



WORKING PAPER SERIES - 210

LESSONS FROM RESEARCH ON UNIONIZED
GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES:
A CRITICAL REVIEW AND APPRAISAL

by

Richard B. Peterson* and David Lewin**

*Richard B. Peterson
Professor
Department of Management and Organization
School of Business Administration
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195
Tele: 206/543-7695

**David Lewin
Director
Institute of Industrial Relations
and
Professor
Anderson Graduate School of Management
University of California, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California 90024
Tele: 213/825-4339

DRAFT: July 1991

**LESSONS FROM RESEARCH ON UNIONIZED
GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES:
A CRITICAL REVIEW AND APPRAISAL**

**Richard B. Peterson
Professor School of Business Administration
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195
(206) 543-7695**

**David Lewin
Professor, Anderson Graduate School
of Management; Director,
Institute of Industrial Relations,
University of California Los Angeles (UCLA)
Los Angeles, California 90024
(213) 206-7666**

July 1991

**NOT FOR CITATION, QUOTATION, REPRODUCTION OR DISTRIBUTION WITHOUT WRITTEN
PERMISSION.**

LESSONS FROM RESEARCH ON UNIONIZED GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES: A CRITICAL REVIEW AND APPRAISAL*

The union grievance procedure provides an important mechanism for resolving workplace disputes. Our objective in this article is to review and assess the empirical research that has been published during the post-WW II period on the grievance procedure.

We begin with a brief introduction that addresses such topics as the importance of the grievance procedure as an area of study, the definition of a grievance, and the benefits of an effectively operating grievance process. Next we briefly discuss several previously published reviews of the union grievance literature, and indicate how our assessment sheds a different light on the grievance procedure from that provided by earlier reviews. The next three sections discuss the common themes that emerge from our review and critique of, respectively, the psychological, sociological, and industrial relations research on the grievance procedure. The final section suggests possible directions for future research on the grievance procedure.

Introduction

Much of the scholarly literature in industrial relations has focused on conflict among and conflict resolution initiatives undertaken by unions and employers related to the periodic negotiation and re-negotiation of labor agreements. Much less attention has been given to the resolution of disputes between the parties during the life of the collective bargaining agreement (Lewin and Peterson, 1988). Yet, it is clear that unions and management spend considerably more time on the processing of grievances than on contract negotiations. Elsewhere we have estimated that perhaps as many as 1,200,000 formal, written grievances are filed annually in the United States (Lewin and Peterson, 1988). This estimate does not include the much larger number of grievances that are resolved informally by employees and supervisors during oral discussions.

Slichter (1947) viewed the grievance process as an important cornerstone of a constitutional system of self-government prevailing among employers and unions representing employees in the workplace. This judicial function was likened to the court system which interprets the meaning of laws and statutes more broadly. Without such a system of checks and balances, employers can stick to their original positions regarding workplace conflict irrespective of the merits of particular cases. In a democracy, it is crucial that mechanisms for both procedural and distributive justice be present (Adams, 1963).

*Thanks to Tom Pearce and Karen Evans for helpful research assistance.

What is a grievance? In its broadest conception, a grievance is any employee complaint about the employment relationship. Some labor agreements describe a grievance in this fashion. More commonly, however, a grievance is defined as a dispute that "...relates in some manner to the proper interpretation or application of the collective bargaining agreement" (Rand 1980, p. 50). The typical grievance procedure uses a multi-step system with the final step calling for a binding decision by a neutral third party (usually an arbitrator). This definition restricts our discussion to grievances that occur in unionized settings since few non-union grievance procedures provide for binding arbitration (although see Delany, Lewin and Ichniowski, 1989.)

A grievance procedure provides certain important benefits, which Staudohar (1977) has identified as follows:

1. an orderly channel to reduce pressures and anxieties of employees;
2. a mechanism for equitable and just interpretation and application of negotiated terms;
3. a communication outlet to promote understanding of the negotiated agreement by both sides;
4. a built-in substitute for a test of economic strength that can provide ongoing consideration of agreement disputes without upsetting the flow of work; and
5. a force against arbitrary, capricious, and discriminatory action by management (p. 6)

Lewin (1983) adds the following to this list of benefits:

Grievance procedures are commended not only for providing a peaceful means of resolving day-to-day workplace disputes and for enabling workers to participate in decisions that affect their work lives, but also for the benefits that they provide to management. These include a virtual guarantee of uninterrupted production during the life of the agreement, the use by management of union resources and personnel to police the labor agreement, and a systematic source of information about problem areas in the workplace—information that can be used for subsequent evaluation and corrective action (pp. 127-128).

Previous Reviews of Grievance Literature

We have identified three previously published reviews/critiques of the grievance literature. The first, by Peterson and Lewin (1982), used a five-fold classification, derived from Dalton and Tudor (1981), of the grievance research literature published prior to that time. They found that the various studies fell into the following groupings: those focusing on the demographic differences between grievants and non-grievants; those linking the leadership patterns of supervisors and union officials with grievance activity; those centering on the impact of organizational structure and technology on the incidence of grievance

filing; those focusing on the relationship between personality traits and grievance activity; and other studies falling outside the previous categories. Peterson and Lewin then briefly summarized the findings of these studies as a means of determining the degree of consistency or convergence across the studies. However, they were unable to make any broad generalizations for most of the classifications.

Gordon and Miller (1984) published the second critique of behavioral and industrial relations research on the grievance procedure. Their paper was written from the perspective of I/O psychology and, thus, they were especially concerned with such methodological shortcomings as the unreliability of grievance data, possible criterion contamination, and limited internal and external validity. As with Peterson and Lewin (1982), Gordon and Miller were critical of the basically atheoretical nature of the literature. Further, they raised potential ethical concerns; for instance, if grievance studies could identify the demographic characteristics of employees more likely to file grievances, employers might "select" out job applicants who exhibited such characteristics.

The third critique, by Labig and Greer (1988), was limited to that portion of the grievance literature which sought to identify factors or variables correlated with grievance initiation. They categorized the relevant literature into the following categories: environmental factors; management factors; union factors, union and management interaction; and employee factors. Labig and Greer (1988) found consistent support for the positive association of a relatively small number of variables with the level of grievance activity. They also made several proposals regarding the types of issues to be addressed in future grievance procedure research.

The present critique differs from previous reviews in several ways. First, we make no attempt to discuss each individual study, as was done earlier. Second, we look for trends in the nature of the studies published over the past forty-five years in order to gain a "bigger picture" of this research. Third, we do not address the psychometric issues in this area, since this was well handled by Gordon and Miller (1984). Last, we summarize several recent studies which offer new insights into and potentially improved understanding of the grievance process.

