parties, then this will
lead to a more supportive environment between both parties (Deery & Iverson, 2005). Moreover, if union members perceive these positive attitudes from their perspective union leaders, and they perceive that this attitude will lead in achieving valued goals for all the union’s members, then they too will have positive perceptions and attitudes towards management (Deery & Iverson, 2005).

A perception of a positive relationship between the two will not be achieved without positive attitudes; without the support and commitment of both management and the labor unions. Moreover, Deery and Iverson (2005) argue that if both parties have positive attitudes towards each other, this will lead to a willingness to support joint-problem solving.

However, Deery and Iverson (2005) argue that not only positive attitudes from both parties can affect a positive union-management environment; negative attitudes can also negatively affect this relationship. For example, if management is perceived as having negative attitudes toward the unions, then this will diminish the willingness of labor union employees to collaborate with management. Likewise, if the labor union employees are perceived as having a negative attitude towards management, this will also reduce management’s willingness to cooperate with labor unions.

In the long run, a positive union-management environment might lead to what organizations call a “win-win” collective bargaining, a new approach to bargaining in which both parties have equal need for a good settlement and are equally committed to continuing a relationship with one another (Till-Retz, Holub & Clements, 2000). If both parties, through consensus decision-making, are content with the results of collective bargaining, then it might bring numerous benefits to the organization (Purcell, 2010). In fact, Deery and Iverson (2005) argue that if management and labor work together instead of against each other, both parties will feel responsibility to have an effective and cooperative relationship (Deery & Iverson, 2005).

A positive union-management environment has been associated with gains for an organization. In fact, research suggests that perceived positive management-union relationships are constantly associated with good communication, increased employee participation, and increased trust in an organization (Yarrington et al., 2007). Moreover, the researchers argue that having a positive union-management environment can also
bring workers many benefits, by preventing wage reductions and employee cuts. In the long run, these potential economic benefits and a higher quality of work life can increase effort and loyalty in the organization’s employees (Deery & Iverson, 2005). Furthermore, Voos (1989) states that a positively perceived labor-management environment can lead to greater employee commitment, which in turn will lead to higher firm profitability, not only by a reduction of absenteeism and employee turnover, but also by increased productivity.

Furthermore, research stated that a positive union-management environment might lead to what organizations call a “win-win” collective bargaining, a new approach to bargaining in which both parties have equal need for a good settlement and are equally committed to continuing a relationship with one another (Till- Retz, Holub & Clements, 2000). Furthermore, research states that perceptions of a cooperative labor relations climate, was found to be associated with an integrative, encouraging bargaining approach (Deery & Iverson, 2005). In addition, research stated that the environment and atmosphere can be directly related to satisfaction (DeSantis & Durst, 1996). In fact, according to Tansel and Gaziogly (2013), management-employee relations seemed to have an effect on the employees’ satisfaction. Ahmed, Rasheed and Jehanzeb (2012) echo this statement and argued that positive organizational climates forecast positive work attitudes and higher satisfaction in the organization.

In addition, research stated that different organizational climate characteristics can have an effect on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB), including employee compliance. In fact, Yulianti (2014) stated that the environment in an organization is closely related to the organizational and psychological processes of employees in an organization, including organizational citizenship behaviors. Likewise, Ahmed, Rasheed and Jehanzeb (2012) argued that an organization’s positive environment leads to positive and favorable OCB behaviors, including organizational compliance.

To understand the influence of a positive union-management environment, the researcher assumes the following hypotheses:

*Hypothesis 4:* A positive union-management environment will positively affect satisfaction with collective bargaining results.
Hypothesis 5: A positive union-management environment will positively affect employee compliance.

Hypothesis 6: A positive union-management environment will mediate the relationship between perceived employee voice in labor unions and satisfaction with collective bargaining results.

Hypothesis 7: A positive union-management environment will mediate the relationship between perceived employee voice in labor unions and employee compliance.
CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides information on the methodology used to conduct this research. It will start by presenting the framework and the hypotheses tested. Furthermore, it provides information about the sample, data collection methods and the questionnaires utilized to develop the research.

Research Framework

The following framework illustrates the relationships tested throughout this study.

Figure 3.1. Research Framework

This framework shows the relationship between perceived employee voice in labor unions and satisfaction with collective bargaining results and employee compliance. Moreover, it shows the relationship between perceived employee voice and a positive union-management environment. Moreover, it demonstrates the effect of on satisfaction of collective bargaining results and employee compliance. Furthermore, it shows the
mediating effect a positive union-management environment has on the relationship between perceived employee voice in labor unions and satisfaction with collective bargaining results and the mediating role of a positive union-management environment between perceived employee voice in labor unions and employee compliance.

**Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses are proposed:

*Hypothesis 1:* Perceived employee voice in labor unions will positively affect satisfaction with collective bargaining results.

*Hypothesis 2:* Perceived employee voice in labor unions will positively affect employee compliance.

*Hypothesis 3:* Perceived employee voice in labor unions will positively affect a positive union-management environment.

*Hypothesis 4:* A positive union-management environment will positively affect satisfaction with collective bargaining results.

*Hypothesis 5:* A positive union-management environment will positively affect employee compliance.

*Hypothesis 6:* A positive union-management environment will mediate the relationship between perceived employee voice in labor unions and satisfaction with collective bargaining results.

*Hypothesis 7:* A positive union-management environment will mediate the relationship between perceived employee voice in labor unions and employee compliance.
Research Design

Given the importance of labor unions in Honduras, an empirical study was designed to test perceptions of union workers’ of union-management environment in their organization. Moreover, it tested employees’ perceptions of voice in their labor unions and whether these perceptions might provide benefits for both the organization and the union workers themselves.

A quantitative study was designed to test the hypotheses proposed, and union workers were asked to complete a questionnaire related to their perceptions about union-management environment, employee voice in labor unions, satisfaction of collective bargaining results, social desirability and employee compliance. Later, statistical analysis was applied to test the hypotheses and to draw the conclusions.

Research Procedure

The research procedure consists of all the steps that the researcher followed to complete the study. Figure 3.2 provides a description of all the steps that were followed in order to conduct this research.

Literature review was one of the most important steps in the research procedure, as it allowed the researcher to develop a research topic. After the development of the topic, the researcher designed the framework and developed the related hypotheses. After this, investigation on the instruments to be used was made. However, no validated instruments to measure perceptions of employee voice in labor unions, satisfaction of collective bargaining results and employee compliance were found. Because of this, the researcher developed and adapted the instrument to measure the above-mentioned. A pilot test was conducted to ensure the validity and reliability of the instruments.

After the instruments were tested, the data was collected, and after this, analyzed. Moreover, the researcher presented the findings and provided recommendations for future research.
Initial contact was made with an agricultural multinational organization in Honduras. In order to be granted access to potential respondents, the researcher agreed not to disclose the name of the company.

The company was founded in the northern coasts of Honduras, in 1899. The Honduran labor movement started in 1954, when employees from the company went on a strike that lasted around three months. Nowadays, the company has some of the largest and strongest labor unions in the country (Sanchez, 2012). The company employs around 10,000 people in Honduras, of which 2,110 are permanent union workers.
The population of main interest is targeted at permanent union workers. However, the different labor unions from the company are dispersed along the northern coast of the country. Because of this geographic isolation, the researcher only has access to one of the labor unions. Created in 1955, this labor union is the oldest and largest labor union in the company, with 795 permanent union workers.

