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Are Single Classified Women’s Needs Being Addressed by the Union in a University Environment?

Chapter 1: Introduction

In January of 2007, the *New York Times* reported that at that time the number of women living without spouses had risen to 51% of American women (Roberts, 2007). With this in mind it would be important to ask the question whether these women have particular concerns at work and if they are being taken as seriously as their married counter-parts. We know that union women in general make only 79.6% of the wages that men make. The average female union member makes approximately $18.00 an hour (Schmitt, 2008). That is at least $100.00 less a week in income than men. For single women that means not only do they make less than their male counterparts but also they do not have a second paycheck to help pay the bills or have something to fall back on when negative financial circumstances arise. This is difficult enough for single women who do not have children, but single women who are parents have an especially difficult time making ends meet (Facts on Working Women).

With the changing demographics and the number of women in the workplace the increasing question becomes are single women’s needs being addressed and are their voices being heard or acknowledged? This study attempts to look at a small group of single working women who are members of a union and
their work related issues. I interviewed twelve women to see if they had encountered problems that had not been addressed by the union or their employer. I was looking to see whether there were problems or needs specific to their status as single women but also whether the women had spoken or communicated these needs to the union and what the results were.

The union that represents the classified personnel at this study’s university is a diverse group, part of which is made up of married and unmarried women. Historically, unions have worked to cover the problems and needs of married women, especially those with families. The purpose of this study was to see whether single women felt they had needs independent of married women that working conditions could address and whether they felt the union has actively taken those needs into consideration and worked to make the workplace and the union friendlier or safer for them.

Through the union, single women were requested to volunteer to participate in this study. Twelve women volunteered to be interviewed. Finding times and places that were convenient for these women to meet me were notable issues. As single women they had little time to spare. In the end we had interviews in many different locations and even resorted to phone interviews with children playing in the background. The women were all eager to help, but most felt they had little to share.
My Background

When I came to thinking about doing this thesis I already had the idea of looking at single women in the work environment. I wanted to know how other single women thought about their own issues and whether there was a difference in how they thought about the work environment as compared to married women. This study aimed to clarify the single woman’s outlook.

As a union member of more than 12 years and a single woman, I had the opportunity to think about the many issues I had encountered within the work environment; some having to do with gender in general while others had to do with marital status. When I was married I always wondered why the job descriptions for all my jobs always included being able to multi-task while the jobs my husband worked at never included it. I wondered why, if an attribute was so desired by an employer, they didn’t pay more to the people (mostly women) who could provide it. Then when I became single and living on my own meager salary I wondered how same sex partners that were women survived on what most women take home whether one partner worked and one stayed home or both partners worked.

Having worked for a large company prior to working for the university I had seen some things that made me stop and ask questions. I worked in the learning centers at this company and had a great opportunity to speak in depth with many different women. The group of employees I encountered was diverse so I
spoke to many women whose status was single (without a spouse). The range in single status was from some who had never been married to some who were married then divorced and others who lived in same-sex relationships. In our conversations it became obvious that the single women were definitely at a disadvantage compared with the women who were married and had a man’s paycheck and work benefits to rely on or fall back on should there be financial difficulties. I wanted to look more deeply and in a more formal way at the issues perceived by single women within their employment conditions.

I was surprised to find that most of my respondents had not really thought about what the union might be able to do to support them as single working women per se. As I analyzed their responses, I realized that most of them reflected dominant cultural norms about women, marriage, and work, despite the ways they are disadvantaged by these norms. This thesis seeks to help us develop a preliminary understanding of the work issues of this group of single women and the implications their responses may have for further research.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

_BREAD AND ROSES_
AS WE COME MARCHING, MARCHING, WE BATTLE TOO FOR MEN
UNITED IN THE STRUGGLE WE STAND WITH THEM
OUR LIVES SHALL NOT BE SWEATED FROM BIRTH UNTIL LIFE CLOSES

Unions make up a social institution that allows a collective group of people to negotiate with owners of businesses or employers who would normally have all the power with regard to wages, work environment and benefits. Though oft misunderstood, unions have done a great deal over the last one hundred fifty years to ensure fairness for workers. Because of unions, many people now have paid sick leave and vacation time. In addition, as a result of union activities the average wage for women in the union is $18.00 per hour while the average for non-union is two dollars less. Even for the lower wage women there is a difference of $2.95 with non-union women making $9.00 an hour and union women making $11.95 (Schmitt, 2008).

According to the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations’ (AFL-CIO) website, “Union membership in the United States increased by 428,000 to 16.1 million in 2008, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The percentage of the workforce that has a union also increased from 12.1
percent to 12.4 percent last year, continuing a second year of growth (AFL-CIO, 2009).

As the number of women becoming unionists grows more changes will take place. In 2007 forty five percent of union members were women. If the rate of increase stays on track as the last 25 years, by the year 2020 the majority of union members will be women (Schmitt, 2008). These facts, with the addition of the blurring of the lines between gender-only work and the new family roles, open to a world where the union has a major role to play. Men are now experiencing “woman’s work” in the service sector and are taking on the dual burden of work and home and family (Cobble, 1993). The possibilities for unions and women to forge a strong, complex system to work for egalitarian rights is in the here and now.

Unfortunately there is a dichotomy in the issues that revolve around women in the union. In some arenas women are “breaking glass ceilings and paving new roads” for women at the top of the union hierarchy, but in areas of salary for the general membership there is a different story (Toppo, 2008). Despite the fact that 13 percent of the employed women in 1987 were members of unions and made up 2.4 percent of the growth of union membership women still made 79.6 percent of men’s wages, or at least $100.00 less a week than male union members (Facts on Working Women). Focus has been in breaking those glass ceilings and striving for higher level positions while women in the middle have been left with the feeling that they should be doing something different. There hasn’t been any discussion on what these women take pride
in or what they are happy doing. In addition, they are made to feel irrelevant, undervalued and underappreciated.

In “Women Union Members-The Changing Face of Union Membership,” Linda Lowen points out that not every woman can go to college. In addition, John Schmitt, a Senior Economist at the Center for Economic Policy and Research (CEPF) says that between two thirds and seventy percent of adult workers in the United States do not have baccalaureate, four year, degrees. He says it is impractical to expect single parents with young children or people over the age of sixty to return to school to finish their education. Lowen says that membership in unions helps those women who instead of going to school have decided or needed to enter the service industry see a closing of the wage gap between those with four year degrees and themselves.

The image of a union worker has changed over the last several decades. No longer can white-blue collar male workers claim the place or the distinction as the face of the union. Today union membership is more clearly made up of non-traditional workers, women, African-American and with the fastest growth, Latinos. Women’s increased membership can be traced to the increasing size of the service sector.

With women’s increasing numbers in the workplace came the need for change. Although women were now working full-time in jobs outside the home, they were still required to maintain their homes and families in the manner they always had. More flexibility in work hours and jobs were needed to satisfy their needs while filling jobs that might go unfilled if not for these accomodations.
Historic Union Identity

A great deal has changed in the workplace due to the ever growing influx of women, but even before women started moving into the work force, women worked with unions to support their husbands. They went to union meetings in their husbands’ stead to protect their identities from businesses that the union were considering striking against. Women were hesitant to enter unions themselves because the emphasis was on male jobs and issues (Tanner, 1990). The opinion of many was that women followed the male conservatism.

In their book *Feminizing the Unions*, Sheila Cunnison and Jane Stageman note “Trade union ideology and rhetoric revolve around establishing and defending the rights of the powerless against the powerful. The values aspired to be were those of fairness, justice and solidarity; the latter often expressed as ‘brotherhood (Cunnison, 1993).’” Unfortunately, these ideas did not pertain to “the weaker sex.” The male-established practices of the union set up a system in which women were allowed to be victimized by employers and the unions themselves. Women were unlikely to stand up against this system because of their indoctrination in the patriarchal culture.

The first society of working women, however, was the Daughters of Liberty, organized as an auxiliary of the Sons of Liberty in 1765. The Daughters of Liberty were the first to show that women could be important in a political setting. They
supported the condemnation of British goods sold in America. They even worked to create replacement goods so that colonialists were not victims of British tyranny. They wove yarn and wool into fabric called “homespun.” They supported the cause of freedom during the Revolutionary War.

Traditionally, men have been able to charge women with indifference to their unions, based on their non-confrontational manner and their familial duties. They attributed this seeming indifference to nature. In the end, what originally began as unconscious behaviors of men in relationship to women’s rights became conscious actions to stem the wave of women clamoring for their rightful place in society and the union. Men wanted to keep hold of the power. They persisted in their view that women were financial dependents and so maintained the idea that women did not deserve equality.

The history of trade unions in the United States is steeped in the patriarchal system that has pervaded all aspects of society. The questions of power and who has it and how much of it there is, has tendrils weaving throughout the union “timescape.” According to Sheila Cunnison and Jane Stageman, the dominant image of the union has always been masculine. It is an image made up by men who engaged in hard, physical, full-time labor or skilled craftsmanship. These men tended to have periods of paid work and periods of leisure. In addition, they have traditionally been seen as the family breadwinner or major wage earner (Cunnison, 1993).
The image of the union bureaucracy was that of tough, hardworking, aggressive and competitive men. These men were willing to work long, irregular hours and spent time in bars, pubs and clubs to further union agendas. Families, if they had them, came in second to the union as far as priority (Deslippe, 2000).