There appear to be three major streams of research on the unionized grievance procedure in the United States. These streams reflect psychological, sociological, and industrial relations perspectives, respectively. Each of these perspectives will be discussed separately below.

Psychological Research

Most of the early postwar studies on the grievance procedure were done by psychologists who attempted to identify and explain individual differences in grievant behavior (e.g., Eckerman, 1948; Stagner, 1956 and 1962; Fleishman and Harris, 1962; and Sulkin and Pranis, 1967). Those researchers focused their attention on three major issues: (1) differences in demographic and job-related characteristics of

grievant filers and non-filers, (2) personality characteristics of managers and union officials, and (3) different types of supervisory behavior as they influenced the level of grievance activity.

The majority of psychological research has centered on identifying those demographic and job-related characteristics that differentiate employees who file grievances from those who don't (e.g., Eckerman, 1948; Sulkin and Pranis, 1967; Ash, 1970; Price, et al., 1976; Kissler, 1977, and Dalton and Todor, 1981). In some cases, as many as 40 separate independent variables were used in a single study. Unfortunately, individual researchers have used widely different sets of variables so there has not been a common set of independent variables emerging from or used to replicate these studies.

Nevertheless, there is some evidence from these studies that grievants are more likely to be younger, have more education, and hold more skilled jobs than non-grievants. Grievants are also likely to have higher absenteeism rates, dispensary visits, and insurance claim filing rates than non-grievants (Labig and Greer, 1987). However, even in the case of these variables, one or more studies was unable to identify any significant differences between grievants and non-grievants. Further, no significant differences between grievants and non-grievants have been found with respect to marital status, and contradictory results have emerged with respect to the effects of race, tenure, pay, and promotions on grievance filing in unionized settings. There has also been insufficient research on the role of personality variables in grievance filing activity to draw firm conclusions in this regard (Stagner, 1956 and 1962).

Another strand of research by psychologists has centered on differences in supervisory style and the effects of these differences on levels of workplace grievance activity. Fleishman and Harris (1962) found that foremen judged high on "consideration" showed a negative but curvilinear relationship with grievance filing by employees in their work groups, whereas the opposite was true of "task oriented" foremen. Further analysis showed that grievances occurred most frequently among work groups whose foremen were low in consideration regardless of the amount of emphasis they placed on job structure or task. Later, Walker and Robinson (1977) found that "autocratic" supervisors had fewer grievances and were better contract administrators than "democratic" supervisors. However, the research instrument used by these researchers does not allow direct comparison with the Ohio State Leadership Questionnaire used earlier by Fleishman and Harris (1962).

There have been several common features of the psychological research on the grievance procedure. First, the samples have been typically drawn from unionized blue-collar workers in private firms. Second, the samples in most cases have been of the convenience type, rather than drawn randomly or systematically. Third, the vast majority of these studies have been cross-sectional, though one of the studies used grievance data compiled over a six-year period (Ash, 1970). Finally, many of the studies have relied on grievance and personnel file data from one or two plants of particular companies; they have not generally used companywide let alone industrywide data. The emphasis of most of the psychological research has been on studying the grievance procedure as a closed system without taking adequate account of the linkages among grievance activity, technology, the broader labor-management relationship, and the environment.

Sociological Research

A second stream of research has focused on properties of work group and organization structure, technology, and the environment associated with grievance procedure dynamics. For example, Weiss (1957) studied grievance filing as a function of the degree of centralization of organizational authority. His main hypothesis was that decentralized organizations experienced a significantly lower level of grievance activity than centralized organizations. However, Weiss was unable to confirm this hypothesis in his empirical work.

The role of technology in grievance activity has been an important area of research (Sayles, 1958; Kuhn, 1961; Ronan, 1963; Peach and Livernash, 1974; and Nelson, 1979). Sayles (1958) hypothesized that grievance rates vary from group to group depending on the social system of the group, especially as that system is influenced by technology. He examined 300 work groups across numerous plants and found grievance activity to be highest in "strategic" (semi-skilled) work groups, lowest in "apathetic" (unskilled) groups, and moderate in "erratic" (semi-skilled) and "conservative" (skilled) groups.

Ronan (1963) attempted to build on Sayles' findings by analyzing formal grievance activity in two plants of a single firm. He was unable to replicate Sayles' findings, but this may have been due to the fact that he collapsed the four types of work groups into two categories. In addition, one of the two plants was very new and this characteristic may have contributed to the high level of grievances filed in that plant. In a later study, Nelson (1979) was able to corroborate Sayles' findings using a sample of 53 work groups in a single plant.

Kuhn (1961) reported the results of grievance case studies in eight large tire and electrical equipment plants. He found four socio-technical factors which apparently influenced a work group's desire to use the grievance procedure to bargain for special benefits. These include: frequency of changes in work methods, standards, or materials; individualized work pace; frequency of interaction with others in the work group; and job specialization. Kuhn's research underscored the political nature of the grievance procedure in which certain work groups fight for special benefits for their own members, sometimes to the detriment of the rest of the bargaining unit employees and the union.

Peach and Livernash (1974) compared pairs of high and low grievance departments in several steel plants in an attempt to highlight the variables contributing to differences in grievance activity. Their sample was drawn from six plants ranging in size from 2,000 to 13,000+ employees. The authors found that a high grievance rate was associated with an unfavorable task environment, aggressive and militant union leadership, and ineffective managerial decision-making, as indicated by leadership, organizational, and policy deficiencies. A low grievance rate was characterized by a favorable task environment that is, one which is both relatively stable and largely free from technological disturbances, and with effective management and organization policies.

Following closely on the work of Peach and Livernash, Muchinsky and Maassarani (1980) studied the impact of environmental factors on employee grievances in the public sector. They reported similar findings to those obtained by Peach and Livernash in steel manufacturing settings. In a later study (1981), Muchinsky and Maassarani also found support for Ronan's finding that the age of a manufacturing facility was negatively associated with grievance activity.

There are some common features among these sociological studies of the grievance process. First, and as with psychological studies, most of the sociological studies have relied on unionized blue-collar workers in private firms. The notable exceptions were the studies of Muchinsky and Maassarani (1980; 1981) in two public agencies. Second, and unlike the psychological studies, the samples in most cases have been drawn on a random or systematic basis. The Sayles' study, for example, drew on work groups ranging across 30 plants, and the Peach and Livernash study used a built-in control for industry (since all six plants were in the steel industry). Third, the sample sizes in terms of numbers of grievances, employees, and facilities have been considerably larger than in most of the grievance studies that use a psychological approach. Finally, the sociological research on the role of technology and technological change in grievance activity has shown relatively consistent results.

Industrial Relations Research

Industrial relations scholars have been interested in the union grievance procedure for many years. Slichter, Healy, and Livernash (1960) provided important insights into the functioning of the union grievance procedure in the 1950s. However, they made no attempt to collect grievance data for the purpose of testing explicit hypotheses about grievance procedure dynamics. More rigorous industrial relations research on the grievance process emerged in the 1970s.