**Sample Profile**

For the purpose of this study, a total of 205 questionnaires were distributed, completed and returned by the permanent union workers of SUTRASFCO. From the 205 respondents, there were 51 (24.9%) females and 154 (75.1%) males, and the ages ranging from 31 – 40 years old had the highest frequency (81 respondents, or 39.5%). Moreover, the majority of the respondents (134, or 65.4%) have a High School Degree education. In this sample, 61 respondents have been working in the company for more than 10-15 years (29.8%) and 61 respondents have been working in the company for more than 15 years (29.8%). In addition, the majority of the respondents have been part of the union for 7 -9 years (32.7%).

Regarding their union participation, 88 of the respondents reported attending union meetings frequently (42.9%) and 90 of the respondents reported voting on union elections frequently (43.9%). However, when it comes to serving on union committees, 78 respondents (or 38.0%) reported only serving occasionally. Moreover, 83 respondents (40.5%) reported having held union office only occasionally.

Table 3.2 lists detailed information on the descriptive statistics of the sample for this study.
Table 3.1.
Descriptive Statistics of the Sample (N=205)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>75.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20 – 30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 – 40</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 – 50</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 – 60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Elementary School Degree</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School Degree</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Tenure</td>
<td>4 – 6 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 – 9 years</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 – 15 years</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Tenure</td>
<td>1 – 3 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 – 6 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 – 9 years</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 – 15 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance to Labor</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Meetings</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Frequently</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted on Labor</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Elections</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Frequently</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served on Labor</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Committees</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Frequently</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held Union Office</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Frequently</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection

Data was collected through the distribution of paper-and-pencil questionnaires. A labor relations expert, who collaborated with this research, personally contacted the union workers to ask them to fill the questionnaire. Union workers filled the questionnaire during their free time, and the labor relations expert was always near to answer any questions about the questionnaire.

The questionnaires were translated by a qualified expert with a TOEIC score of 990 into Spanish, the native language of the union workers. Later on, expert review was conducted by a qualified Labor Relations expert in Honduras. After this, back translation was conducted, by a qualified expert with a TOEIC score of 925 to make sure that the original meaning from the English version was kept when translated into Spanish.

Data collection was conducted throughout the months of March and April, 2014. Because the questionnaire used to collect data was designed by the researcher based on literature, a pilot test was designed to ensure the validity and reliability of the questionnaires. The pilot test was conducted on 42 union workers. The study conducted Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) to test validity of the measures and Cronbach’s Alpha to measure internal consistency of the measures.

Data Analysis

This study utilized SPSS and SmartPLS as the statistical tools. SPSS was used for descriptive analysis, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), reliability, and correlation. SmartPLS was used for Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and model testing.

Descriptive analysis was conducted to analyze the demographics of the respondents in order to reveal the sample profile. Moreover, descriptive analysis was utilized to check for errors, outliers and the distribution of the data. Descriptive Analysis was also used to examine the means and standard deviations of the research variables in this study. EFA was applied to the data collected in order to determine the factor structure of each research construct to ensure construct validity. EFA was also used to run Harman’s one factor test to detect whether the final data had a serious CMV problem. In order to measure the reliability of the scales, the scales’ Cronbach’s Alpha was tested. Moreover, this study utilized correlation to find initial relationships on the hypotheses.
and any patterns among the variables. Correlation was also performed to understand the strength of the relationship between the variables.

EFA and CFA were conducted through Measurement Model Validation using the SmartPLS software. CFA was conducted to ensure construct validity of the data. Model testing through Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) using the SmartPLS software was utilized to test the research framework and the relationship among the variables. SEM allows simultaneous testing of all relationships in the research framework. Moreover, SEM allows a better test on mediation.

**Instruments and Measurement**

A survey questionnaire was designed to collect the data for this research. The questionnaire was adapted from reference literature and questionnaires that were used for similar topics. The questionnaire will be organized into the following parts: demographics, positive union-management environment, perceived employee voice, satisfaction of collective bargaining results, employee compliance, social desirability and control variables.

**Demographics**

Participants were asked to provide their age, education, gender, tenure in the organization, tenure in their respective labor union, and level of participation in the labor union in order to better understand the respondents’ profile and the impact these have on the study variables.

**Positive Union-Management Environment**

Union-management environment is defined by Angle & Perry (1986) as the “setting in which labor unions and management interact over time”. Positive union-management environment can be defined as how positively employees perceive this interaction. To measure positive union-management environment, this study will utilize Angle & Perry’s ‘Labor-Management Relationship Climate’. The instrument has a reliability of .95, which shows a high-level of reliability. Some items include “management is reasonable when dealing with unions” and “the union and management
are natural enemies”. In total, 25 items are utilized using a 5-point Likert Scale. The respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). A high score represents a positive union-management environment. A low score represents a negative union-management environment.

Because the measurement was very long, some items that were not appropriate for the research context were eliminated. The researcher got permission beforehand from the one of the scale’s original authors to delete some of the items. Originally, the scale was described as a uni-dimensional scale. However, Romero and Yeh (2014) did a research of a sample of 92 respondents, and utilized the SPSS software to conduct exploratory factor analysis, it revealed to be multidimensional. So in order to ensure construct validity, EFA was conducted on the original scale. The items with communalities lower than 0.6 were deleted. Another factor analysis was conducted, and after checking the rotated matrix, items with a factor loading below 0.6 were also deleted.

The final factor analysis revealed 2 dimensions with 10 remaining items in the positive union-management environment scale (as shown in Table 3.1).

Table 3.2.

*Rotated Component Matrix of Positive Union-Management Environment.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUME 2</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUME 8</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUME 12</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUME 10</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUME 4</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUME 6</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUME 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUME 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUME 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUME 19</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
Perceived Employee Voice in Labor Unions

Employee voice is defined as an opportunity to ‘have a say’ (Townsend et al., 2013, p.4). Perceived employee voice can be defined as employees’ perceptions of whether or not they ‘have a say’ in their work environment. Moreover, literature states most union workers are concerned with issues related to their wages, pension, health benefits, work conditions, working hours, job responsibilities and safety (Budd, Warino, & Patton, 2004). Utilizing this definition and literature as reference, 7 items were developed to evaluate employees’ perceptions of their voice, utilizing a 5-point Likert scale. Some items include “the labor union provides an opportunity for me to give voice to wage related issues” and “the labor unions provides an opportunity for me to give voice to safety related issues”. The respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). A high score represents a higher level of perceived employee voice. A low score represents a lower level of perceived employee voice.