On the other hand, women had the image or identity that was based on unpaid family service and the perception was that they were not serious workers. This identity was made up of three major areas: patterns of childbearing, patterns of care and service and the experience of subordination. The work outside the home they did was based on women’s aptitudes and times of their availability, which for most women, it was supposed, was before and after childbearing.

Feminists have looked at the relationship of the patriarchal system to women’s place and their lack of power in the union system. An argument has fermented between factions as to whether a woman’s place in the union has been determined by her place in the family or whether the two are independent of each other (Cunnison, 1993).

Equality of the sexes has been a difficult concept for both workers and employers (Cook, 1992). To be classified as a female worker or to be employed in women only classified jobs meant that they would always be paid lesser amounts (Deslippe, 2000). Based on the male identity of the union it has long been an environment that has been uncomfortable for women to express their ideas and perceptions. Women’s focus in the union has been somewhat different than men’s.
Women’s focus has been on “women’s issues” which are composed of two main priorities:

- Pursuit of equality with respect to traditional union power structures
  - Equal pay
  - Equal representation within the movement
  - Value of the work women do
- Widening the union agenda
  - Sex discrimination
  - Women’s health
  - Housing & other community concerns

**Protectionist Laws**

The Protectionist Laws, created at the turn of the century, were meant to protect women and children from poor and hazardous, exploitative working conditions. They were based on the idea that women were disadvantaged in comparison to men. While these laws were not based on equality, it was felt they were a step toward protecting workers from industrial abuse. They protected women for 75 years, but kept women from earning a fair wage (Deslippe, 2000).

In addition, to the Protectionist Laws, around the mid-century, state laws were introduced that mandated minimum wages, limited working hours and gave meal and rest periods. The new laws also limited “nightwork,” industrial work, and the weight that women were required to lift. At this time women made up 20% of the workforce but were limited to very few types of work they were allowed to do “Moreover, as the scores of letters written by women to Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt in the 1930s
attest, most working-class women were in accord with male unionists and middle-class reformers about the need to defend the ‘provider’s wage’ against the less-deserving women, especially those who were married (Deslippe, 2000).”

Protectionists felt that they were protecting the industries from being brought down by women’s work. They also felt that these laws would protect the family and help produce healthy children. However, laws that were meant to protect women defined them as the atypical worker and not included in the “freedom of contract” doctrine that informed male workers struggles. It also locked women into a category defined by physical stamina and moral character that held strong for decades. Women could not ask for childcare facilities or police patrols around factories where they were required to work nights. Women were being held to a different set of standards than their male counterparts.

**Women and the Union**

Even though today a significant majority of women work outside the home because of necessity or a need for fulfillment, Cunnison and Stageman say:

It can be argued that most women have three fairly distinct working lives, structured by the system of reproduction (Cunnison, 1987). During the first life, from leaving school until the birth of children, women’s concerns revolve largely around romantic and domestic relationships. During the second life, until children reach their mid-teens, women tend to be preoccupied with servicing and caring for the family. Women reach their third working life when the pressure of caring for children is lifted (though it may be replaced by caring for elderly parents). In the first life paid employment is perceived as secondary in importance to establishing domestic relations, often as a temporary prelude to home and children (Pollert, 1981; Westwood, 1984). In
consequence, interest in unionism tends to be low. In the second,
preoccupations with domestic responsibilities limit most women to part-time
work, and they have little time or energy for trade unionism. In the third,
relationships at work may become more important to them. They have more
time to think about their situation though, by then, they are often trapped in
low-status jobs. Time and energy no longer present practical barriers to trade
union activity, and more women show interest.

In the early years of trade unions, women had little access; the unions were
considered “men only.” Male union leaders (Adolph Strasser - Cigar Makers
International Union and founding member of American Federation of Labor (AFL))
supported protectionist laws as they saw them as protecting the weaker members of
society – women. They maintained that it was the duty of government not the union to
take care of women’s needs. However, there was a hidden agenda of union leaders and
that was to keep more women from entering the workplace, and keep them from
moving up and into more lucrative positions. The cry for women to remain in their
place as homemakers was especially prevalent when there was a shortage of jobs or
when men saw that women would be used as cheap labor. The unions went as far as
fining employers who instructed women in more highly skilled jobs and positions that
were usually reserved for male unionists. Employers ignored the myth that women
belonged back in the home when it suited their economic outlook or in times of war.
Women flocked to jobs normally done by men during these times (Kopelov, 1976).

Even though women had been part of the union system from the late eighteenth
century, it was not until the nineteenth century and up until the First World War that
women started to become more organized. At that time the cotton unions, federations
of local weaver’s, spinners’ and other cotton worker’s trade unions organized the greatest number of women out of all the trade unions. The nineteenth century saw a drop in wages that caused women unionist to strike alongside men. During this difficult time rioting broke out. Both men and women were in the streets fighting for their rights. In the South and the Northeast cross-gender strikes led to strategies that in many cases were supported by families. Familial connections could invoke both inflammatory behavior or commitments as well as ambivalence based on whether family members worked at the same company or at opposing companies (DeVault, 2004).

Handloom weaving had historically been a male occupation; being a position of prestige. When wages fell women nudged their way into those positions that many men came to believe was beneath them. Women were then in position to take over the positions that came about because of the newly invented power looms. Some men held onto jobs that used hand looms, but when this market finally gave way, they had to move to the factories where women were already working. An equal pay system developed, but men brought hostility to the workplace, arguing that married women should not be allowed to work outside the home, and that they alone should be given what amounted to a family based wage (Cunnison, 1993).

During this period women were under-represented in the hierarchy of the unions, but because they had maneuvered themselves into jobs they otherwise would not have had they set precedents that held and inspired feminists later on. These
precedents included the right for married women to work outside the home, the creation of mixed-sex craft unions and in some areas the right to skilled work and equal pay (Cunnison, 1993).

The early part of the nineteenth century also heralded the feminist values promoted by the Owenite movement. Their pamphlet, titled *An Appeal to One-Half of the Human Race* promoted equal pay, a woman’s right to paid employment and the right to be able to take on jobs that had heretofore been solely held by men. In addition, the Owenites set about creating a union that was to be all-inclusive. The Grand National Consolidated Trade Union (GNCTU) was founded in 1833. Unfortunately, men’s anger with working women continued to play out in the union, and it finally collapsed within a year.

During that year the warring factions had created organizations within the union that were gender-specific. Men were determined to keep women out of the ruling hierarchy and out of what they considered to be their roles and organizations. With the collapse of Owenism men firmly took over craft-based unions. They controlled the number of perspective employees by controlling the number of apprentices and those apprenticeships were limited to males. There were a few crafts that men could not control as far as gender, but they did control the better paying jobs; keeping women from earning top dollar. The male dominated craft unions came together as a loosely organized national association which was establish in 1868,
called the Trade Union Congress (TUC). This organization, from its very beginning, was male defined.

In the United States farm girls were being encouraged by employers to work in factories until they married. To keep it respectable, boarding houses and dormitories were built to house the young women who were away from home. The employers even included cultural events (Lewis, 1999), educational and literary opportunities to try and satisfy these young women’s growing disenchantment with their surroundings. Lowell was portrayed as a model town. Despite the amenities of the town the average length of stay in the local jobs was three years whether the young women had plans to be married or not (DeVault, 2004).

One of these employers was the Lowell Mill and the young employees were known as the Lowell Mill Girls then later when they unionized creating the first female only employment based organization, the Lowell Female Labor Reform Association (LFLRA) their members were known as Lowell operatives (DeVault, 2004). In 1834 the women went on strike. Their cause, wage cuts, poor work environment and the company’s attempt to stop unionization. Originally 800 women went on strike, but eventually the number grew to over 2000. The women refused to take wage cuts and said that they would stay out of work as a group or return to work as a group.

In 1836 the women went on strike again. This time to rebel against the rents that were been demanded at the boarding houses and to try and nullify the control that
mill owners tried to keep over their daily lives. Both these strikes ended in defeat but the women were not finished. They turned to the Female Labor Reform Association (LFLRA) to try an address their issues (Kopelov, 1976).

Sarah Bagley who was the first president of the LFLRA testified before the Massachusetts house, describing the poor working conditions that these young women had to work under. She fought for the 10 hour work day and resisted speed-ups. She asked for protective laws to be passed. She became the editor of The Voice of Industry for a brief time and even though women did not have suffrage at the time, Bagley’s influence was so strong that she was able to get the committee chairman of the FLRA, William Schouler, a Lowell newspaper publisher, tossed out of his position. This would later have repercussions when Schouler led a smear campaign against Bagley (Kopelov, 1976).

The union eventually went on strike with between 13,000 and 18,000 women on the picket lines. Mill owners were surprised when even the non-union women walked off jobs or stayed away. Women were admonished “To act like men. Be manly.”