Despite this fact, we have been unable to find a common set of themes in the early industrial relations-based grievance research akin to the themes which emerged from psychological- and sociological-based grievance research. Rather, industrial relations-based grievance research is characterized by the following issues and problem foci:

- a comparison of binding arbitration with an appeal method which permits strikes in lieu of arbitration (Gideon and Peterson, 1979);
- the impact of grievance language on the level of settlement (Graham and Heshizer, 1979);
- college faculty grievance process experiences and dynamics (Begin, 1978; Duane, 1979);
- a comparison of grievance procedures with civil service system procedures (Hayford and Pegnetter, 1980);

- the role in and attitudes of foremen toward grievance handling (Jennings, 1974a and 1974b);
- type of grievance issues and differences in their resolution (Dalton and Tudor, 1981; Moore, 1981);
- grievance experiences of employees in health care facilities before and after the 1974 Taft-Harley Amendments (La Van, Carley, and Jowers, 1980);
- the organizational commitment and job satisfaction of union stewards in relation to their grievance handling behavior (Dalton and Tudor, 1982);
- a comparison of the outcomes of grievance mediation and grievance arbitration (Brett and Goldberg, 1983).

The vast majority of these studies took an institutional approach to explaining the dynamics of the unionized grievance procedure. Some studies compared alternate conflict resolution methods, for example, arbitration and mediation, in terms of their strengths and weaknesses, while other studies compared public and private sector grievance activity and resolution. In attempting further to characterize this early grievance procedure research, it can be said, first, that it is largely atheoretical, as is largely true of the psychological and sociological studies reviewed above. Second, most of the early industrial relations-based grievance studies lack conceptual models and explicit hypotheses. Third, most of the research continued to treat the grievance process largely in closed system terms without considering the broader labor-management relationship of which the grievance procedure is a part. Finally, the samples used in early industrial relations-based grievance research appear to be larger and more systematically drawn than those used in psychological studies but not sociological studies of the grievance process.

If this review were to end here, the reader might be discouraged about our level of understanding of the grievance process. However, we believe that more recent research is breaking new ground in advancing our knowledge of the grievance process. There are several reasons for this newfound optimism. First, research is moving in the direction of testing hypotheses based on explicit theoretical frameworks. As examples, Gordon (1988) tested the linkages between procedural and distributive justice and union member satisfaction with the union and management, Ichniowski (1986) tested for the displacement effects of grievance activity in nine paper mills, Lewin and Peterson (1988) tested exit-voice and industrial punishment theories against an extensive multi-sector, longitudinal grievance data base, Knight (1986) used systems theory as a basis for his study of grievance initiation and feedback, and Cappelli (1990) has empirically tested an economic model of grievances which focuses on the demand for and price of grievance procedures.

Second, several recent studies have examined the association between grievance activity and organizational performance or productivity. Freeman and Medoff (1984) have shown that unionized grievance procedures are significantly negatively associated with employee quits and significantly positively

associated with employee productivity in the manufacturing sector of the U.S. economy. Katz, Kochan and Gobeille (1983) and Katz, Kochan, and Weber (1985) found that grievance rates were significantly negatively associated with performance measures in two sets of General Motors automobile assembly plants. Norsworthy and Zabala (1985) studied grievance activity and productivity in the U.S. automobile industry from 1959-1976, and found that the rate of grievance activity was significantly negatively associated with total factor productivity and significantly positively associated with unit production costs. Ichniowski (1986) examined the relationship between grievance filing and monthly tons of paper produced in unionized paper mills over the 1976-1982 period. He found an inverse relationship between the grievance filing rate and productivity in these mills, when other variables were controlled.

Third, a stream of research by Lewin (1984) and Lewin and Peterson (1988; 1991) tests a model of grievance procedure effectiveness which uses more comprehensive measures of effectiveness than earlier studies. These researchers incorporated six separate measures of effectiveness into their grievance model, which was tested against a four-year data set drawn from steel manufacturing, retail department stores, nonprofit hospitals, and local public schools.

Fourth, one study (Lewin and Peterson, 1988) has specifically focused on personnel outcomes for grievants and non-grievants, including promotions, performance ratings, absenteeism, and voluntary and involuntary turnover. Using data for specified three-year periods, they found that grievants experienced significantly more adverse personnel outcomes than non-grievants in the one-year post-grievance filing and settlement period, whereas no significant differences between the two groups existed in the one-year pre-grievance period or in the year of grievance filing and settlement. Similar findings emerged with respect to supervisors of grievance filers compared to supervisors of nonfilers.

Fifth, other recent research asks union members to provide an assessment of the grievance procedure in terms of their attitudes towards it and experiences with it (Gordon, 1988; Fryxell and Gordon, 1989; and Clark and Gallagher, 1988). Fryxell and Gordon (1989) tested relationships between beliefs in procedural justice, distributive justice, and moral order and unionists' overall evaluation of the grievance system as well as union members' satisfaction with their unions and employers. Procedural due process was positively associated with union members' assessment of the overall grievance system, while both procedural and distribute justice were positively related to members' satisfaction with their union. Satisfaction with management was significantly positively related to union members belief in a moral order. The Clark and Gallagher study queried members of the mail carriers' union (1988), and the authors' ATGP scale is an important first step in gaining insights from union members into their assessments of the grievance procedure. It is clear from Clark and Gallagher's research that union members who file grievances have somewhat different assessments of the grievance procedure from members who don't file grievances.

Sixth, while the latest industrial relations-based research is clearly concerned with outcomes of grievance activity for management, unions, employees in general, and employees who have used the

grievance procedure, it has not been especially concerned with the outcomes of grievance handling for collective bargaining relationships. However, a study by Lewin and Peterson (1988) addresses this issue and provides substantial evidence that where a particular issue is heavily grieved, the parties are subsequently likely to negotiate language into the labor contract to address the specific problem surfaced by grievance filing.

Seventh, some of the most recent studies (Klass, 1989a; Klass and De Nisi, 1989; Meyer and Cooke, 1988; Ng and Dastmalchian, 1989; and Dastmalchian and Ng, 1990) have tested for: a) the influence of the grievant's work history; b) the nature of the grievance; c) economic and political factors and d) industrial relations climate on whether or not the grievant wins, partially wins, or loses a case. These studies show an increasing interest in outcomes for the grievant, rather than for the union and employer, as was true of the earlier research.

Eighth, the recent trend in grievance research has been towards using multiple data gathering methods and sources, whereas earlier studies typically used single methods and sources. For example, in their four-sector study of grievance procedure dynamics, Lewin and Peterson (1988) used a multistage field study which incorporated large scale mail survey questionnaires, interviews with union and management officials familiar with grievances, extensive grievance files, and comprehensive personnel files. This research can fairly be said to represent an exercise in triangulation for the purpose of studying the modern grievance procedure.