Satisfaction with Collective Bargaining Results

Aydin and Ceylan (2009) define employee satisfaction as the combination of affective reactions to the differential perceptions of what the employee wants to receive with what he/she actually receives. Utilizing the definition above, satisfaction with collective bargaining results can be described as the differential perceptions of what the employee wants to receive through collective bargaining, with what he/she actually receives. Utilizing this definition and literature as reference, 7 items were developed to evaluate satisfaction of collective bargaining results, utilizing a 5-point Likert scale. Some items include “I am satisfied with the wage agreements reached during collective bargaining negotiations” and “I am satisfied with the safety issues reached through collective bargaining negotiations”. The respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). A high score represents a higher level of satisfaction with collective bargaining results. A low score represents a lower level of satisfaction with collective bargaining results.
Employee Compliance

Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine and Bachrach (2000) define employee compliance as employees’ internalization and acceptance of the organization’s rules, regulations and procedures. Acceptance will result in a conscientious adherence to these regulations and procedures, even when no one is observing or monitoring the employee. Utilizing this definition and literature as reference, 5 items were developed to evaluate employee compliance, utilizing a 7-point Likert scale. Some items include “I usually comply with the organization’s regulations” and “I generally conform with the organization’s regulations”. The respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). A high score represents a higher level of employee compliance. A low score represents a lower level of employee compliance.

Social Desirability

Because the researcher feared a social desirability bias related to employee compliance, a validated scale measuring social desirability was added. Social desirable responding is defined as the tendency for participants to present a favorable image of themselves (Van de Mortel, 2008). Moreover, the author argues that socially desirable responding is most likely to occur in responses to socially sensitive questions and that social desirability response bias can affect the validity of an instrument. The social desirability measure was taken from Strahan and Gerbasi (1972), with a Cronbach’s alpha of .85. It is a short version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale consisting of ten true or false items. The items are either socially desirable but untrue for most people, for instance “I am always willing to admit when I make a mistake”; or very socially undesirable but very common, for instance “I have never being annoyed when people express ideas very different from my own”. To compute a person’s score, the number of true responses was counted after reversing the negatively keyed items. A high score represents high social desirability while a low score represents low social desirability.
Control Variables

The demographic variables included in this study were also utilized as control variables: age, education, gender, tenure in the organization, tenure in their respective labor union, and level of participation in the labor union.

Research states that there is a strong relationship between age and satisfaction. According to DeSantis and Durst (1996), there are two general theories that have been put forth in regards to this relationship. The first theory is that the relationship is best represented by a U-shaped curved. First, satisfaction decreases, however, satisfaction then increases with age. The second theory, well-documented in literature, is that job satisfaction increases with age. Older employees may have a stronger sense of achievement, and might gain esteem just by the virtue of time on the job. As age might affect satisfaction with collective bargaining results, the researcher decided to hold it as a control variable.

Moreover, Bedeian, Ferris and Kacmar (1992) argue that tenure is a consistent and stable predictor of satisfaction. In fact, Lee and Wilbur (1985) argue that as tenure increases, workers are better able to adjust their expectations to the returns that can be provided by their jobs, or in this case, the returns that can be provided by collective bargaining. Because of this, the researcher decided to hold tenure in the organization and tenure in their respective labor unions as control variables.

In addition, there is evidence that gender might affect satisfaction. Numerous studies report a ‘masculinity culture’ well-within labor unions (Cooper, 2006). In fact, Reilly (2013) argues that in order to gain acceptance and avoid marginalization, women might be forced to play ‘accepted’ feminine supporting roles. For instance, Jung, Moon and Hahm (2007) state that women tend to have lower expectations and are generally more satisfied than men. As such, gender might affect satisfaction with collective bargaining results, so the researcher decided to hold it as a control variable.

Likewise, education can have an influence on workers’ satisfaction. DeSantis and Durst (1996) argued that the effects of education on satisfaction are negative. The younger generation, especially those workers who have more formal education, may have lower levels of satisfaction. Since education can have an effect on satisfaction, the researcher decided to hold it as a control variable.
Kelloway and Barling (1993) define union participation as the expenditure of time on union’s affairs. Level of participation might affect satisfaction with collective bargaining results, as it has been shown in past research that employees who felt had an effective communication with management might be associated with higher levels of satisfaction (Thornton, 2009). The scale to measure union participation is based on Kelloway and Barling (1993) literature on participation, which states that formal participation measures involve: meeting attendance, voting in union elections, serving on union committees, and holding union office.

As stated before, social desirability will be held as a control variable for employee compliance, as the researcher fears that the tendency to answer questions in a more favorable manner might affect this variable.

**Validity and Reliability**

The researcher feared that self-report might lead to Common Method Variance (CMV). According to Podsakoff and Organ (1986) CMV happens when measures of two or more variables are collected from the same respondents and an attempt is made to interpret any correlation among them. Because both measures come from the same source, then any defect in that source contaminates both measures. In order to minimize CMV, different scale points were utilized for dependent and independent variables for this study. According to Podsakoff, Mackenzie and Podsakoff (2003) Harman’s single-factor test is one of the most widely utilized techniques by researchers to address the issue of CMV. As such, Harman’s single-factor test was conducted, and the largest factor only explained 21.2% of the variance, which shows there is not a serious CMV problem with the measurements.

In addition, because most of the questionnaires used to collect the data for this study were designed by the researcher based on literature review, EFA and CFA were necessary to ensure that the instrument was stable and effectively measured what they were intended to measure. As this was an important step before going through the model assessment process, convergent and discriminant validity were assessed.

The Smart PLS software was utilized to confirm the validity and the reliability of the measurements. According to Hulland (1999) items with a factor loading below 0.5 are
not considered valid, therefore they should be dropped. As such, items below 0.5 were deleted. The internal consistency of the indicators for each construct is shown through the composite reliability. According to Hair, Black, Babin and Anderson (2010) the standard score for composite reliability is >0.7. Moreover, according to Fornell and Larcker (1981) the Average Variance Extracted value (AVE) should be greater than 0.5 to indicate good convergent validity.

**Convergent Validity**

Table 3.3 shows the means, standard deviations, factor loadings, composite reliability and AVE value of the variables. The mean and the standard deviations were calculated using SPSS, and PLS provided the information for factor loadings, composite reliability and AVE.

Table 3.3

*Descriptive Statistics, Factor Loadings, Composite Reliability and AVE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S/D</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading (&gt;0.6)</th>
<th>Composite Reliability (&gt;0.7)</th>
<th>AVE (&gt;0.5)</th>
<th>Reason for Deleting Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Union-Management Environment</td>
<td>2.9090</td>
<td>1.1087</td>
<td>PUME 2</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.9533</td>
<td>0.7734</td>
<td>Loaded below 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUME 4</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUME 6</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUME 7</td>
<td>deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUME 8</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUME 9</td>
<td>deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUME 10</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUME 12</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUME 14</td>
<td>deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUME 19</td>
<td>deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUME 19</td>
<td>deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
The composite reliability and AVE for all of the variables presented good convergent validity and internal consistency, as most of the scores are higher than the minimum reference. The AVE for Satisfaction with Collective Bargaining Results did fall a little below 0.5. However, according to Ping (2009), an AVE below 0.5 might still be acceptable in a ‘first-time’ study, as long as they are noted in the limitations section.
Table 3.4 shows all the factor loadings and cross loadings among the variables.