There was a great deal of sympathy from the community for the strikers. The strike grew to other locations including the Lawrence hosiery mill where the employer fired 15 women for just attending a strike meeting one evening. The company labeled them trouble makers and said they were a disruptive influence to the harmony of the work environment. Unfortunately, the union was unable to bargain with owners of the
mills so joined ranks with the New England Workingman’s Association. Gradually, as the young farm girls became more disillusioned, leaving their jobs behind, they were replaced with Irish immigrant women who had to deal with even worse working conditions. Women’s textile unions faded from the forefront.

In 1860 shoe workers went on strike, 5000 men and 1000 women walked the picket lines despite an enormous snow storm. During this period 1800 women came together to form the Daughters of St. Crispin. This was the first nationally organized women’s union to come into existence. By the end of the year there were union lodges in Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Wisconsin, California and Ohio (Kopelov, 1976). This union’s predominant issue was equal pay for equal work. The union was modeled on the already established group the Knights of St. Crispin who were in support of this women’s group. The first president of this group was Carrie Wilson. Prior to the depression of the 1870s St. Crispin women went out on strike, but it took the support of the Knights of St. Crispin for them to get their jobs back. The ensuing depression put an end to the Daughters of St. Crispin (Lewis, 1999).

In 1863, in Troy, New York there was created the Collar Laundry Union (CLU) which was made up entirely of women. These women worked in large laundries starching and pressing the men’s shirt collars that were in style at the time. Their 1863 strike raised the pay of the women workers from approximately $8.00 per
week to $14.00 per week. The CLU’s leader Kate Mullaney became assistant secretary of the National Labor Union (NLU).

By 1901, 20 percent of the workforce in the United States was made up of women. Unionism in general was discouraged by employers but within the ranks of women it was beginning to pick up steam especially among garment and clothing workers who were predominantly female immigrants. Also, during this time there were other struggles for petticoat butchers (meat cutters), waitresses, and teachers, textile and boot and shoe workers, tobacco workers, laundresses and fur workers, whose groups were centered in Chicago, Massachusetts, Virginia, San Francisco and New York.

In 1912 there finally began the Bread and Roses strike. Women held up signs saying “We Want Bread, but Roses Too!” This meant that they not only wanted the wages that brought sustenance and a roof over their heads, but also they wanted to be treated as human beings with their human needs considered.

By 1892 an estimated 142,000 women were members of women’s trade unions. By 1913 the figure had risen to over 433,000. The cotton industry’s female unionists comprised the largest membership. In the 1880s a growing number of women joined general unions; unions that had no specific occupations to represent. These unions also were less inclined to the male-only standard, although the overwhelming majority of members were still men.
In 1906, Mary Macarthur founded the National Federation of Women Workers (NFWW). This federation was a combination of many of the female-only occupational societies that existed at that time. Its purpose was to eventually join with the men’s movement but from the start it was very active and did the most to secure the place of women unionists (Cunnison, 1993).

Groups like the Women’s Co-operative Guild and the National Union of Women’s Suffrage Societies started organizing women, especially unionists, in the fight for the vote. Violence and property destruction became a tool for furthering the goals of many radical suffragists. They also fought for minimum wage and protection from manufacturing abuses of women. World War I saw more women entering the workplace and the demand for the right to vote became crucial.

In 1921 the NFWW merged with the Workers’ Union, creating a general union that catered to both men and women, the General Workers’ Union. Although, to begin with, women were given special representation within the union, because the union was made up of predominantly men, the men were able to organize and maneuver to rid themselves of that special female representation. What remained of women’s power resided in the post of Chief Woman Officer which was filled by Margaret Bondfield.

A similar situation played out when the Women’s Trade Union League merged with the TUC. Only two seats were established for women on the General Council and a committee to address women’s issues was set up, but because the committee was so
heavily male constituted the committee soon came under fire for little action. Although women were now part of unions, and women desperately needed the unions, they were considered inferior to men and so had to pay heavy costs for any advances that were made.

During World War I and II women were encouraged to take over men’s positions and jobs while the men were off fighting, but as soon as the wars were over old habits took over and men made it near impossible for women to continue working in those positions. In addition, national bargaining agreements were negotiated to uphold the principle of the family wage for men only, which enforced the practice of unequal pay for men and women.

During the interim years between wars bargaining also took place to keep women out of the workplace. There was high unemployment during this time and even though women were still members of the union, men used the union to keep control of what women were able to do. Women were feared as cheap labor and men saw any gains made by them as personal threats to their livelihoods, but counter to this was the fact that women’s membership in the unions helped prop the unions up from a dramatic decline in male membership. Unions were encouraging men to support their wives and daughters in membership in unions and pressured them to pay the union dues for them (Cunnison, 1993).

In the 1920s women unionists became angered by the tight control men had over their women’s advisory delegate conference held in 1925. They felt that the male
dominated national Women’s Group of the TUC held too strong a sway over the conference and ignored their wishes and so no further conferences were held until 1931. This conference was put together in response to the decline in women members of the union. This conference was renamed to be the Conference of Unions Catering for Women (CUCW). Since then advisory conferences have been held every year (Cunnison, 1993).

The goal of the women unionists, led by teaching and clerical unions, was to gain equal pay. These unions were not to be affiliated with the TUC that dealt mainly with the private sector. These unions were to become integral parts overseen by the Civil Service Equal Pay Committee. This group of unions was also attached to a non-union group- the Status of Women Committee. These groups continued to campaign for equal pay while the TUC argued against it until in 1951 when equal pay for white-collar civil servants and local authority employees was gradually phased in, ending in 1961. During this time the TUC continually argued that equal pay would add to inflationary problems.

In 1970 Barbara Castle, Minister of Labour, committed to the Equal Pay Act that would apply to all workers. In addition, laws making it illegal to discriminate based on race and ethnicity were passed. Unfortunately, unions failed to address these issues, leaving Asian and black workers to find their own ways of dealing with discrimination.
The 1980s saw the limiting of union activities. Laws that had previously been enacted to support unions were now being looked at by the government as unhealthy for the economy. While the unions were busy fighting these onslaughts to their very being, they were also losing members. Their response was to campaign to bring in new members, especially women. The Women’s Advisory Conference lost “advisory” as part of the name and they set aside additional seats for women on the General Council. Unionists and feminists came together in their fight against sexual harassment, and discrimination against Lesbians and disabled women.

Sadly, gender problems within the union continued. Women did not see the union as a support for their economic needs. Job classifications and job grading were direct reflections of the patriarchal system. Men had a much wider variety of job classifications than women while women were squeezed in to two or three classifications, In addition, men’s job classifications were graded at a higher level, and thus awarded higher pay. An example of this was the group of men that had jobs as porters. This label was broken down into three different classifications and pay grades. This allowed for men to be able to move up in rank and pay while women who were doing jobs like cleaning, clerking, nursing and other jobs were lumped into one for nurses and the rest into one or two major groups. There was no upward mobility in the jobs set aside for women.

Additionally, the system of shop stewards was also set up to favor of men. Each job classification was represented by its own steward. With men having the more
numerous categories, when it came to decision making the numbers ostensibly left women out of the process. Furthermore, when there was no female steward to have say on issues, men went ahead and made decisions for the women in the union without surveying the membership (Cunnison, 1993). Women, however, were never in a position where they were making decisions for the male union members.

Shop stewards, also, had a habit of meeting after work for drinks. There was much discussion and decision making going on at these meetings. If women were to join them for drinks the stewards saw it as reason for not supporting higher wages for women. Their reasoning was that women only needed money for drinks and cigarettes, frivolous things indeed. They hypocritically did not see that they themselves were spending their money in the same way. The idea that women work for “pin money” has had long reaching effects. Even today, there is the unspoken idea that women do not need as much money as men, because they have a husband or significant other to bring home the living wage and that women work to buy extras.

Marginalizing also took place in the form of the union meeting agendas. The union secretaries were generally men and they controlled what was to be placed on the agenda for each meeting. The position of secretary was powerful because it controlled which issues could be discussed and what issues were important to the union. Women’s issues very rarely made it to the agenda, and so women could never voice the problems they saw in the workplace, and when they attempted to bring these issues forward they were shouted down or summarily dismissed as being out of order.
Women’s work or employment issues were also marginalized by categorizing them as personal issues. Shop stewards then assumed that because women issues were personal, the union had no business involving itself. One of the unfortunate side effects of this way of thinking was that it sent messages to women that their problems were individual and that they should be able to take care of them themselves. As it happened, one of the “personal” issues happened to be intimidating attitudes of management toward the female employees. This resulted in numerous absences and health issues brought about by work conditions and stress. This situation was fraught with missed opportunities for the union.

If the union had looked at the problems in a more public or global fashion they would have been able to not only make a bigger impact on the employers but they would have giving women a reason to participate and support the union as something relevant, impactful and necessary. Had they taken on management’s poor control of supervisory behavior they would have perhaps cut absenteeism and increased female workers’ satisfaction with their jobs and the union.

The patriarchal norms of society also played into this gender power issue. When it came to the union election of officers it was normal for women to follow the patriarchal notion that men were the more fit for jobs of power. Instead of women voting for women, they voted for men thus continuing the legacy of the patriarchal system. Women who were in the subordinate position colluded with the dominant
group even though they may have disagreed with their particular positions. They were, also, often pressured to do so.