Last, recent studies have relied on much larger samples of plants, organizations, employees, and industries than was the case in earlier grievance studies. Further, statistical analyses in grievance studies have moved from relatively simple chi-square and correlational analyses to more sophisticated multiple regression analysis and related econometric and multivariate testing.

Future Research Directions

This review and assessment has shown that research on the unionized grievance procedure has made important strides in recent years. The best of these studies can be added to earlier research by Sayles (1958), Kuhn (1961), Peach and Livernash (1974), and Brett and Goldberg (1983), among others, to form an impressive inventory of knowledge about grievance procedure dynamics and outcomes. However, several additional research steps should be undertaken, including the following:

First, researchers should seek out theories from the disciplines of psychology, sociology, economics, and political science that are germane to the study of the grievance process (as a form of conflict resolution), and should combine these into a larger multidisciplinary framework of analysis. We especially encourage political scientists to contribute to research in this field, inasmuch as they have not been well represented in the past.

Second, new research can focus on validating previous research, in part by conducting replication

studies, to determine whether findings vary over time or among different samples (e.g., along such dimensions as occupation, industry, location, and job content). Third, we still know relatively little about the impact of the grievance process on the broader labor-management relationship, and conversely. For example, does a smoothly functioning grievance procedure, as judged by the parties, contribute to a better labor-management relationship? This question merits the attention of researchers who do not view the grievance procedure as a closed system. Fourth, more concentrated effort is needed to assess the effects of differences and changes in environmental factors—inflation, regulation, industry structure, foreign ownership—on grievance filing, resolution, and organizational and personal outcomes.

Finally, from the perspective of due process, one may ask whether unionized (and nonunion) employees are being well served by the grievance procedure, both in the procedural and distributive senses of justice. To date, little research has explored this issue. Our interviews with union and management officials suggest that they are most likely to judge effectiveness in terms of whether their side wins or loses grievances; the merits of individual cases seem less important to them in reaching judgments about grievance procedure effectiveness. This and related findings suggest that researchers should conduct more focused research which incorporates into their models and measures managers', employees', and grievants' perceptions and assessments of modern grievance procedures.

References

- Adams, J. Stacy. "Inequity of Social Exchange," in L. Berkowitz (ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press, pp. 267-299.
- Ash, Philip. "The Parties to the Grievance," Personnel Psychology, Vol. 23, No. 1, (Spring, 1970), pp. 13-37.
- Brett, Jeanne M., and Stephen B. Goldberg. "Grievance Mediation in the Coal Industry," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, Vol. 37, No. 1 (October, 1983), pp. 49-69.
- Briggs, Steven. "The Steward, the Supervisor, and Grievance Process," Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association. Madison, Wis.: IRRA, 1981, pp. 313-319.
- Cappelli, Peter. "An Economic Model of Grievances," Working Paper #722, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, 1990.
- Catlett, Judith L., and Edwin L. Brown. "Union Leaders' Perceptions of the Grievance Process," Labor Studies Journal, Vol. 14, No. 1 (Winter, 1990), pp. 54-65.
- Clark, Paul F., and Daniel G. Gallagher. "Making Perceptions of the Value and Effect of Grievance Procedure," Proceedings of the Fortieth Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association. Madison, Wis., IRRA, 1987, pp. 406-415.
- Dalton, Dan R., and William D. Tudor. "Union Steward Locus of Control, Job, Union Involvement, and Grievance Behavior," Journal of Business Research, Vol. 10, No. 1 (February, 1982a), pp. 85-101.
- Dalton, Dan R., and William D. Tudor. "Antecedents of Grievance Filing Behavior: Attitude/Behavior Consistency and the Union Steward," Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 25, No. 1 (March, 1982b), pp. 158-169.
- Dalton, Dan R., and William D. Tudor. "Win, Lose, Draw: The Grievance Process in Practice," Personnel Administrator, Vol. 26, No. 3 (May-June, 1981), pp. 25-29.
- Dastmalchian, Ali and Ignace Ng. "Industrial Relations Climate and Grievance Outcomes," Relations Industrielles, Vol. 45, No. 2 (1990), pp. 311-324.
- Eckerman, Arthur C. "An Analysis of Grievances and Aggrieved Employees in a Machine Shop and Foundry," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 32, No. 3 (June, 1948), pp. 255-269.
- Fleishman, Edwin A., and Edwin F. Harris. "Patterns of Leadership Behavior Related to Employee Grievances and Turnover," Personnel Psychology, Vol. 15, No. 1 (Winter, 1962), pp. 43-56.
- Freeman, Richard B., and James L. Medoff. What do Unions Do? New York: Basic Books, 1984.
- Fryxell, Gerald E. and Michael E. Gordon. "Workplace Justice and Job Satisfaction as Predictors of Satisfaction with Union and Management," Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 32, No. 4 (December 1989), pp. 851-866.

- Gandz, Jeffrey. "Resolving Conflict: A Guide for the Industrial Relations Manager," Personnel, Vol. 56, No. 6 (June, 1979), pp. 22-31.
- Gandz, Jeffrey, and J. David Whitehead. "The Relationship Between Industrial Relations Climate and Grievance Initiation and Resolution," Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association. Madison, Wis.: IRRA, 1982, pp. 320-328.
- Gideon, Thomas F., and Richard B. Peterson. "A Comparison of Alternate Grievance Procedures," Employee Relations Law Journal, Vol. 5, No. 3 (September, 1979), pp. 222-223.
- Glassman, Alan M., and James A. Belasco. "The Chapter Chairman and School Grievances," Industrial Relations, Vol. 14, No. 2 (Spring, 1975), pp. 233-241.
- Gordon, Michael E. "Grievance Systems and Workplace Justice: Tests of Behavioral Propositions About Procedural and Distributive Justice," Proceedings of the Fortieth Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association, Madison, Wis.: IRRA, 1987, pp. 390-397.
- Gordon, Michael E. and Roger C. Bowlby. "Reactance and Intentionality Attributions as Determinants of the Intent to File a Grievance," Personnel Psychology, Vol. 42, No. 2 (Summer 1989), pp. 309-329.
- Gordon, Michael E. and Roger C. Bowlby. "Propositions About Grievance Settlements: Finally, Consultation with Grievants," Personnel Psychology, Vol. 41, No. 1 (Spring 1988), pp. 107-123.
- Gordon, Michael E., and Sandra J. Miller. "Grievances: A Review of Research and Practice," Personnel Psychology, Vol. 37, No. 1 (Winter, 1984), pp. 117-146.
- Graham, Harry, and Brian Heshizer. "The Effect of Contract Language on Low-Level Settlement of Grievances," Labor Law Journal, Vol. 30, No. 7 (July, 1979), pp. 427-432.
- Graham, Harry, Brian Heshizer, and David Johnson. "Grievance Arbitration: Labor Officials Attitudes," The Arbitration Journal, Vol. 33, No. 2 (June, 1978), pp. 21-24.
- Hayford, Stephen L., and Richard Pegnetter. "Grievance Adjudication for Public Employees," The Arbitration Journal, Vol. 35, No. 3 (September, 1980), pp. 22-29.
- Hirschman, Albert O. Exit, Voice and Loyalty. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- Ichniowski, Casey, and David Lewin. "Grievance Procedures and Firm Performance," in Morris Kleiner, et al. (eds.), Human Resources and the Performance of the Firm, Industrial Relations Research Association Series. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of National Affairs, 1987, pp. 159-193.
- Ichniowski, Casey. "The Effects of Grievance Activity on Productivity," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, Vol. 40, No. 1 (October, 1986), pp. 75-89.
- Jennings, Ken. "Foremen's Views of Their Involvement with Other Management Officials in the Grievance Process," Labor Law Journal, Vol. 25, No. 5 (May, 1974a), pp. 305-316.
- Jennings, Ken. "Foremen's Views of Their Involvement with the Union Steward in the Grievance Process," Labor Law Journal, Vol. 25, No. 9 (September, 1974b), pp. 541-549.
- Katz, Harry C., Thomas A. Kochan, and Kenneth R. Gobeille. "Industrial Relations Performance, Economic Performance and QWL Programs: An Interplant Analysis," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, Vol. 37, No. 1 (October, 1983), pp. 3-17.