Table 3.4.
**Factor Loadings and Cross-Loadings among the Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Perceived Employee Voice</th>
<th>Positive Union-Management Environment</th>
<th>Employee Compliance</th>
<th>Satisfaction with Collective Bargaining Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.0438</td>
<td>0.9956</td>
<td>0.0403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3</td>
<td>0.0601</td>
<td>0.0253</td>
<td>0.9957</td>
<td>0.0642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4</td>
<td>0.0868</td>
<td>0.0104</td>
<td>0.8389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC5</td>
<td>0.0489</td>
<td>0.0285</td>
<td>0.9966</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEV1</td>
<td>0.8869</td>
<td>0.3458</td>
<td>-0.0457</td>
<td>0.2376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEV2</td>
<td>0.7961</td>
<td>0.3573</td>
<td>0.0624</td>
<td>0.2663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEV3</td>
<td>0.7498</td>
<td>0.1946</td>
<td>-0.0018</td>
<td>0.0958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEV4</td>
<td>0.8868</td>
<td>0.3181</td>
<td>0.1286</td>
<td>0.1165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEV5</td>
<td>0.9223</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.0886</td>
<td>0.2146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUME10</td>
<td>0.3843</td>
<td>0.8889</td>
<td>0.0606</td>
<td>0.4466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUME12</td>
<td>0.2774</td>
<td>0.9041</td>
<td>0.0141</td>
<td>0.3965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUME2</td>
<td>0.3122</td>
<td>0.9226</td>
<td>0.0415</td>
<td>0.3801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUME4</td>
<td>0.3744</td>
<td>0.8792</td>
<td>-0.0123</td>
<td>0.4821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUME6</td>
<td>0.2415</td>
<td>0.7582</td>
<td>0.0022</td>
<td>0.3101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUME8</td>
<td>0.3106</td>
<td>0.9132</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.3837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCBR1</td>
<td>0.2293</td>
<td>0.1109</td>
<td>0.0176</td>
<td>0.5270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCBR2</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.4389</td>
<td>-0.0816</td>
<td>0.7989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCBR3</td>
<td>0.0098</td>
<td>0.0968</td>
<td>0.2924</td>
<td>0.5180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCBR4</td>
<td>0.2272</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.2087</td>
<td>0.5638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCBR6</td>
<td>0.1143</td>
<td>0.4055</td>
<td>0.0436</td>
<td>0.8042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discriminant Validity**

The square root of AVE was checked in order to test the discriminant validity of the study. The square root of the AVE has to be larger than any of the correlations in Table 3.5.
Table 3.5
*Overview of Discriminant Validity Testing among the Constructs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Perceived Employee Voice</th>
<th>Positive Union-Management Environment</th>
<th>Employee Compliance</th>
<th>Satisfaction with Collective Bargaining Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Employee Voice</td>
<td>(0.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Union-Management</td>
<td>0.3670</td>
<td>(0.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Compliance</td>
<td>0.0567</td>
<td>0.0328</td>
<td>(0.96)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Collective</td>
<td>0.2295</td>
<td>0.4619</td>
<td>0.0522</td>
<td>(0.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The square root of AVE is in parentheses and must exceed the correlations with other constructs.

**Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability**

The reliability of this study was assessed by observing the variables’ Cronbach’s alpha. For the reliability to be acceptable, the Cronbach’s alpha score should be above .70 (Nunnally, 1978). Table 3.6 shows the variables’ Cronbach’s alpha.
Table 3.6.

*Cronbach’s Alpha*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Compliance</td>
<td>0.9727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Employee Voice</td>
<td>0.9050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Union-Management Environment</td>
<td>0.9409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Collective Bargaining Results</td>
<td>0.7053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

This chapter provides information of the results of the data analysis. SPSS software was utilized to calculate means, standard deviations and correlations between variables. The Smart PLS software was utilized to test the hypotheses.

Correlation Analysis

According to Table 4.1, there is a significant correlation between education and gender ($r=0.459$, $p<0.01$). This might be due to the fact that males in Honduras usually receive more support in their education than females do. In addition, education was found to be negatively correlated with age ($r=-0.355$, $p<0.01$). This might be due to the fact that the older generation didn’t have as much access to education as the younger generation has now.

In addition, a significant correlation was found between company tenure and age ($r=0.714$, $p<0.01$). This might indicate older employees also have more time in the organization. Company tenure was found to be negatively correlated to education ($r=-0.253$, $p<0.01$). This might indicate that the older employees, who have longer tenure in the organization, also had less access to education.

Union tenure was found to be positively correlated with age ($r=0.672$, $p<0.01$). In other words, the longer a union worker has been part of the union, the older the union worker might be. Moreover, union tenure was found to be negatively correlated with education ($r=-0.159$, $p<0.05$) and positively correlated with company tenure ($r=0.796$, $p<0.01$).

There was a significant correlation between union participation and gender ($r=0.605$, $p<0.01$). This might mean that males are more participative and involved in the labor union. Furthermore, union participation was also found to have a significant correlation with age ($r=0.496$, $p<0.01$). It might indicate that the older union workers tend to be more participative in the labor union. In addition, union participation was found to have a significant correlation with education ($r=0.162$, $p<0.05$). This might indicate that the more educated union workers, probably with more confidence in their opinions, were
also the more participative. In addition, union participation was found to have a significant correlation with company tenure \((r=.356, p<0.01)\) and union tenure \((r=.446, p<0.01)\). This might indicate that the union workers with longer tenure, either in their labor union or in the company, are also more participative.

Surprisingly, social desirability was found to be negatively correlated with age \((r=-.299, p<0.01)\). This might indicate that the younger employees tend to be more socially desirable. In addition, social desirability was found to be negatively correlated with company tenure \((r=-.202, p<0.01)\), union tenure \((r=-.145, p<0.05)\), and union participation \((r=-.240, p<0.01)\).

According to table 4.1, satisfaction with collective bargaining results was found to be negatively correlated with gender \((r=-.210, p<0.01)\). This might indicate that women might be more satisfied with collective bargaining results than men. Likewise, satisfaction with collective bargaining results was found to be significantly correlated with age \((r=.195, p<0.01)\). This might indicate that the older union workers are also more satisfied with the results attained from collective bargaining. Moreover, satisfaction with collective bargaining results was also found to be significantly correlated to company tenure \((r=.270, p<0.01)\) and to union tenure \((r=.183, p<0.01)\).

Additionally, a positive union-management environment was found to be positively correlated with satisfaction with collective bargaining results \((r=.317, p<0.01)\). It might indicate that the more positively perceived the union-management is, the more satisfied union workers are with the collective bargaining results.

Perceived employee voice was found to be significantly correlated to company tenure \((r=.179, p<0.05)\). It might indicate that those union workers who have a longer tenure also perceive to have a degree of voice. Likewise, perceived employee voice was also significantly correlated to satisfaction with collective bargaining results \((r=.266, p<0.01)\) and significantly correlated with a positive union-management environment \((r=.373, p<0.01)\).