Additionally, women’s employment issues had strong familial ties; whether it was the necessity for women to divide their time between work and family life and make sure neither were left feeling as if they had been cheated, or the situation that many women found themselves in and that was as support mechanism for their husbands who were also in the union system (Cunnison, 1993). Women’s divided attention set them up as victims of a system that was having difficulty playing fair and often marginalized their needs and issues.

In 1979 unions experienced what was known as the Winter of Discontent. Unrest started in December. A number of unions across the country and across occupations shared experiences that caused the members to strike in February and March. However, the strikes did not accomplish what they set out to accomplish and there was considerable backlash. It was a dark period for unions and women in general, but what women gained in knowledge from their experiences during this period caused their attitudes about rights to change substantially.

While men were using underhanded tactics to keep women in low-paying, low-level jobs and kept them from gaining power in the union women were beginning to awaken to these practices. Union education in consciousness and rights played a large part in how women changed their views and confidence level. Eventually, women began challenging the union system. They fought against male practices that were
based on what men saw as women’s ambivalence and lack of confidence. However, 
women were more likely to fight for equal pay rather than against low pay. They were 
only beginning to understand they were being undervalued.

**Unionists and Feminists**

In 1974 a group of feminists created the Working Women’s Charter Group. 
Trade unions were to be the basis of social change, but they were to work hand in- 
hand with women outside the union framework. The aim was to improve the wages 
and lives of low-paid women, mostly blue collar, but in actuality it tended to improve 
the work and wage outlook for white-collar women. While working on these 
endeavors some non-union women attempted to gain access to union committees and 
councils. The political fall-out was the disbanding of many union councils but still 
unionists attempted to incorporate feminist techniques and beliefs into their meetings 
and work plans (Cunnison, 1993).

Charters and Lists of Aims aimed at improving the lives and wages of working 
women were established by various groups and some were accepted by large groups of 
unionists but the TUC opposed or refused to support each one of them. It was not until 
the TUC’s own Women’s Advisory Conferences led to the NWAC producing its own 
List of Aims that a list was then approved by the TUC. The 1974 version of the 
Charter was to not only include wage, education, and employment issues, but went so
far as to include sex discrimination in law, tax and mortgages and claimed the right to paid maternity leave, as well as included a childcare provision.

There has been an uneasy working arrangement between unionist women and feminists even though they have worked together to accomplish a great deal. Dorothy Cobble, in her book *Women and Unions* says that in recent years feminist scholars have taken a new look at unions and that they have become more open to the idea that unions have become less antagonistic towards the needs of women, and ask, under what conditions can unions represent the aspirations of women? She also says that feminist scholars are now looking at the class-biased scholarship that presumes that unions are all-powerful which in turn requires from unionists a standard of self-sacrifice and heroic measures when required. These demands of union membership have never been required of any other class (Cobble, 1993).

Across the board and across the nation unionists have had great influence in getting equality for women in their working lives and in their personal lives. Where women had once been relegated to gender specific jobs they now feel and have the right to vie for jobs that have historically been male. Feminists are now seeing unions as a mechanism to push forward on all fronts the agenda of the economic and personal rights that are important to women.

However, unionist women fought against the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) when it was first introduced in the 1920s. Union women were afraid that it would undo what gains had been made by the Protectionist Laws. They “Saw it as operating
like ‘a blind man with a shot gun.’” They worried that the ERA language was “that of liberal individualism (Cunnison, 1993).”

While many unionists consider themselves feminists, they are well aware of some of the negative connotations surrounding its belief system and what it bestows upon them. Many feel that their work in the union is an extension of their work for social justice. They know they may have to defend their beliefs in feminist justice on a daily basis. They feel their belief in feminism has developed to new dimensions over time while working within the union. Their sense of agency has developed as a response to the day-to-day struggle they have in keeping their jobs in male dominated industries (Fonow, 2003).

Mary Margaret Fonow’s book, *Union Women: Forging Feminism in the United Steelworkers of America*, is about the United Steelworkers of America (USWA) and how the 700,000 workers in the United States and Canada have watched as union feminism has emerged and solidified within its midst. The women had to find new ways to organize and make the union more flexible to their needs. They had to look at their resources and networks in new ways, and look at the combining of the labor movement with the feminist movement so as to make them more responsive to the needs of unionists in the political arena as well as to the interests of workers, women and citizens. She says that to move on to the twenty-first century, the union movement must be informed by the feminist movement as well as other social movements (Fonow, 2003).
Women’s Voices

One of the best known and most courageous of the labor leaders was Mother Jones (Mary Harris Jones), once labeled “the most dangerous woman in America (AFL-CIO).” Starting her labor union activities at about the age of 50, she spent a good 50 years fighting for the rights and economic justice for women in mining villages, and mill and industrial towns (Lewis). Her life was a progression of harassment, imprisonment and threats, but her motto was, “Pray for the dead and fight like Hell for the living (Kopelov, 1976).”

She inspired men, and compelled their wives and daughters to fight for their workers’ rights. She used any tactic she could think of to get men to fight including embarrassing them by telling them she had been arrested more than once and would probably get arrested again but said the important thing was to continue the struggle. She became one of the founders of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW, the “Wobblies”) (Lewis).

Her organizing was original. She would get crowds of children to parade with signs saying they wanted an education and not to have to work in the mines. She welcomed people of color into the struggle and organized groups of women with mops and brooms to guard the mines from scabs. She became “Mother Jones” to thousands of striker when in 1897 she rallied thousands of men in a nation-wide strike for the
bituminous (soft coal) miners. She was so successful she was asked to go into the coal fields and sign up miners for membership in the union.

However, not all was pleasantries and success. She was banished from some towns, arrested in others and kept on house arrest, charged with a capital offense, until the people of the country arose in protests and made the governor release her.

Mother Jones was also concerned about child labor practices. During a strike to reduce the work week of child workers in the silk industry Jones marched a group of 100 children from the textile mill of Philadelphia to New York City. She wished to show the well-to-do the grievances the children had. She also led them to President Theodore Roosevelt’s Long Island home. Her last strike was in support of Chicago dressmakers. The strike was ill-fated and Jones died soon after at the age, some think, of 100 (AFL-CIO).

In their book, *Rocking the Boat: Union Women’s Voices, 1915 – 1975*, Brigid O’Farrell and Joyce L Kornbluh say that there are 5 major areas of collective action that the women they interviewed conveyed.

1. Organization of women into unions
2. The need for shared leadership and the need for women to have positions of leadership in unions
3. The building of bridges to other organizations that allows women to establish effective coalitions that bring to the forefront issues that are important to women and minorities, with the aim at creating solutions.
4. Bringing about women’s education programs
5. Establishing organizations that are involved in the political realm. To support those in power or to be actively involved in legislative and political arenas.

The first area saw women organizing to participate in everything from strikes to soup kitchens, and from political fights to fights to gain leadership positions. Their need to fight sexism, racism and classism outside and inside the union required women to work together. They worked to open doors to better jobs, better wages and better work conditions; things that could not be fought on an individual basis. They testified in public hearings, demonstrated and went on strike to gain the collective goals.

The second area was based on the knowledge that there needed to be a sharing of leadership. Women could not sit back and not challenge the lack of female leadership in most unions. So to remedy this problem, committees were created and training on the needs of union memberships and education on how to be leaders was set up. In addition, training on workplace and union issues was created. Women were encouraged and supported in their running for leadership positions. Female unionists were encouraged to toughen their skins in their run for offices and in their interactions with employers, managers, union officials and union members. They had to learn how to fight stereotypes within their unions; even within female majority unions.

The third area of importance was the creation of coalitions. Groups like the Women’s Trade Union League, the National Consumers’ League and the Young
Women’s Christian Association (YWCA) as well as the Jewish Labor Committee came together by having women work within each group to address issues that crossed different economic and political arenas. Many of these women worked on civil rights issues as well as labor issues in groups like National Organization for Women (NOW) and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). In some cases these women also worked internationally. Maida Springer-Kemp worked in Africa for the International Women’s Year which reached out to women around the world (O’Farrell, Kornbluh, 1996).

The fourth area to be addressed was education. Training and educational programs were set up to teach or educate women to be union organizers and to understand trade unions. Many of the women started out in these programs as learners but went on to become mentors and trainers themselves. In 1914 the Women’s Trade Union League, the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers, and the government-sponsored programs under the New Deal were some of the first major programs of this type.

The fifth area of importance is the political participation of unions and their members. They work for laws to be passed that will improve their lives. In 1935, the National Labor Relations Act gave them the right to join a union. In addition, there is the Fair Labor Standards Act, passed in 1938, which stipulated a start of a minimum wage and opened up the possibility of negotiating for better wages. The 1964 passing of the Civil Right Act and the Voting Rights Act both were created to establish better
lives for people. These laws were all in part, supported by unionist lobbying, registering people to vote and running for office by women working for their unions (O’Farrell, Kornbluh, 1996).