- Katz, Harry C., Thomas A. Kochan, and Mark R. Weber. "Assessing the Effects of Industrial Relations and Quality of Work Life Efforts on Organizational Effectiveness," Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 28, No. 3 (September 1985), pp. 509-527.
- Kissler, Gary D. "Grievance Activity and Union Membership: A Study of Government Employees," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 62, No. 4 (August, 1977), pp. 459-462.
- Klass, Brian S. "Managerial Decision Making About Employee Grievances: The Impact of the Grievant's Work History," Personnel Psychology, Vol. 42, No. 1 (Spring 1989), pp. 53-68.
- Klass, Brian S. "Determinants of Grievance Activity and the Grievance System's Impact on Employee Behavior," Academy of Management Review, Vol. 14, No. 3 (July 1989), pp. 445-458.
- Klass, Brian S. and Angelo De Nisi. "Managerial Reactions to Employee Dissent: The Impact of Grievance Activity on Performance Ratings," Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 32, No. 4 (December 1989), pp. 705-718.
- Johnson, Ralph A. "Grievance Negotiation: An Analysis of Factors Popularly Associated With Success," Labor Studies Journal, Vol. 9, No. 3 (Winter, 1985), pp. 271-278.
- Knight, Thomas R. "Feedback and Grievance Resolution," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, Vol. 39, No. 4 (July, 1986), pp. 585-598.
- Kuhn, James W. Bargaining in Grievance Settlement: The Power of Industrial Work Groups. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.
- Labig, Chalmer E. Jr., and Charles R. Greer. "Grievance Initiation: A Literature Survey and Suggestions for Future Research," Journal of Labor Research, Vol., 9, No. 1 (Winter, 1988), pp. 1-27.
- LaVan, Helen, Cameron Carley, and J. Marshall Jowers. "The Arbitration of Employee Grievance in Health Care Institutions: An Empirical Study," The Arbitration Journal, Vol. 35, No. 4 (December, 1980), pp. 33-36.
- Lewin, David, and Richard B. Peterson. The Modern Grievance Procedure in the United States. New York: Greenwood Press, 1988.
- Lewin, David. "Empirical Measures of Grievance Procedure Effectiveness," Proceedings of the 1984 Spring Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association. Madison, Wis.: IRRRA, 1984, pp. 491-499.
- Lewin, David. "Theoretical Perspectives on the Modern Grievance Procedure," in J.D. Reid, Jr. (ed.), New Approaches to Labor Unions, Research in Labor Economics, Supplement 2. Greenwich, CT.: JAI Press, 1983, pp. 127-147.
- Meyer, David and William Cooke. "Economic and Political Factors in Formal Grievance Resolution," Industrial Relations, Vol. 27, No. 3 (Fall 1988), pp. 318-335.
- Moore, William R. "Justice and the Grievance Procedure in the Federal Public Service," Relations Industrielles/Industrial Relations, Vol. 36, No. 4 (October, 1981), pp. 848-862.
- Muchinsky, Paul M., and Mounawar A. Maassarani. "Public Sector Grievances in Iowa," Journal of Collective Bargaining in the Public Sector, Vol. 10, No. 1 (1981), pp. 55-62.

- Muchinsky, Paul M., and Mounawar A. Maassarani. "Work Environment Effects on Public Sector Grievances," Personnel Psychology, Vol. 33, No. 2 (Summer, 1980), pp. 403-414.
- Nelson, Nels E. "Grievance Rates and Technology," Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 22, No. 4 (December, 1979), pp. 810-815.
- Ng, Ignace and Ali Dastmalchian. "Determinants of Grievance Outcomes: A Case Study," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, Vol. 42, No. 3 (April 1989), pp. 393-403.
- Norsworthy, J.R., and Craig A Zabala. "Worker Attitudes, Worker Behavior, and Productivity in the U.S. Automobile Industry, 1959-1976," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, Vol. 38, No. 4 (July, 1985), pp. 544-557.
- Peach, David A., and E. Robert Livernash. Grievance Initiation and Resolution: A Study in Basic Steel. Boston: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1974.
- Peterson, Richard B. "A Multiple-Measure Test of Grievance Procedure Effectiveness," Proceedings of the Fortieth Annual Meetings. Industrial Relations Research Association. Madison, WI.: IRRA, 1988, pp. 398-405.
- Peterson, Richard B., and David Lewin. "A Model for Research and Analysis of the Grievance Process," Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth Annual Meetings, Industrial Relations Research Association. Madison, WI.: IRRA, 1982, pp. 304-312.
- Price, John, et al. "Three Studies of Grievances," Personnel Journal, Vol. 55, No. 1 (January, 1976), pp. 33-37.
- Rand, James F. "Creative Problem-Solving Applied to Grievance/Arbitration Procedures," Personnel Administrator, Vol. 25, No. 3 (May/June, 1980), pp. 50-52.
- Ronan, W.W. "Work Group Attitudes and Grievance Activity," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 47, No. 1 (February, 1963), pp. 38-41.
- Sayles, Leonard R. Behavior of Industrial Work Groups. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1958.
- Slichter, Sumner H., James J. Healy, and E. Robert Livernash. The Impact of Collective Bargaining on Management. Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1960.
- Slichter, Sumner H. The Challenge of Industrial Relations: Trade Unions, Management, and the Public Interest. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1947.
- Stagner, Ross. "Personality Variables in Union-Management Relations," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 46, No. 5 (October, 1962), pp. 350-357.
- Stagner, Ross. Psychology of Industrial Conflict. New York: Wiley, 1956.
- Staudohar, Paul D. "Exhaustion of Remedies in Private Industry Grievance Procedures," Employee Relations Law Journal, Vol. 7, No. 3 (September 1977), pp. 454-464.
- Sulkin, Howard A., and Robert W. Pranis. "Comparison of Grievants in a Heavy Machine Company," Personnel Psychology, Vol. 20, No. 2 (Summer, 1967), pp. 111-119.