In the case of employee compliance, it was only found to be negatively correlated to age \((r=-.172, p<0.05)\). It seemed that the younger employees where more compliant to organizational rules and policies.
Table 4.1  
Means, Standard Deviations and Correlation Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S/D</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.459**</td>
<td>-0.335**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Company Tenure</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.714**</td>
<td>-0.253**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Union Tenure</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.672**</td>
<td>-0.159</td>
<td>0.796**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Union Participation</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.605**</td>
<td>0.496**</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.356**</td>
<td>0.446**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Social Desirability</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>-0.299**</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.202**</td>
<td>-0.145</td>
<td>-0.240**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Satisfaction with Collective</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-0.210**</td>
<td>0.195**</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>0.270**</td>
<td>0.183**</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.85)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Positive Union-Management Environment</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.317**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Perceived Employee Voice</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>-0.132</td>
<td>-0.079</td>
<td>0.266**</td>
<td>0.373**</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Employee Compliance</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>-0.172*</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Note: Numbers in parenthesis indicate the construct’s Cronbach’s alpha.
Gender = Female (0) Male (1)
Age = 19 or less (1), 20 -30 (2), 31 – 40 (3), 41-50 (4), 51-60 (5), 61 or more (6)
Education = Elementary School (1), High School (2), Technical/Vocational School (3), College (4)
Company Tenure = Less than a year (1), 1-3 years (2), 4-6 years (3), 7-9 years (4), 10-15 years (5), More than 15 years (6)
Union Tenure = Less than a year (1), 1-3 years (2), 4-6 years (3), 7-9 years (4), 10-15 years (5), More than 15 years (6)
Model Testing in PLS

PLS software was utilized to test the relationships among the variables by duplicating the sample and the t-value of the duplication through bootstrapping. Bootstrapping is used to evaluate the significance of the path coefficients and estimate the standard of error. Bootstrapping is not a standardized procedure (Bontis, Booker & Serenko, 2007). However, research states that it is recommended to run bootstrapping at a 5000 sample (Preacher & Hayes, 2008).

Moreover, PLS allowed the researcher to review how much of the variance of the dependent variables is explained by the independent variable through the coefficient of determination ($R^2$). According to Cohen (1988), the close the $R^2$ is to 1, the better. However, some $R^2$ values of 0.02, 0.13 and 0.26 can be used to asses weak, medium or strong $R^2$.

Furthermore, the path coefficient indicates the relationship between the dependent and independent variable. According to Moore, McCabe, Duckworth and Alwan (2009), a significant relationship is found at 90% confidence level when $t > 1.65$ (*), at a 95% confidence level when $t > 1.984$ (**), and at a 99% confidence level when $t > 2.626$ (***).

Figure 4.1 shows the PLS algorithm results. In addition, table 4.2 shows the path coefficient, error, t-value, and R square of the analysis of this research.
Figure 4.1. PLS algorithm result

Note: The number in the circle shows the R square and the number next to the path shows the path coefficient.
Table 4.2  
**PLS Model Testing Results**

| Path Coefficient | Original Sample (O) | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | Standard Error (STERR) | T Statistics (|O/STERR|) | R square |
|------------------|---------------------|----------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|----------|
| **Effect of Control Variables** |                     |                |                           |                        |                 |          |
| Gender -> SCBR   | -0.25               | -0.25          | 0.08                      | 0.084                  | 3.030***        |          |
| Age -> EC        | -0.19               | -0.19          | 0.07                      | 0.078                  | 2.465**         |          |
| **Effect of Main Variables** |                     |                |                           |                        |                 |          |
| PUME -> EC       | -0.00               | -0.00          | 0.06                      | 0.069                  | 0.041           |          |
| PUME -> SCBR     | 0.38                | 0.38           | 0.07                      | 0.072                  | 5.308***        |          |
| PEV -> EC        | 0.08                | 0.08           | 0.07                      | 0.075                  | 1.098           |          |
| PEV -> PUME      | 0.36                | 0.37           | 0.05                      | 0.053                  | 6.886***        |          |
| PEV -> SCBR      | 0.22                | 0.23           | 0.06                      | 0.068                  | 3.317***        |          |

Positive Union-Management Environment  
Satisfaction with Collective Bargaining Results  
Employee Compliance

Note: *Significant at 90% confidence level t>1.65, **at 95% t>1.984, ***at 99% t>2.626
Hypothesis 1, which stated a positive relationship between perceived employee voice in labor unions and satisfaction with collective bargaining results, was supported, as \((\beta=0.23, t>2.626)\). On the other hand, hypothesis 2, which stated a positive relationship between employee voice in labor unions and employee compliance, was not supported, as there was no significant relationship between them \((\beta=0.08, t=1.09)\).

Hypothesis 3 stated that perceived employee voice in labor unions would have a positive effect on a positive union-management environment. The results show that hypothesis one was supported, as perceived employee voice in labor unions positively affects a positive union-management environment \((\beta=0.36, t>2.626)\). Likewise, the results show that hypothesis four, which hypothesized that a positive union-management environment positively affects satisfaction with collective bargaining results was also supported \((\beta=0.38, t>2.626)\).

In addition, results show that the relationship between a positive union-management environment and employee compliance was not significant \((\beta=-0.002, t=0.04)\), therefore hypothesis five was not supported. This is an unexpected result, as it was expected that perceptions of fairness in the decision making procedures, would promote feelings of compliance. However, it’s important to note that compliance had very little variance, with a mean of 6.17.

The control variable that seems to have an effect on satisfaction with collective bargaining results is gender. In fact, gender seems to have a negative effect on satisfaction with collective bargaining results \((\beta=-0.25, t>2.626)\). The control variable that seems to have an effect on employee compliance is age. In fact, age seems to have a negative effect on employee compliance \((\beta=-0.19, t>1.984)\).

**Mediation Testing in PLS**

In addition, Smart PLS allowed the researcher to test whether a positive union-management environment is a significant mediator between employee voice and satisfaction with collective bargaining results. According to Bontis, Booker, and Serenko (2007), in order to test for mediation, the following guidelines must be met: First, there must be a direct link between independent and dependent variable, to ensure that there is a relationship to be mediated. Second, a direct relationship must be established between
independent and mediator variable. Third, the mediator must be shown to be related to the dependent variable.

Mediation exists if the coefficient of the direct path between independent and dependent variable is reduced when the indirect path via the mediator is introduced into the model. However, there was no significant relationship between perceived employee voice, a positive union-management environment and employee compliance; as such, the mediation relationship cannot be tested. On the other hand, the standardized beta of the direct path between perceived employee voice and satisfaction with collective bargaining results was 0.249. After a positive union-management environment was introduced as a mediator, the standardized beta was reduced to 0.086. As such, the amount of relationship between perceived employee voice and satisfaction with collective bargaining results accounted for by the mediator was 0.161.

The significance of the mediation effect was assessed using the Sobel test. The Sobel test has been a traditional method of testing mediation effects, and it will be utilized in this study, as it is the most widely employed (Bontis et al., 2007). According to the authors, this formula requires the unstandardized regression coefficient and the standard error between the independent variable and the mediator, and the mediator and the dependent variable. This is shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Employee Voice – Positive Union-Management Environment</td>
<td>0.3696</td>
<td>0.0537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Union-Management Environment – Satisfaction with Collective Bargaining Results</td>
<td>0.3859</td>
<td>0.0727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, according to Kock (2014), in order for a mediation effect to be significant, the z-value provided by the Sobel tests must be higher than 1.96 and the p value lower than 0.05 (p<0.05). The z-value provided by the Sobel test was 4.715, and
Furthermore, Kock (2014) states that in order for a mediation to be considered a ‘full mediation’ the path between independent and dependent variable should have a t-value of lower than 1.96. As shown in figure 4.2, the path between perceived employee voice and satisfaction with collective bargaining results has a t-value of 1.063. This shows that a positive union-management environment is a full mediator between perceived employee voice and satisfaction with collective bargaining results.