Feminist unionists have participated in raising awareness and fighting for such things as pay equity, minimum wage and childcare. They have stressed that women can only achieve their goals by collective bargaining not by the individual’s fight for upward mobility. The women of O’Farrell’s and Kornbluh’s book showed that the protectionist laws that were prevalent in the early 1900s while on the surface effective in providing more safety on the job for women also kept women from achieving equal pay or upward mobility. The only way for these to change was for women to take to the streets and poles and voice their anger and frustration at their less than adequate treatment in the working environment. New strategies were needed to encourage and organize women in unions. The most affected women are women in part-time or contingent type jobs. Women unionists have as a whole achieved higher wages and better working conditions than their counterparts outside of the union.

In order to continue the work and to make work conditions even better, more women need to be in union leadership positions. They need to be in committees, go to workshops and gain an overall clearer position in the union. Coalitions like the ones used to help pass the Civil Rights Act, the Family and Medical Leave Act and the Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978 were made up of unions and women’s organizations. These coalitions, today, are still working for legislation to make work
and pay more equitable and work for programs that revolve around health and child care.

Women like Lillian Herstein have worked their whole lives as union members to better the treatment of women. She was a delegate from the Chicago teacher unions to the Chicago Federation of Labor (CFL) and was the only woman on the executive board for 25 years. She was also a leader in the Chicago Women’s Trade Union League and taught at Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers. In addition, she headed the Chicago WPA workers’ education program during the depression. In 1920 she and other unionists marched for the right to vote for women (O’Farrell, Kornbluh, 1996).

Lillian was encouraged by John Fitzpatrick of the International Union of Journeymen Horseshoers, and president of the Chicago Federation of Labor to become more active in union activities. Her response was to start talking on street corners and in union halls. Just as the Women’s Trade Union League in England had done earlier, she and others worked to organize women into trade unions and fought for protective legislature for working women and children in the work environment. Lillian was an active unionist during the 1918 miners’ strike and the 1919 steelworkers’ strike as well as other strikes, and organizational programs.

Lillian was also one of the first instructors at the Bryn Mawr Summer School for women. At a time when the WTUL was busy creating education programs, in the 1920s and 1930s, for women in industrial areas, the Bryn Mawr School served to
teach women factory workers about American society and, the democratic process and how they could use that process to better their own conditions. The school was supported by the philanthropist John D. Rockefeller, Jr. At first women were suspicious of the aims of the school, and outside the school the media and others described the school as a communist revolution. Despite the naysayers, finally, the membership was in the hundreds from all over the country. They were all women that worked with tools of the trade; none could be in a supervisory position.

Along the way, the issue of allowing waitresses into the school came up. At first members were reluctant to allow them to join because the members saw them as immoral women because they made dates with men they waited on. Finally, it was decided that the waitresses would not have to rely on tips that they received by smiling and flirting with men if they were members of a union and gained better wages. It was also, decided that waitresses should then be allowed to enroll in the school.

Another difficulty was the admission of African American women to the Bryn Mawr school. The students voted to allow their admission even though they knew it would mean that some women would no longer want to participate in the school. In the end they discovered they learned more about the working world because of their new attendees then any of them could previously conceive (O’Farrell, Kornbluh, 1996).

Lillian eventually worked to create the first all African American union, the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters. It was a difficult task because every time groups
came together for discussing the possibilities spies would infiltrate and word would get back to employers. The day after the meetings would see men being fired but eventually with the help of Philip Randolph a self sustaining union was created; one that did not rely on another union or group to keep it moving in the right direction. Three white people were heralded in celebration of the new union for their support and help, Mary McDowell, Chicago economics professor Paul Douglas and Lillian Herstein.

Starting in 1920 Lillian Herstein became busy in Politics, eventually working in 1936 for the support of Franklin Roosevelt’s campaign for re-election. In turn, Eleanor Roosevelt became active in the Women’s Trade Union League of New York and then went on to the National Women’s Trade Union League (WTUL). With the help of Eleanor Roosevelt and Lillian the WTUL reestablished the annual convention; something that had not happened since the early depression.

At age 85 Lillian was still active in union business. She wrote articles and taught classes. She said that, “all the reason that operated for discrimination against women in universities and professions operated among unions.” She said that union men thought that women were only in industry temporarily and that eventually they would go back to being housewives and mothers. She felt that they did not even attempt to organize women and African Americans who she felt were two pools of labor left untouched and this was a weakness of the American Federation of Labor. Lillian also thought that women and unions should be working for equal pay even
though she knew that it was an uphill fight. Conversely, she felt that being a housewife and mother was something to be respected and that women who stayed at home should be allowed to do so without feeling inferior.

**Unions Today and Their Impact and Issues**

Today, the most important issues facing union members are: sexual harassment, pay equity, and pregnancy and family leave. Women are still fighting for their rights for equal pay even within their own unions. The improvement or lessening of the wage gap between men and women in the 1980s can be attributed more to the stagnation of men’s wages rather than the increase in women’s wages.¹ Membership in unions dropped from 34 to 8 percent for men and from 16 to 6 percent for women from 1973 to 2007. Wage inequality increased by 40 percent during this time (Western, 2011). Traditional values of male dominance still pervaded the union landscape making it difficult for women to show their relevance in the workplace. With women verging on making up the majority of the workforce it is an important time to be looking at how the union can be used to support the needs and issues that face them. Women can no longer be considered the secondary wage. In many cases they are single parents and the only wage earner and in other cases they are the primary wage earner in a two adult household.

---

Women are more and more working in jobs in the service industry that is no longer made up of centralized workplaces. These employers generally have staffs of fewer than fifty employees. The women employees tend not to have any attachment or loyalty to any one employer. In addition, there is a movement to different work schedules: part-time and contingent work, flexibility in hours, and shorter hours that makes it more important that unions adjust their way of doing business.

In Cynthia Cranford’s article *Constructing Union Motherhood: Gender and Social Reproduction in the Los Angeles “Justice for Janitors” Movement* the issue became social or familial reproduction. The family was the basis for union action during the 1980’s, 90’s to 2000. Cranford says that in her article she shows that the women leaders of the movement constructed a “union motherhood.” She addresses the problem of gender inequalities in social reproduction that the explicit value of care giving undermines in union politics (Cranford, 2007).

Unions were built with the white, blue-collar male in mind with the traditional eight to five workday as the basis. The framework for the union has revolved around a manufacturing or craft base for the better part of a century, but today even though for some unions this is still relevant, the workplace has changed so much that new insights into the working relationships between worker, employer and union needs to take place. What was pertinent to yesterday’s workforce may no longer be in place or may have evolved into something quite different. There is a challenge in how unions organize and represent their new members. The union must, also, acknowledge the
changing personal and familial needs of their membership. Cranford says that making
care giving visible brings it out of the biological defined realms and makes it gender
neutral in union politics and in the public arena. The J4J or Justice for Janitors action
was brought about by the international union working with the Service Employees
International Union (SEIU), Local 399. The action started as a small, local effort but
the ground swell took in many areas and counties of the Los Angeles area. The action
between 1995 and 2000 took in both men and women for development of leadership
and incorporating families as its roots.

However, economist John Schmitt says that in the last three decades the typical
United States worker has seen his/her wages stagnate or decline and the more recent
economic downturn has made women’s situations increasingly dire. Furthermore, the
privatization and deregulation of many jobs has added to the difficulty for many in as
much as the employer has more power and has less motivation, their eye on profit, to
provide living wages. Jobs that have traditionally been held by women are now being
contracted out to private companies who hire non-English speaking workers and
women who can only work part-time. The workers are less likely to fight for higher
wages because they feel they have little choice for employment (Lowen, 2010).

Cunnison and Stageman make the following points.

Pay differentials are usually thought of as corresponding to differences
in skill and training. Skill, however, is largely a subjective notion:
conventional ideas about what factors determine skill have been socially
constructed over many years. Trade unions have been largely instrumental in
this process. Countless agreements made at grass-roots level and others made
at national level have contributed to currently accepted definitions and hierarchies of skill. Nearly all such agreements have been dominated by men. And this is one of the main reasons why men’s jobs have become regarded as skilled while women’s are seen as unskilled, why men’s wage rates are so much higher than women’s (cf. Westwood, 1984:233).

They charge that unionists and academics have characterized women as “the problem” rather than the opposite that men are the underlying problem of why women have had difficulty in achieving equality or relevance in their unions. It has been somewhat like the issue of blaming the victim for the crime. They say that in part the issue has been in the vantage point of where skills come from.

Men make the assumption that skills and traits that women possess come from their function as homemaker and family caregiver. Skills like multi-tasking and social networking are irrelevant even though many job positions include them in their list of job requirements.

In recent times multi-tasking has come under fire from some experts saying that it is an inefficient way of working and is, in fact, dangerous. However, in different research, it has been shown that men shy away from multitasking and find it uncomfortable if not impossible to maintain in the home and workplace while women tend to be more successful and accurate. While the practice of multitasking has taken hits from different areas, the United States military has shown that the ability of infantry to be able to multitask has contributed to their ability to stay alive in combat situations (Criss). Brandy Criss’s research shows that while both men and women can
produce the same amount of work while multitasking, women were, in fact, more accurate in theirs. So why are women not paid more for this skill?