- Sulzner, George T. "The Impact of Grievance and Arbitration Processes on Federal Personnel Policies and Practices: The View from Twenty Bargaining Units," Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector, Vol. 9, No. 2 (1980), pp. 143-156.
- Thomson, Andrew W.J. The Grievance Procedure in the Private Sector. Ithaca, New York: New York State School of Labor and Industrial Relations, Cornell University, 1974.
- Walker, Robert I., and James W. Robinson. "The First-Line Supervisor's Role in the Grievance Procedure," The Arbitration Journal, Vol. 32, No. 4 (December, 1977), pp. 379-392.
- Weiss, Edward C. "The Relation of Personnel Statistics to Organizational Structure," Personnel Psychology, Vol. 10, No. 1 (Spring, 1957), pp. 27-42.

Table 1
A Summary of Studies of the Unionized Grievance Procedure

STUDY	INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	MODERATING VARIABLES	DEPENDENT VARIABLES	FINDINGS
Eckerman (1948)	Several demographic variables such as number of children marital status, height and weight		Grievant vs. non-grievant, type and disposition of grievances	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Most grievances are over wage and pay issues 2. Grievants have larger pay raises, more seniority, more past jobs, started at a lower wage rate, are more likely to be married, in debt, and have children than non-grievants 3. Grievants and non-grievants are not significantly different with respect to height, weight, age, and educational attainment
Stagner (1956)	Degree of sensitivity of individuals	Working conditions	Number of grievances filed	Grievants are more sensitive than non-grievants and thus more likely to file grievances in the face of a given set of working conditions
Weiss (1957)	Degree of centralization of authority		Number of grievances filed	Unable to substantiate hypothesis
Sayles (1958)	Technology	Skill level of employees Variation in tasks Inter-worker coordination required	Grievance rate	<p>Hypotheses supported:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Apathetic groups have low grievance rates 2. Erratic groups have medium grievance rates 3. Strategic groups have high grievance rates 4. Conservative groups have medium grievance rates
Kuhn (1961)	Technology		Willingness to engage in factional bargaining	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Workers in rubber plants, unlike their counterparts in technical equipment, used frequent walkouts as a factional bargaining tactic rather than protest against poor grievance handling 2. Technology that subjects a large proportion of workers to continued changes in work methods, standards and materials allows workers a considerable degree of power

Table 1 (continued)

STUDY	INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	MODERATING VARIABLES	DEPENDENT VARIABLES	FINDINGS
Stagner (1962)	Personality variables		Degree of union achievement Amount of union pressure Tendency toward legalism	Certain personality characteristics have an impact on grievance activity
Fleishman and Harris (1962)	Foreman behavior - consideration - structure		Grievance rate Employee turnover rate	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relationship between foreman behavior and work group grievances is negative and curvilinear for consideration 2. Structure is positively but curvilinearly related to grievance rate 3. Grievances occur most frequently among groups whose foremen are low in consideration regardless of the amount of emphasis on structure.
Ronan (1963)	Sayles' four different types of groups differentiated by technology and skill level	Age differences between two plants - one new and one old	Grievance activity	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No basic differences between two groups (Sayles' four groups were consolidated into two) 2. Findings distorted because "new" plant had many grievances filed due to its "newness"
Sulkin and Pranis (1967)	Numerous variables, including number of grievances, amount of union participation, sick days, absences, tardiness, hourly wage rate, number of pay increases, tenure, work force experience, age, education, sex, and race		Grievant vs. non-grievant	Grievants are more likely to have more education, be active in the union, be late more often, have lower hourly pay rates, and have fewer pay increases than non-grievants
Ash (1970)	Various demographic and grievance characteristics		Grievant vs. non-grievant Grievance activity	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grievants are younger than non-grievants 2. Grievance activity does not fluctuate seasonally or by month of the year 3. Grievants are more likely to be veterans than non-grievants 4. Non-grievants are more likely to be women, married, have children, be aliens, and be rehired than grievants

Table 1 (continued)

STUDY	INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	MODERATING VARIABLES	DEPENDENT VARIABLES	FINDINGS
Jennings (1974a)	Blumer's interpersonal typology; codified, power, sympathetic		Foreman/steward relationship	1. Formal role requirements do not guide the parties in their interactions
Jennings (1974b)	Several demographic variables, including age, education, experience; structural variables such as number of employees and technology		Foremen perceptions of importance their organizations attach to grievance handling	Foremen do not place a high priority on grievance handling. Foremen do not have strongly homogeneous attitudes
Peach and Livemash (1974)	Size and character of the community, working conditions, and technology	Type of union leadership Type of management Union election year	Level of grievance activity	1. Grievance rates are higher in union election years 2. Unfavorable task environment, aggressive and militant union leadership, and ineffective managerial decision-making are related to high grievance rates 3. Low grievance rates caused by favorable task environment and few technological disturbances
Glassman and Belasco (1975)	Grievance chairman based variables, such as sex and marital status, and demographic variables, such as the proportions of minority teachers and students		Initial grievance filing activity Grievance appeal activity	Initial grievance filing is associated with: 1. perception by teachers that they are excluded from decision-making 2. assignment to schools with few minorities 3. absence of rival organization 4. presence of an upwardly mobile chairman Appeal activity is associated with: 1. a chairman who is single or female 2. short tenure at current school 3. high proportions of minority students and teachers in a school

Table 1 (continued)