The results show that hypothesis six was supported, as a positive union-management environment positively mediates the relationship between perceived employee voice and satisfaction with collective bargaining results. On the other hand, hypothesis seven, which stated the mediation effect of a positive union-management environment between employee voice and employee compliance was rejected, as the relationships could not be tested for mediation. Refer to Table 4.4.
Figure 4.2. PLS bootstrapping result

Note: The number next to the paths show the t-value and the stars represent the level of significance of the t-value.
### Table 4.4

**Hypotheses Testing Results Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypothesis 1:</em> Perceived employee voice in labor unions will positively affect satisfaction with collective bargaining results.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypothesis 2:</em> Perceived employee voice in labor unions will positively affect employee compliance.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypothesis 3:</em> Perceived employee voice in labor unions will positively affect a positive union-management environment.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypothesis 4:</em> A positive union-management environment will positively affect satisfaction with collective bargaining results.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypothesis 5:</em> A positive union-management environment will positively affect employee compliance.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypothesis 6:</em> A positive union-management environment will mediate the relationship between perceived employee voice in labor unions and satisfaction with collective bargaining results.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypothesis 7:</em> A positive union-management environment will mediate the relationship between perceived employee voice in labor unions and employee compliance.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Post-Hoc Interview**

After conducting the study, the researcher wanted to gain more in-depth information about the results. The researcher was especially concerned with employee compliance, and why it did not have any significant relationship with the other research variables. In order to understand more about the results of the study, a labor relations expert currently working at the case company, with more than 20 years of expertise with labor unions, agreed to be interviewed.

The semi-structured interview was divided into four parts: (1) Union-Management Environment, (2) Employee Voice (3) Satisfaction with Collective Bargaining Results, and (4) Employee Compliance.

In order to understand whether the findings in the study actually reflected the current union-management environment in the case company, in the first part of the interview, the interviewee was asked about the current situation of the union-management relations in the case company.

In the second part of the interview, the interviewee was asked about employee voice. In specific, the interviewee was asked whether employee voice could lead to a more positive union-management environment in the company.

During the third part of the interview, the interviewee was asked more about collective bargaining in the company. Specifically, the interviewee was asked about the relationship between a positive union-management environment and the satisfaction with collective bargaining results.

In the fourth and last part of the interview, the topic of employee compliance was approached. In specific, the interviewee was asked about the high rating that employees gave to themselves when asked about their compliance. In addition, the interviewee was asked more details about why union workers were unwilling to comply to the organizations’ regulations and policies.

Because the researcher and the interviewee where geographically isolated, the interview was conducted via Skype, an internet voice communication application, and the interview lasted an hour. The interview was conducted in Spanish, the native language of the interviewee, and was later transcribed into English.
Interview Results

First, the interviewee was asked whether the findings of the study reflect the current union-management relations in the company, he stated:

“Actually it does. Our union-management relations could not be better now. In fact, we just got an award by the International Labour Organization (ILO) in Honduras...we won first place on Union-Management relations. We have implemented many changes in our organization, to make sure we have good relations with the labor union. We give the union workers scholarships, free housing, health insurance, schooling and trainings. We also strongly emphasize an open labor-management talk, to have better collaboration with labor unions.”

In addition, when asked the labor expert whether he believed employee voice leads to better union-management relations in the company, he answered:

“Yes, it definitely can. Like I was mentioning before – we place a strong emphasis on communication. This means to not only talk with the union workers, and to be in constant contact, but also to listen to them. These workers are the ones who really know what is really going on at the workplace, and how we can improve some things to work more efficiently. And they like being listened to! When we listen to them, they are more open, more willing to cooperate. Let me give you an example: just a couple of days ago, I had a long meeting with some of the union workers at one farm. To make the story short, the company used to give the union workers fruit to take home. However, some of them started to abuse and take too much fruit, and as such we decided to end this benefit. Of course, the union workers were not happy. So, we met with them, we talked to them, we listened to them. Nothing changed – we still ended that benefit – but all of the union workers left that room happy, because we heard what they had to say. It’s small things like these that make union-management relations more cooperative.”
Furthermore, the expert was asked whether a higher satisfaction with collective bargaining results could be some of the benefits of a positive union-management environment. He stated:

“A positive union-management environment does provide countless benefits – and yes, one of those benefits can be a higher satisfaction with collective bargaining. See, negotiations might take a long time, but with more cooperative union-management relations, negotiations might be more effective. It’s important to listen to union workers, to work with them and try to implement some of their ideas or opinions, so that they will feel more satisfied. In fact, I will tell you this – the more a union worker feels like he/she participates in making decisions, the more satisfied they will be with collective bargaining, since they will feel that they had an input and that they have a voice in their organization. Of course, none of this would be possible without a positive union-management environment. Positive union-management relations are the key to everything.”

In addition, the expert was asked about employee compliance. Specifically, he was asked on the reason why most of the union workers rated themselves very high on their compliance to organizational rules and regulations. He mentioned:

“Well, none of them will actually say that they don’t comply to our regulations – no one will admit that. And unfortunately – most of them refuse to follow our regulations. In fact, they only follow the rules and regulations that we agree on through collective bargaining. Anything outside collective bargaining – even if it’s the tiniest thing – the union workers refuse to comply. We could say that the collective agreement is their bible – if it’s not there, they will not even consider following it.”

Moreover, the labor expert was asked on some of the reasons why union workers are unwilling to comply with organizational rules and policies. He stated that one of the main reasons was their reluctance to change.
“Change is never easy to implement in an organization, especially in labor unions. Permanent union workers usually feel ‘protected’ by their labor union – and they enter a ‘comfort zone’ – where they feel that everything is established, and that there is no need to follow any regulations in the company. And if some of the union workers follow the rules, they don’t follow all of the rules and only to a certain degree – until a level of comfort. So, when we need to reinforce compliance, or when we have new regulations, we do so through the union officers. The union workers always listen to the union officer, so once we the union workers get the approval of their union officer, then they will be more compliant.”

In addition, the labor expert mentioned that the level of education also had an impact on the employees’ compliance:

“It’s also important to remember that most of these workers have a very low educational level and most of the time, they don’t really ‘understand’ what these regulations mean or the importance of complying with these regulations. Even with simple regulations, such as regulations related to quality control - they don’t understand the importance. They don’t understand about our market, our competitors, and efficiency. Most of these workers live in farms far away from the city, they don’t read newspapers often, and they are not informed about the outside world. We try to do our best to explain to them everything, to teach them – at least I always try to do it – but it’s still difficult for them to understand some of the regulations. If they don’t fully understand the regulations, how can they follow them?”

Furthermore, another reason to low compliance by union workers could be a high paternalistic environment by the company. The expert explained:

“Also, in Honduras, multinationals tend to have a very paternalistic nature. These companies have given them everything – housing, loans, even milk and wood. Imagine, the company even paid to clean their yards! Of course, since 2010, this is starting to change, but still union workers have the idea that the company must provide for them. In
Honduras, union workers have a lot of power, a lot of voice. They know this, and they believe that the company should always provide for them – regardless of whether or not they follow our regulations.”