Viewed from the male side of the union, it is perhaps not a surprise that a skill that appears be more gender specific to women and is required for certain types of jobs that women have historically filled, that men should refuse to allow for higher wages to compensate for the ability and refuse to acknowledge it as a necessary work trait. Up until recently multitasking has been qualified as “just something women do.”

When the culture of women has been used with conscious effort to counter male domination in the workplace there has been greater strides made to increase women’s wages and to deal with what has been categorized as women’s issues. When women come together as a group separate to men’s to work in concert and focus on what is fair and just for them they have been able to face up to men’s sometimes violent opposition.

Women, however, need to take stock of the abilities they have and give worth to those abilities. Until women do so they will have difficulty countering in any effective way the block employers and male unionists have put up against fair wages. Using the words of Cunnison and Stageman, what women have experienced has been “the self-fulfilling prophecy of irrelevance.” For union women it is not just about raising gender consciousness, it is about developing a consciousness of their identity as unionists and gaining respect for themselves and their abilities (Cunnison, 1993).
Recently historians have discovered that union women have been invisible in the emergence of second-wave feminism.

In today’s economy it is important to remember that not all women can or want to go to college. Many women become part of the ever expanding service sector. For these women the union has been the mechanism to help them close the wage gap that is evident even today in not only the areas based on education or lack thereof but also in the still prominent gap between men and women (Lowen, Linda, 2010). Linda Lowen says, “There’s a one-hundred percent private sector solution for declining earnings – a union that’s going to negotiate better wages for workers.”

In 1999, the Coalition of Labor Union Women (CLUW) met in Chicago. Gloria Johnson, the CLUW national president pointed out that, “You don’t get justice by swapping recipes; you get it by fighting for it. That’s why we’re here to continue the fight for economic justice for women and minorities.” Linda Chavez-Thompson, AFL-CIO executive vice president, said she would like to tell everyone that the fight for equality and justice was over, but she said she could not. She said there were three areas that must be addressed:

1. Help women to organize
2. Diversify union leadership
3. Advance working women’s issues, especially pay equity
Chavez-Thompson felt that helping women organize was the single most important aspect to the fight, but she also felt that the fight was also to get the union leadership more representative of the membership they serve.

On the political front during the gathering Steelworkers President George Becker said that union pressure had led to the stoppage of the worst parts of the Contract on America that was drafted by then House Speaker Newt Gingrich and Maxine Waters commented, “That no president can now be elected without the active support of the labor movement (Gaboury, 1999).”

John Schmitt sees the union as the solution to the difference in wage scales and the problems brought about by the dismal economic outlook. He says that the union and its bargaining power have the most plausible and positive impact on worker’s wages, insurance and pension plans given the eroding power of the individual (Lowen, 2010). In addition, in general, compared to the non-union sector, he says, union women have a two dollar or 11.2 percent advantage in wage scale, (Schmitt, 2008). Schmitt also says that female unionists are 19 percent more likely to have employer-paid insurance and 25 percent more likely to have employer-funded pension plans.

**Patriarchy**

Feminists describe the system where men have the dominant position in society as patriarchal. This system sets men at the top of the hierarchy or class system. Those men at the top of the hierarchy give power to those beneath to have power over
those that are in turn beneath them. This, as a result, gives men power over groups of women. Men rely on each other to sustain their dominance. It is a set of social relations between men which has a material base and even though it is hierarchical in nature, it has established or created an interdependency among men that enables them to dominate women (Hartmann, 2003). “The sexual division of labor outside of the family, in the labor market, keeps women financially dependent on men even when they earn a wage themselves,” so says Heidi Hartmann.

The patriarchy supports capitalist control and fights against struggles against it. To work against the negative results women should not be talked out of the urgency and importance of their tasks. There must be a concerted effort to fight coercion to abandon feminist objectives.

Mary Daly said that, “Loving ordinarily is good, but under patriarchy, loving can become, for women, a form of total self-sacrifice or martyrdom.” Women cannot thrive as long as they subscribe to the morality of victimization, she stressed in Gyn/Ecology that women cannot even survive as long as they remain in patriarchy (French, 2009).”

The history of unions has its beginnings in the exclusion and discrimination against women. In late 1800s and early 1900s, unionists saw women as competition for wages and jobs. This was thought to threaten men’s job security. Unions were supportive of the patriarchal system in work and families. This position finally manifested itself as the family wage ideology which conveyed the notion that the
working class had a right to the “ideal” family which included the gender roles of men as wage earners and women having domestic responsibilities (Crain, 2007).

In unions, the patriarchal system remains in some areas while feminist ideas have taken over others. Across an organization and between different organizations like unions patriarchy persists depending on the focus within a group or from group to group. Early models that suggested that all patriarchal practices had collapsed were in fact inaccurate. Today there are still remnants found in most unions despite good intentions. In some situations patriarchal customs were not merely set aside for a more feminist or liberal culture but became a hybrid of both (Cuneo, 2011).

**Single Women**

Women that are single face numerous daunting obstacles whether they have chosen to be single from the start, have chosen to end a marriage or relationship or are widowed. According to Bella M. DePaulo and Wendy L. Morris just being single stigmatizes people. They say, “As such, they are targets of negative stereotyping, interpersonal rejection, economic disadvantage, and discrimination.” They are also considered to be less happy than their married counter-parts within their peer groups (DePaulo, 2005).

According to Jeanne M. Hilton and Tamara L Anderson one of the bases for how marriages work is the social exchange theory. They say the basic assumptions of
the exchange theory are “that (a) people are motivated by self-interest (least cost and most rewards), (b) individuals are constrained by their choices (it is more about choices than exchanges), (c) humans are rational beings (they consider alternatives and make choices based on the lease costs, which differ for every person), and (d) social relationships are characterized by interdependence (people tend to expect reciprocity and fairness in their exchanges) (Hilton, 2009).” Based on some of these issues some women choose to seek divorces to become single.

The significance of this is that midlife divorce appears to have long-term effects or consequences for these women especially in regard to their finances. Women who divorce mid-life are far less likely to have large wealth accumulations.

On the other end of the spectrum are the women who are single parents who have never been married. In the higher education environment these women students are less likely to receive warm attentions from their peers or professors. According to Jillian M. Duquaine-Watson these women receive highly “chilly” reactions in their educational environment (Duquaine-Watson, 2007).

**This Research**

Throughout the history of unions women have had to fight to gain rights and jobs. For the most part, and accept for the Lowell women, unions have focused the influence on married women with families. In this paper I attempt to explore the
experiences that single, unmarried women have in regards to their work and the union. In addition, this research will attempt to determine, based on previous research, whether these women have experienced something different to their married counterparts.

The experience women had in this research was in some situations similar to previous generations while in others it was new. In addition, based possibly on the education women were now gaining, the experience was now being perceived in new ways. The research will attempt to show how cultural patriarchy insinuated itself in how the women were treated and in how they experienced that treatment, making it, for some, difficult to consider their own needs. Interestingly enough, many of the women were aware of the inequalities in the system in which they worked and were even angry at the class system that was being perpetuated. They looked for fairness for themselves and for others who were in the same situation.

While most of the study participants were union members they all had varying relationships with the union. Some saw the union as ineffectual while others were pleased with the union’s representation but felt that it had little power to address the problems and needs they encountered. Some also felt that the university system in which they worked played fast and loose with the truth when it came to bargaining time. The union, for the most part, was not blamed for any misunderstandings that led to poor work conditions or status.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Basis for Research

Although the basis for wanting to do this research had to do with gender equity and feminism, it was not the whole story. Generally, we look at social location as gender, race, age or class; we do not always see it as marital status and how that informs the social outlook of women. All women are subjected to the effects of patriarchy based on their social location. Marital status has generally been viewed as part of the whole of gender inequality. We look at how women have been raised to believe they should be married to a man; we do not, for the most part, look at single women, whether gay or straight, and how the marriage messages have inflicted harm or made assumptions.

Over the course of union history worker’s rights have been at the forefront. During the course of that history women have had to fight to be heard and to have their rights pushed forward. The nature of women’s paid employment has changed since the industrial revolution (Walby, 1986), but family has always been a part of the union makeup with the roles of married women found in the fight and in the goals themselves. The purpose of this research was to evaluate the possible differences in viewpoints of employment needs of working women at a specific university based on their status as single (unmarried or without a spouse) women. I used historical material from the literature review to provide a basis of what married women had experienced.
The goal of my research is to provide a viewpoint of a group of single women employees at a specific university.

The study is qualitative, relying on semi-structured interviews. “At a basic level, qualitative research commonly refers to the collection and the analysis of material that seeks to uncover meaning and understanding of experience (Brayton, 1997).” We use qualitative research as a means to center the experiences of our participants and hear their voices. Qualitative research attempts to give the oppressed a voice and place participants in the subject position, expressing value for individual personal meaning and definition while looking for commonalities and themes in the responses participant give (Brayton, 1997). This study suggests commonalities of class, furloughs and most importantly the oppressive nature of the patriarchal system among participants.