STUDY	INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	MODERATING VARIABLES	DEPENDENT VARIABLES	FINDINGS
Price, et al. (1976)	Forty different behavioral and demographic variables	Sex, seniority and job classification	Grievant vs. non-grievant Multigrievants vs. non-grievants Disciplinary grievants vs. non-grievants	An exploratory study; very few factors intercorrelated
Walker and Robinson (1977)	Leadership style of supervisor - democratic or autocratic	Age, education, geographic area, tenure as foreman, and number of workers supervised	Grievance rate, types of grievance steps at which grievances are settled, number of grievances overturned by higher levels of management	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Autocratic supervisors have fewer overall grievances, discipline related grievances, overtime related grievances, and harassment related grievances than democratic supervisors 2. Autocratic supervisors also have fewer grievances settled at lower levels and fewer decisions on grievances overturned by higher management than democratic supervisors 3. Autocratic supervisors are better contact administrators than democratic supervisors
Kissler (1977)	Grade, step, age, tenure, education, sick days, income, no. of promotions, union membership, sex, race		Grievance activity	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grievance activity not related to tenure or age 2. Grievants have less union representation, more sick days, and more minority representation than non-grievants
Begin (1978)	Level of settlement processing time		Faculty grievance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase in perceived fairness 2. Personnel procedures formalized 3. More lower level settlements 4. Increased processing time

Table 1 (continued)

STUDY	INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	MODERATING VARIABLES	DEPENDENT VARIABLES	FINDINGS
Graham, Heshizer and Johnson (1978)	No independent variables (survey)		Attitudes toward arbitration	A survey found: 1. 78% of respondents think arbitration is the best method of settling unresolved grievances 2. Union members are unwilling to strike over grievances 3. Costs of arbitration discourage unions from proceeding to arbitration
Gideon and Peterson (1979)	Arbitration method vs. appeal method		Overall grievance activity Level of grievance resolution Which side was favored Resolution pattern by levels Discipline/discharge activity	1. Appeal method produces a more volatile labor environment than the arbitration method 2. Timberland's union increased its chances of winning or at least getting a compromise by appealing to Step III 3. Arbitration method accounted for only about half as many grievances as the appeal method 4. Based on number of grievances won, management should prefer the arbitration method and the union the appeal method
Nelson (1979)	Sayles' work group classifications: apathetic, erratic, strategic, conservative		Level of grievance activity	Sayles' hypotheses hold: 1. Apathetic work groups had lowest grievance rate and strategic groups the highest 2. Erratic and conservative groups both had intermediate grievance levels
Graham and Heshizer (1979)	Contractual language specifying low-level grievance resolution		Step in grievance procedure at which grievances are resolved	1. Grievances resolved more readily at the oral stage than the written stage 2. Low-level contract language did not affect the level of grievance resolution

Table 1 (continued)

STUDY	INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	MODERATING VARIABLES	DEPENDENT VARIABLES	FINDINGS
Brett and Goldberg (1979)	Frequency of wildcat strikes	Population of county, unemployment rate, occupational distribution, family income, quality of housing, schools and public	No. of labor problems Levels at which problems are resolved Confidence of miners in non-local grievance steps Perceived value of a strike	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No of labor problems not related to strike activity 2. Local level of grievance resolution contributes to low strike level 3. Confidence in higher step grievance resolution not significant 4. Partial support for differing values at low and high strike mines of striking
LaVan, Carley, and Jowers (1980)	Before vs. after 1974 Taft-Hartley amendment		Differences in way grievances are handled, such as % of cases filed by union or individual employee, % of cases using expert witnesses, and % of cases involving union issues	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No pre- and post-1974 differences for 11 of the 13 variables tested 2. Increased use of expert witnesses since 1974 in arbitration hearings 3. Tendency of arbitration to award back-pay has increased
Sulzner (1980)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Representation of employees under negotiated grievance procedure - Coverage of disciplinary actions - Representation of employees under the negotiated arbitration procedure 		Personnel policies and practices	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nearly 2/3 of respondents thought the grievance procedure impacted on personnel policies and practices 2. Little impact is associated with the size and scope of the grievance process, but does vary with the substance of grievances 3. Discipline grievances are more likely to be processed than promotion grievances

Table 1 (continued)

STUDY	INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	MODERATING VARIABLES	DEPENDENT VARIABLES	FINDINGS
Muchinsky & Maassarani (1980)	Work environment in public sector agencies		Types of grievance	Results are similar to those of Peach and Livernash. Work environment does impact organizational behavior as reflected in number and types of grievances filed
Hayford and Pegnetter (1980)	Specific elements of due process		Comparison of unionized grievance procedure with civil service appeal systems in four states	The grievance procedure is the better of the two approaches because: 1. A broader scope of issues can be adjudicated 2. Greater assurance of competent employee representation at hearing 3. Mutual selection of the third party neutral 4. Employee perceptions of neutrality of the third party 5. Enhanced finality of adjudication
Dalton and Todor (1981)	Grievances by category		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - % in each category - % won, compromised, withdrawn, abandoned, or lost by category - % positive outcome for union - % positive outcome for management 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Certain categories of grievances are likely to have positive outcomes for unions and other categories for management Categories in which grievances are most frequently filed are less likely to have a positive union outcome
Muchinsky and Maassarani (1981)	Article of contract grievated and location of grievant	Department	Disposition of grievances - denied or upheld	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Denial rate is much higher in the public sector than the private sector Significant interaction between article grievated and grievance disposition in one department (DDS) but not in the other (DOT). DOT had small volume of grievances Inexperience of departments resulted in large grievance denial rate by managers

Table 1 (continued)

STUDY	INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	MODERATING VARIABLES	DEPENDENT VARIABLES	FINDINGS
Moore (1981)	Adjudicable griev- vs. non- adjudicable grievances	Type of griev- ance: - pay - discipline - leave - special leave - miscellaneous	Disposition of griev- ance: - granted - denied - partially granted - abandoned - resolved - partially resolved first and intermedi- ate level of results final level of results past grievance results time delays	Restrictions placed on types of griev- eligible for adjudication create an undesirable hindrance to industrial justice
Gandz and Whitehead (1982)	Organizational climate		Grievance initiation and resolution	Grievance rates higher where union-man- agement relationship is poor as judged by line managers and industrial relations executives in sampled organizations
Dalton and Todor (1982a)	Company commitment, union commitment and job satisfaction		Steward behavior	Differences in commitment of union stewards to the union and the company are strongly related to steward griev- ance handling behavior
Dalton and Todor (1982b)	Locus of control, job involvement, and union involve- ment		Behavior of union steward in responding to a potential or real grievance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Job involvement not significantly associ- ated with any of the five possible steward grievance behaviors 2. Union involvement significantly related to steward: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. encouraging member to file when no interest shown by involved person b. filing grievance over objections of involved member 3. External locus of control negatively relat- ed to all five steward grievance behaviors

Table 1 (continued)