The expert mentioned that one of the most important ways for union workers to comply with organizational rules and policies is through union officers:

“Like I mentioned before - the only way we can really get them to follow the rules or regulations is to do it through the officers in their labor unions – now, they listen to them. An excellent union officer can make a difference. However, this doesn’t mean we don’t have to be careful with some of the officers – as not all of them have good leadership. For instance, sometimes things get very political in labor unions. Some union officers might ‘sell themselves’, they want to get the union workers vote for the next term, and will do everything they can to get this vote – even if this mean allowing some of the workers to not follow some regulations. Just some weeks ago, we had an incident with one of the union workers. He was in charge of cutting the sick leaves of banana trees, and these leaves have a substance that might cause severe irritation, conjunctivitis, and even some corneal damage. Because of this, it is a rule that all workers have to wear goggles, and union officers have to make sure they do. One of the workers didn’t wear his goggles, and even though the union officer knew, he ignored the problem. In the end, we had to rush this worker to the hospital, and he had to take some days off work because of the damage in his eyes. Still, this doesn’t mean all officers are the same – there are many cases in which union officers have actually helped us get the union workers to comply with new regulations. And believe me a good union officer can make a big change. A good union leader can really help change the attitude of a worker. Nowadays, everything union workers do has to go through the union officers first. If the union officers approve, then the workers are more willing to comply.”

Through the interview conducted, the results of the study can be concluded as an effective reflection of the case company’s environment. For instance, the interviewee did state that the company’s union-management environment was more positive than ever,
and that this definitely had to be influenced by the strong emphasis that the case company places on employee voice. In addition, the interviewee reiterated numerous times not only the importance of employee voice but also the importance of having a positive union-management environment in the organization. In fact, the labor relations expert believed that a positive union-management environment provided the organization with many benefits, including a higher satisfaction with collective bargaining results.

In addition, the interviewee stated that even though union workers won’t openly admit it, most of them are not very compliant to the organizations’ rules and policies. In fact, the interviewee stated that the only rules and policies that the workers will follow, are only the ones agreed through collective bargaining. Some of the reasons why union workers might be so unwilling to comply might be: reluctance to change, low educational backgrounds and a paternalistic environment fostered by the company. However, the interviewee stated that a good union officer makes a great difference in the union workers’ compliance, as it can actually influence other union workers to adhere to the organizational rules and policies.
CHAPTER V  CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

The final chapter of this study will present the conclusions based on the data analysis and some discussions of the results. Furthermore, the research implications of this study will be explained, as well as the research limitations and future research suggestions.

Conclusions

This research intended to understand the effect perceived employee voice in labor unions had on a positive union-management environment, and the effect union-management environment had on satisfaction with collective bargaining results and employee compliance.

Based on the results, perceived employee voice positively affects a positive union-management environment. Furthermore, union-management environment positively affects the satisfaction with collective bargaining results. In addition, a positive union-management environment positively mediates the relationship between perceived employee voice and satisfaction with collective bargaining results.

However, employee voice did not have a significant effect on employee compliance. In addition, a positive union-management environment was also not found to have any significant effect on employee compliance. As such, the mediating effect on a positive union-management environment between employee voice and employee compliance could not be tested.

Discussions

Workers who perceive having a voice in their labor unions also have more positive perceptions of their union-management environment. This echoes research done by Pyman, Holland, Teicher and Cooper (2010) which stated that voice mechanisms been a positive association with favorable perceptions of climate. It could be that if the union workers feel they have a voice and that this voice is being heard, it translates to a more supportive union-management environment.
These positive perceptions of the union-management environment also lead to a higher satisfaction with collective bargaining results. It seems that positive perceptions of the environment might lead to greater satisfaction with collective bargaining, as the employees might feel that management is indeed listening and acting upon the ideas and requests of the workers. Other studies (Voos, 1989) have shown the benefits of a positive union-management environment in an organization. Results of this study confirm that a benefit of a positive union-management environment is a greater satisfaction with collective bargaining results, a relationship that as far as the researcher knows, was assumed but had never been empirically tested before. In addition, female union workers seem to have a higher satisfaction with collective bargaining results than men. It could be that female workers are more easily satisfied, as the job opportunities and benefits for female workers are limited in Honduras.

Furthermore, through the results of this study, employee compliance did not seem to be affected by any of the other research variables. In addition, employee compliance was not found to have a significant relationship to social desirability. The results are unexpected, however, it might be explained by the fact that employee compliance had little variance, as all of the employees rated themselves extremely high in employee compliance.

On the other hand, employee compliance did seem to be affected by age. It seems that younger employees tend to report themselves more compliant to the organizational rules and regulations. Due to the economic situation in Honduras, it is extremely hard to get a job, and it could be that these younger workers are more concerned and interested in keeping their jobs. On the other hand, the older employees, who might feel a certain degree of security in their job, might report themselves as less compliant to the organizational rules and policies.

**Research Implications**

This research has very important implications for researchers in the field of labor relations, as it adds new literature on the subject of labor unions. For instance, despite the importance that collective bargaining represents in labor unions, there is very limited research on the satisfaction related to this variable. Moreover, this study found a
relationship between a positive union-management environment and satisfaction with collective bargaining results, a relationship that as far as the researcher knows, has never been studied before.

Furthermore, through this research, the effect that perceived employee voice has on a positive union-management environment was confirmed. As employee voice and positive union-management environment are gaining more attention in recent years, this relationship is of importance for further reference. In addition, this study echoes research done on procedural justice, which states that employees who perceive the processes utilized to determine outcomes in an organization are fair and transparent, will also have more positive perceptions on the union-management environment (Deery & Iverson, 2005).

In addition, employee compliance has not been studied much during the past years. However, it could be of benefit for organizations to study this variable, as it might bring many advantages to organizations. For instance, Lee, Kim & Kim (2013) argued that voluntary compliance is fundamental for organizations, especially those organizational environments in which innovation and flexibility are emphasized.

This study did not find a significant relationship between perceived employee voice and employee compliance, and between positive union-management environment and employee compliance. In addition, employee compliance was not found to have any relationship with social desirability. As all of the union workers rated themselves very high in employee compliance, the variable presented a mean of 6.17, making it difficult to test the relationship between employee compliance and other variables. This shows the limitations of using self-report measures of sensitive behaviors. In addition, according to the post-hoc interview, employees in the case company were unwilling to comply with the organization’s rules and policies. It could be that even though union workers rated themselves high in compliance, in reality, they are very uncompliant to the organization’s rules and policies.

Although this study did not find a relationship between employee compliance and the other research variables, some demographics variables, such as age and union tenure, did have an effect on employee compliance. This can open the door for further research to be conducted on employee compliance.
Practical Implications

This research can be an important contribution to companies that constantly interact with labor unions, especially to the case company utilized for this study.

Many organizations, not only in Honduras, but in Latin America, are struggling to find a way to more effectively collaborate with labor unions. This study lends support to the benefits that providing a voice for employees might have in an organization, as it can lead to positive perceptions of the environment. In addition, these positive perceptions of the union-management environment leading to higher satisfaction with collective bargaining results can prove to be very beneficial to organizations. If more union workers are satisfied in an organization, this might lead to more committed employees, less strikes, and less economic loss for an organization.