**The Research**

**Procedures**

Because this research was to be qualitative in nature I chose the semi-structured interview as my methodology. It was, I felt, the best opportunity for the participants to express themselves, giving them flexibility and latitude in their answers. It also allowed me to ask additional follow up questions pertaining to what had already been revealed. Given that each participant’s experience was different, even though they all had a common employer, I was able to ascertain some major
commonalities both in the way they answered and what information they were able to provide.

**Participant Selection**

The participants for this study were all single women who were classified members of the union or those known as “fair share” who do not have voting rights with the union but are still represented by the them. My list of participants ranged from single, never married, divorced, living with a same-sex partner, and widowed. All participants were white females.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Education Level Achieved</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To find volunteers I sent a letter to the union explaining my proposed thesis research and requesting the use of their listserv to send out an email calling for volunteers. Unfortunately, the process was slow. The emails went out but the volunteer process took longer than expected. Single women, it appeared, were reluctant to participate.
My initial thoughts on doing the interviews were based on anticipation of a larger number of women volunteering. It soon became clear that this was not going to happen. I eventually went from office to office making in-person requests. It was only then that I was able to fulfill the limited number of twelve participants.

**Time and Site Selection**

Participants responded to the request for volunteers by way of emails. Contact information was included as to the best way to communicate. I called each of the participants to set up times and locations. Setting times and sites for the interviews was a long and frustrating process. It took a great deal of effort to manage the times and locations for each of the volunteers which was indicative of the busy and stress-filled lives that each of the participants led. Each interview was done in a different place so as to facilitate the experience in the best possible way for the interviewee.

Time played an important role in whether interviews could take place. Most of the women had to work around their work schedules and their children if they had them. Many of the interviews were done during lunch breaks while some were done from home via the telephone. Each time and location was agreed in advance by the interviewee. One interview was done on the 4th floor of the university library while another was done in a lactation room of the union hall. Each location was made as private as possible for the comfort of the participant.
Data Collecting Techniques

I set out with a set number of questions to be asked during the interview but because I was utilizing a semi-structured interview I allowed myself the addition of questions as the interview progressed depending on what was conveyed. The first of the questions was basically to get a baseline of who my subjects were while the rest were to try and understand the experiences of those subjects.

Interview questions

1. What is your single status, i.e. never married, married then divorced, widowed, living in same sex relationship, living with opposite sex relationship.
2. What is your educational background?
3. What salary level are you?
4. How long have you worked for the Oregon University System (OUS)?
5. What is your position or job description?
6. How long have you been a member of the union?
7. How much and in what way do you participate in union activities?
8. Please describe what your experience has been with the union.
9. Have you discovered personal or employment needs that you feel the union could address?
10. Please describe the form these needs take.
11. How do you see the union addressing them?
12. Have you contacted union representatives about your concerns?
13. If so, please describe your experience with your contact.
14. Do you feel your experience could have been different? In what way?
15. Have you ever belonged to another union?
16. Which union did you belong to?
17. Were your experiences with the other union different to those you have had with SEIU? Please explain.
18. Is there anything you would like people to know about the union?
Data Analysis

Once I had started the interview process it soon became apparent that the forthcoming answers that I had anticipated were not what I had expected. I had to change my thoughts about what was actually going on with my participants. While all of them were eager to share in the interview, most of them had not thought of themselves and their needs when it came to their jobs. Few had issues that they thought affected them specifically, while others worried about issues that affected other people. In the end it was the lack of specific personal issues that became the issue. Also, there could not be overlooked, the problem of class or hierarchy and furloughs that kept popping up and were collective problems among all the subjects.

My analysis of the study had to change in its framework from what were the needs to why there was not a multitude of needs if any expressed. I began my study with some deductive reasoning but soon found that I needed to turn to inductive reasoning to deal with the difference in data (Thorne, 2000). I turned to negative case analysis (True) to view my resulting research, looking at what was not there or what was different rather than just what was there (Trochim, 2006).

I looked at how women were brought up and the messages they received. Instead of a laundry list of things single women wanted from their workplace I had very little. I had to ask the question, how does patriarchy affect the way single women think of themselves and how does it color their perceptions of the work environment?
I projected that onto how they saw their positions at work and how they viewed the union. I also needed to look at the relationship women had to their employment; what was the underlying framework.

There were, however, two areas that came up repeatedly, the matter of furloughs and the problem of the hierarchy system at the university. While most participants felt the union was a good thing, they also thought that they and their union were helpless in changing their environment or in making work issues, including furloughs, better.

**Strategies to Protect Human Subjects**

I followed the requirements demanded of the university’s IRB process. I requested the use of the union’s listserv to gain volunteers. The volunteers responded to me alone via email which was then held in a password protected account. Each interview was held in a private or out of the way place so that the participants felt comfortable and their identities were protected. Once the interviews were completed each of the participants were assigned new names, also to protect their identities. All documents were then held in a password protected account on my computer. Once the research process is over all documents and materials are to be held in a locked cabinet controlled by the lead researcher.
Chapter 4: Findings

Study Background

The research for this study was done on a university campus. Its purpose was to see whether single women who were members of the union otherwise known as classified staff, had needs that were different in any way from what their married counterparts had shown in the past that they felt the union could address. In the Literature Review we looked at the history of unions and their use to provide married women with families with the necessities, either in terms of higher wages or in the realm of benefits such as shorter work days to paid sick days or vacations.

Twelve women volunteered to be interviewed. Three of the women had extensive experience with the union while the others had little or no experience. These women ranged in age from the early thirties to late fifties. Their single marital state ranged from never been married to married then widowed. While eight of the women had been married but were now divorced, one was single living in a same sex relationship. Their education ranged from four having only high school diplomas to three with masters degrees.

The women were eager to share their experiences but felt they did not have much to offer. The interviews ranged from a half an hour to an hour in duration. Of the twelve interview participants, several voiced needs that were specific to outside the
family or marriage arena but others had needs that were in reference to having families. Others could not think of anything they could possibly need outside of what they already had but voiced concerns for classified women in general.

**Women with Specific Needs**

Each participant was asked what she felt could be better or what the union could do to make her life better within the confines of her job. Some of the interviewees had no trouble coming up with requirements that would be beneficial to their working environment or to their individual lives while others had difficulty seeing themselves in terms of wants or needs. Those that had specific needs were those that wanted something for themselves or for their job category while the rest spoke either in regard to the needs of others or thought they had nothing to say at all.

The following are the results of those interviews. I use pseudonyms for each of the women to allow their identities to remain unknown.

**Diane**

Diane, who has a Masters Degree, was single living with an opposite sex domestic partner. She has been a Library Technician, who has worked for the university for 29 years, and has worked with the union at various times during contract negotiations. She says that she made $38,000 last year but has been topped out at her
pay level for some time. During the interview she expressed the feeling that there
should be career ladders set up so that if an employee worked hard they could rise up
in the ranks instead of either being stuck at one level or having to keep applying for
higher positions and continually having to start over.

In the university environment classified staff had been only able to rise to a
certain level. Diane conveyed her frustration when she said, “I feel the union could
deal with a lack of a career ladder; especially here in the library. It is extremely
hierarchical. Classified people are relegated to the lowest paying jobs in the library.
And I think that’s an issue.”

Even with higher degrees behind them there has been no facility for classified
staff to move into management or what they call Professional Staff positions without
applying for the new position and going through the interview process all over again.
And if they do eventually move up to management they then lose their union
membership and support. This situation mirrors somewhat what happened years ago
when women workers were relegated to a few classifications while men working for
the same companies had numerous levels, salaries and opportunities within their own
job classifications that they could aspire to(Cunnison, 1993).

In the University System many men and women who are in job classifications
like Library Technician and Office Specialist find that they are doing many types of
work that have been incorporated under those classifications. Two people who have
had the same job classification may have vastly different jobs with varying degrees of
difficulty or quantity and both making equal salaries based on their years of service. It may be no coincidence that jobs that have been traditionally filled by women are the ones that are more likely to be treated in this way (Cunnison, 1993).

It should be noted that classified positions that have traditionally been held by men such as Painter or Plasterer are considered “skilled labor.” These jobs are less varied and require only a journey level training but are paid at a higher level wage than the traditional women’s position that require advanced degrees (Oregon University System - Human Resources).

In addition, the classified staff members have not received raises for doing a good job; there are no merit raises. Instead they have had what they call Step raises. Each year, and within the negotiated contract, an employee gets a specified dollar raise depending on their classification. After a number of years an employee runs out of steps and stays at that same amount unless the union negotiates to create additional steps or there is a cost of living increase. Also, during lean years steps can be frozen or done away with depending on the negotiated contract. Classified workers have had very little say in this matter.

Diane’s description of a hierarchical environment reflected observations made by other interview participants. Of the twelve the majority described the work environment as classist. They all felt that there was a definite class system at work at the university and that classified staff, no matter what their experience or education, were the lowest rank.
Diane confessed that the union had been helpful with other issues. There had been situations when she had to have someone from the union represent her while she was in difficult discussions with her employer. Her overall opinion of the union was positive but she felt that the pay cuts that the union had allowed for classified members meant that the library was able to hire four new faculty-paid positions and gave raises to other faculty members. Her understanding was that these raises were underwritten by the savings the university saw by implementing the furlough system for classified employees, the poorest paid people on campus.