STUDY	INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	MODERATING VARIABLES	DEPENDENT VARIABLES	FINDINGS
Goldberg and Brett (1983)	Number of third step grievances	Mediator's advisory opinion if arbitration was used	Grievance outcome, speed of settlement, cost, and satisfaction of parties	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 89% of grievances settled through mediation Mediation 3 months faster on average than arbitration Mediation \$739 cheaper on average than arbitration All parties expressed high levels of satisfaction with mediation
Freeman and Medoff (1984)	Unionism, capital/labor ratios, and other variables	Grievance and arbitration clauses, percent of worker grievances	Job tenure and job quits	Grievance procedure coverage significantly negatively associated with job quits and positively associated with job tenure who filed
Katz, Kochan and Gobeille (1983) and Katz, Kochan and Weber (1985)	Quality of working life (QWL) programs	Industrial relations performance, including grievance filing rates	Product quality and direct labor efficiency	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Industrial relations performance significantly positively associated with product quality and direct labor efficiency QWL program not consistently related to changes in industrial relations performance or economic performance
Norsworthy and Zabala (1985)	Grievances filed per worker, unresolved grievances per worker, and worker behavior index		Total factor productivity, total unit cost, and production worker productivity	Grievances filed per worker significantly negatively correlated with total factor productivity and production worker production, and positively correlated with total unit cost
Knight (1986)	Reference to previous grievance settlements and arbitration decisions	Types of grievances, organization level	Grievance resolution	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> References to previous grievance settlements significantly positively related to management perceptions of subsequent grievance resolution union officials made more frequent references than management officials to previous grievance settlements and arbitration decisions

Table 1 (continued)

STUDY	INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	MODERATING VARIABLES	DEPENDENT VARIABLES	FINDINGS
Ichniowski (1986)	Grievance filing rates, arbitration decisions	Plant dummies, production process dum- mies, and con- trols for factor inputs	Tons of paper pro- duced per month per plant	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grievance filing rates significantly negatively associated with plant productivity 2. plant productivity significantly lower in one nonunion plant than in nine unionized plants
Gordon (1988)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Procedural Justice - Distributive Justice 		<p>Satisfaction with union</p> <p>Satisfaction with management</p> <p>Overall satisfaction with the grievance system</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Three measures of grievance system as a group significantly related to member satisfaction with union 2. Perceptions of procedural and distributive justice more closely tied to satisfaction with the union than satisfaction with management 3. Procedural justice shows significantly higher correlations with overall evaluation of grievance system than distributive justice
Meyer and Cooke (1988)	<p>Costs to Management of granting the grievance</p> <p>Production level at time of grievance</p> <p>Skill level of grievant</p> <p>Size of union local</p> <p>Timing of grievance relative to union election</p> <p>Cost to other employees of a grievant winning a case</p>	Degree of clarity of rights	<p>Attention given grievance by local union representative</p> <p>Grievant winning vs. losing the case</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Management more resistant to granting grievance if more employees affected 2. Partial support for position that the more skilled the employee, the greater likelihood of grievant winning a case 3. Partial support given for role of union political factors such as size of local union vote being linked to grievance outcomes 4. No support for position that grievants have more favorable case outcomes as date of union elections approaches 5. Degree of clarity of employee/employer rights effects link between the two sets of variables

Table 1 (continued)

STUDY	INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	MODERATING VARIABLES	DEPENDENT VARIABLES	FINDINGS
Lewin and Peterson (1988)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Characteristics of bargaining unit - Grievance policies of the parties - Characteristics of L-M relationship - Grievance procedures characteristics - Environmental influences 		<p>Grievance procedure effectiveness measures including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - grievance rate - level of settlement - arbitration rate - perceived importance of grievance issue - perceived equity of grievance settlement 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strongest support for grievance procedure effectiveness found in nonprofit hospitals and steel manufacturing 2. Strongest regression coefficients found for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. management and union policies to take certain grievances as far as possible through the procedure b. union policy of committing grievances to writing c. adversarial labor relations d. supervisor's knowledge of the grievance procedure e. use of expedited arbitration 3. Evidence of negative outcomes for grievance procedure users and their supervisors in the immediate post-grievance settlement period when compared to non-users and their supervisors
Clark and Gallagher (1989)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demographic characteristics - Grievance filers vs. non-filers 		<p>Attitude toward the grievance procedure (ATGP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effect of workplace - Process - Representation - Importance 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Members with grievance filing experience differ with respect to their perception of the grievance procedure 2. Grievance filing activity is both negatively and positively associated with ATGP
Fryxell and Gordon (1989)	<p>Procedural justice</p> <p>Distributive justice</p> <p>Belief in moral order</p>		<p>Overall evaluation of grievance system</p> <p>Satisfaction with</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - union - management 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Procedural justice is stronger predictor of overall evaluation with grievance system than distributive justice 2. Belief in procedural and distributive justice significantly related to workers' satisfaction with union 3. Belief in moral order strongest predictor of satisfaction with management

Table 1 (continued)

STUDY	INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	MODERATING VARIABLES	DEPENDENT VARIABLES	FINDINGS
Gordon and Bowlby (1989)	Reaction to felt grievance Intentionality attribution		Employee filing of a grievance	Significant support for the idea that both greater threat and dispositional attributions provoke a stronger intent to file a grievance. Non-significant interaction effects found.
Klass (1989a)	Work history variables - past performance - tenure - disciplinary record - number of grievances filed previously		Management granting grievance in part or whole vs. denial of grievance	1. Managers at the later stages of the grievance process are influenced by the grievant's previous work history, even when not relevant to the merits of the current grievance 2. Management granting of grievance (in part or whole) positively related to grievant's performance, job tenure, and (good) disciplinary record
Klass and De Nisi (1989)	Whether grievance filed over - supervision - organizational policy Grievant winning case against - supervisor - organizational policy	There were controls for performance-related behavior - absenteeism - tenure - production-ratio	- Employee's annual performance rating	1. Filing grievance against supervisor negatively related to subsequent performance rating of grievant 2. Filing grievance against organizational policy had little impact on grievant's subsequent performance rating 3. Negative performance rating of grievant particularly significant when grievance filed against supervisor and grievant wins the case

Table 1 (continued)

STUDY	INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	MODERATING VARIABLES	DEPENDENT VARIABLES	FINDINGS
Ng and Dastmalchian (1989)	Grievance level Salary of grievant Subject of grievance Organizational type		Outcome of grievance	Grievants were more likely to win or partially win their grievance if: 1. Settled at lower steps of the procedure 2. Grievance is in higher pay group 3. Grievance was over working conditions, not work assignment
Dastmalchian and Ng (1990)	Degree of favorability of industrial relations climate		Grievance rate Grievance outcomes Grievance step resolved Speed of settlement	1. Partial support for a positive relationship between favorability of industrial relations climate and granting or partial granting of the grievance 2. Support for negative relationship between poor unfavorable industrial relations climate and granting or partial granting of the grievance 3. Positive relationship between favorable industrial climate and grievance being resolved quickly and at lower steps of procedure