Furthermore, human resource practitioners can also utilize the findings found throughout this study, to find a more effective and cooperative way to work with union workers. Specially, HR practitioners in Latin America can utilize these findings to learn more about the perceptions of union workers to find more cost-efficient ways to negotiate with union workers, and to have collective bargaining results that might bring benefits to both parties involved. Likewise, based on the findings of this study, organizations and labor unions can improve the design of their voice mechanism, not only to make sure that employees’ voices are heard, but also to demonstrate policy changes as a result of hearing employee voices in the organization.

In addition, this research can be of benefit to the union leaders. The study result gives union leaders a leverage to convince the organization the importance of employee voice and positive union-management environment. Union leaders hold critical positions in relaying employee voice to the management and constructing a more positive union-management environment. If organizations move towards a more positive union-management environment, more union workers not only get to keep their job, they might also have an opportunity to improve their work environment and their quality of life through more satisfactory bargaining results.
Contribution of the Study

This research contributes to existing literature on labor unions. Although there is extensive research on labor unions, studies that focus on union workers perceptions are still quite few.

Furthermore, this study contributes in adding much-needed knowledge and information about labor unions and union workers in Honduras. Although there are some studies that examine perceptions of union-management environment and employee voice in English-speaking countries, Spanish-speaking countries, where labor unions are still strongly rooted, are lagging behind in these studies.

In addition, research which tests union workers’ perceptions of union-management environment, employee voice, satisfaction with collective bargaining results and employee compliance in one study are virtually nonexistent, and this study contributes to new literature on this topic.

Limitations

A limitation of this study is that employee compliance, a socially sensitive question, presented very little variance. All of the respondents rated themselves very high in employee compliance, as such the variable had very little variance, which makes it difficult to test the relationship of compliance to other variables.

Additionally, the AVE for Satisfaction with Collective Bargaining Results was 0.429, a little below 0.5, which might indicate a minor problem with validity in this instrument.

Moreover, the data was collected with the help of a labor relations expert; however, the researcher was not present throughout the data collection. This made data collection very challenging and time-consuming, and the researcher had no control over the environment/circumstances throughout which the questionnaires were filled.

Also, the researcher only had access to one of the labor unions in the company. The cultures and environment vary widely across labor unions, even within the same company, making it difficult to generalize these results to other union environments.
Future Research Suggestions

For future research, the researcher suggests to utilize another measure for employee compliance, as self-report was proved not useful. A better scale could be developed to measure employee compliance. In addition, the researcher suggests re-checking the relationship between social desirability and employee compliance. Moreover, for future research, the researcher suggests to consider other variables that might impact employee compliance. For instance, as it was mentioned in the post-hoc interview, leadership from the union officers might have an effect on the union workers’ compliance.

In addition, satisfaction with collective bargaining results should be analyzed further, to ensure that it is appropriate for use in other contexts. In addition, other variables, such as negotiation strategies, could be tested as mediators between union-management environment and satisfaction with collective bargaining results.

Also, it is important that the research be conducted with a larger sample and with other labor unions. For instance, this research could be conducted with governmental labor unions in Honduras, as it would be interesting to compare different perceptions on different union environments. Likewise, it would be advisable to conduct this research in other Latin American countries.
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APPENDIX: QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire of Effects on Union-Management Environment and Employee Voice in Labor Unions: Evidence from Union Workers of a Multinational Company in Honduras

Dear Respondent,

Please spare a few minutes to complete this questionnaire. Your participation in this survey will help us understand more about union-management environment and employee voice in Honduras. Please be assured that your responses will be treated with the strictest confidentiality. Your time and cooperation are highly appreciated!

Part I. Please provide the following information about yourself.

1. What is your gender?
   Female □ (0)  Male □ (1)

2. What is your age?
   19 or less □ (1)  20-30 □ (2)  31-40 □ (3)  41-50 □ (4)  51-60 □ (5)
   61 or more □ (6)

3. What is your highest education degree?
   Elementary School Degree □ (1)  High School Degree □ (2)
   Technical/Vocational School □ (3)  College Degree □ (4)

4. How long have you been working in this company?
   Less than a year □ (1)  1-3 years □ (2)  4-6 years □ (3)
   7-9 years □ (4)  10-15 years □ (5)  More than 15 years □ (6)

5. How long have you been member of the labor union?
   Less than a year □ (1)  1-3 years □ (2)  4-6 years □ (3)
   7-9 years □ (4)  10-15 years □ (5)  More than 15 years □ (6)

6. Have you during the last two years:
   Never □ (1)  Rarely □ (2)  Occasionally □ (3)  Frequently □ (4)  Very Frequently □ (5)
   Attended union meetings?
   Voted on union elections?
   Served on committees?
   Held union office?
Part II. In the following items, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by marking the corresponding number 1 to 5. The response should indicate the experience in the current company and only one choice per statement is permitted.

1 = Strongly disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Neither disagree or agree  
4 = Agree  
5 = Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the following outcomes reached through collective bargaining negotiations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Wage agreements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pension agreements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Health benefits agreements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Work conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Working hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Safety issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part III. In the following items, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by marking the corresponding number 1 to 7. The response should indicate the experience in the current company and only one choice per statement is permitted.

1 = Strongly disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Somewhat disagree  
4 = Neither agree or disagree  
5 = Somewhat agree  
6 = Agree  
7 = Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I usually comply with the organization’s regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I frequently follow the organization’s regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I generally conform with the organization’s regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to adhere to the organization’s regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I normally obey the organization’s regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part IV. For each of the following questions, indicate whether the statement is True or False.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am always willing to admit when I make a mistake.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I always try to practice what I preach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I never resent being asked to return a favor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have never been annoyed when people express ideas very different from my own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone’s feelings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I like to gossip at times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. At times I have really insisted in having things my own way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part V. In the following items, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by marking the corresponding number 1 to 5. The response should indicate the experience in the current company and only one choice per statement is permitted.

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither disagree or agree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Management tries to interfere in internal union affairs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Management will give in to the union when the union is right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Management deals openly with the union.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Management abuses its power.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Management tries to cooperate with the union.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Management doesn’t understand the union’s problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The union’s relations with management are satisfactory.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The union and management are natural enemies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In this organization, relations with management are better than they used to be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I expect a strike at this organization within the coming year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>There are many rules which tend to <em>dictate</em> the settlement reached on specific issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Management uses pressure tactics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Management makes concessions to avoid problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Management won’t listen to new ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>The union and management work together to try to find creative solutions to problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Management tries to understand the union’s side.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Management is more interested in supporting its members than in “what is right.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>The union shares relevant information with management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Management shares relevant information with the union.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part VI.** In the following items, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by marking the corresponding number 1 to 5. The response should indicate the experience in the current company and only one choice per statement is permitted.

1 = Strongly disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Neither disagree or agree  
4 = Agree  
5 = Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The union provides an opportunity for me to give voice to…</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Wage related issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pension related issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Health benefits related issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Work conditions related issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Working hours related issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Safety related issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>