The furlough system was implemented as a money saving process by which classified employees had reductions in pay while taking a corresponding number of days per year off. The number of days an employee was to take was determined by how much they earned which was on a sliding scale basis.

Jessica

Running in a different work direction was Jessica’s need for additional training. Jessica had a Bachelor of Science degree majoring in Business. Her marital status was married then recently divorced. Her yearly salary gross was $26,000 a year. She had worked for the university 2-1/2 years and had had no contact with the union. About training she said, “The union could be more positive and more helpful in providing more opportunities for additional training in my particular job which is
Office Specialist 2.” When asked what form this training would take she said that “it would be classes or special sessions offered on or off campus throughout the day.”

In truth the university does offer employees the option of taking classes on campus through the Staff Fee Privileges program which allows employees and their dependents to take university classes at reduced rates. The only drawback is that it is up to the department the employee works in as to how and when they are allowed to take those classes. Some departments have been liberal in their following of the rules while others have been more stringent in keeping employees to their assigned work hours. Additionally, the classes that have been offered by the university are university classes so may not pertain particularly to an employee’s job. With much perseverance and flexibility an employee can achieve a Bachelors or Masters degree while working full-time, though it probably would not pertain directly to an employee’s job or be in anyway construed as training.

Jessica voiced a negative opinion of the union. She had no faith in what they do based on the furlough situation. She expressed some anger that the union was not stronger in their negotiations. She said that “I am at the bottom of the pay scale anyway so I lost additional funding whereas certain staff, such as, I am a classified staff, but there are others staff such as teachers they are actually called non-classified or faculty who make a great deal more than I do skated right by that. So it’s robbing from the poor.” When asked if she thought the union could have been tougher when it came to bargaining, she said, “Yes, I think the union should have put down their foot
and made sure that if the classified staff had to have forced furloughs and reduction in pay then it needs to be across the board.”

Both Diane and Jessica’s needs revolved around bettering themselves or their circumstances. Diane appeared to understand the limitation she had based on the work environment while Jessica seemed to be looking for ways to improve within her work situation with perhaps the idea of being able to move up at some point.

**Stephanie**

Another of the interview participants, Stephanie, who had a Bachelor’s degree in Environmental Science and is an Office Specialist 2, would have liked time in her day to go and work out at the recreation center, an on-campus gym facility. Stephanie was also looking for more work flexibility like working from home a couple of hours a week because she already checked her emails from home. She felt that if the union could make it a little more flexible “for folks with families it would be great.” She said she understood that she would have to work the eight hours a day though.

Stephanie voiced concerns with whether the union had any power to do anything. She was worried that at the next bargaining time classified would have to pick up the tab for health insurance. She said,

I can’t lose anymore take home income. I just can’t. My baby’s father pays child support but he just lost his job. He’s been getting unemployment and I get sporadic checks from his unemployment because they automatically withdraw it because he’s not going to pay voluntarily. He’s being deployed to
Afghanistan then we’ll get regular checks. My expenses have increased $500 in the last year because I moved out of my sister’s house. My sister was helping with the childcare, and there is the gas. I now live in North Albany instead of Corvallis. I pay $100 more in gas.

It appeared she also felt that in her particular profession the employees were marginalized; that the value of their work was not recognized.

When asked whether she thought the union could do something about it she said that, “in this atmosphere of academia, probably not.” She felt the union could not change the culture, but maybe they didn’t try. She felt it was “irksome.”

Stephanie was also upset about the furlough situation. She also expressed the feeling that she didn’t mind taking furloughs if all staff did, but wished that the union could make sure that classified personnel didn’t take home less money. She showed dismay and frustration that faculty and professional staff got away with only having to take furloughs for 6 months while classified had them for two years and that most faculty members made more than double what she made.

**Women with No Personal Needs**

Woman are raised in an environment that says they should serve rather than being served. They look outside themselves to discover what others may be in need of or require rather look inside to see what they need. This study shows that the majority of the participants had difficulty focusing on their own needs pertaining to their job or work environment.
Rachel

While the previous three participants were looking for personal needs on the job others tended to look out for others’ interests. Rachel, for instance, who was married then divorced and had some college in her background but no degree felt that, even though her children were now too old to need them, there should be more lactation rooms. She said, “I would love to see the union take on issues regarding breastfeeding moms; making more workplaces family friendly for moms who want to pump milk for their babies. My babies are now almost 7 and 5. I pumped for them in one of the bathrooms, in one of the bathroom stalls because that was the only place available with privacy.” She also felt there should be lounges for medical or physical needs. Her thought was that if someone had a migraine or some other ailment they could lie down or relax somewhere for twenty minutes or so then get back to work instead of just going home.

While Rachel was able to talk of needs they weren’t hers specifically there were some that she could have possibly taken advantage of. She was looking out for women in general when it came to lactation rooms but she could include herself when it came to using the rooms for medical purposes.

Andrea

Another participant who was looking out for other employees was Andrea. Andrea had been married but was now divorced. She said she had a high school
diploma and some college but no degree and worked as an Office Specialist. Her concern was with the university’s replacement of classified personnel with student workers and with technology. She said, “There was a time a while back when we lost our classified workers and student workers were hired. That was quite a long time ago. That was wrong. It didn’t affect me personally but it did affect people in the office and I thought that question was taken to the union. Whatever the outcome we kept the student workers. Our office is now being run with student workers.” In other words, despite the union’s best efforts Andrea’s office was now, for the most part, run by students instead of by classified staff.

When asked if she thought the union should have done more she said that maybe they did, but that she might not have been keyed into it. She said that in general “I don’t have issues myself; I’m not confrontational so it would not be my first thought to go to the union.” Andrea didn’t give a specific need but it was obvious she was looking out for other people in her office.

**Gina**

Gina is a divorced woman who said she has a high school education with some college. She said she was at step 17, meaning she earns about $3250 a month as an Administrative Program Assistant. She has worked at OSU since 1992 and while not actively participating in union activities very much she said she keeps track of what’s
going on. She says she has read the union contract multiple times so that she knows what is happening.

When talking with Gina she made it clear she felt that the wages for classified people were too low. She felt the union should advocate for stronger wages on campus. She also felt that even though classified had decent benefits the union needed to “keep wages high and premiums low.”

She was also concerned with how union members are perceived by the public. She thought that the union should become more visible so that workers would be less misunderstood. Her misgivings were that the only time the union was visible was when there was a strike. She went on to say,

Striking is one of those activities that people do not always understand. And they think, ‘Oh you’re just a state worker, get back to work. You don’t work anyway.’ And sometimes that makes me angry to have to explain to people you know what, I probably work harder than all of you do. And I think of what I would be making if I worked out on the open economy. All I’m asking the state to do is to keep up the agreement they made with me when I was hired. They’ve already messed with PERS (Public Employees Retirement System) and they want to continue to mess with that. I also know we have to get through this economy and I don’t mind taking my furlough days and doing my part as long as management and faculty do the same.

When asked if there was anything the union could do for her or if she had needs that the union could address she said:

I’ve been fortunate. No. I have not needed mediation or anybody to come with me to a meeting with a supervisor or any sort of personal representation and I for a long time thought that was silly and unnecessary when I’d read about what they do for you. Then I started meeting people who did need that help
who had sexist bosses, who had inappropriate stuff going on in their workplace who needed somebody to stick up for to give them weight in a meeting with administrators whoever they were meeting with. There’s a need for that, but I’ve been fortunate and never had a need for that.

Gina was also looking for fairness. In part she felt that it is the union that needs to do their part, but she also felt like the state, or university system needed to keep to their promises. Her opinion was that if the union and classified had the public support behind them it would make a difference to the situation. It should be noted that she was not only looking out for herself but for all classified workers. Her needs were those of the group.

**Meghan**

Meghan was not only somewhat different in her life experience; she was a widow, but also in her feelings about the union. She said she had a lot of education but no degrees and said at the moment her pay grade was a level 15, an Office Specialist 2 which she classified as a jack of all trades. She did not appear to have any needs that she wanted to share, but it was clear she wanted to defend the union and make sure the union was not misunderstood. She said,

The union is my country. That’s how I put it. It’s been my political life. Everything revolves around my union. Because to me it crosses all boundaries; everybody had to work, everybody had to make a living and that includes races, women, gender. Everybody has to work and to me we’re for the working people. I don’t think you could get more political than that. It’s my political party, it’s my country. If you take away my union I don’t want to be here anymore.
These were strong feelings to be sure and although she did voice her needs eventually, they were couched in a way that involved the union’s defense. She said she wanted higher wages and wanted furlough days removed but she also wanted the lowest paid workers on campus to get a living wage. She also said she wanted classified staff to stop having to work out of class. She said, “The way I look at it is, and that it should be looked at as though the union doesn’t do anything for you. You do for the union and then you get back what you put into the union. So in other words, it’s not a service.” She also said, “so yeah, there are lots of things the union can do for me, increase my wages, get rid of furlough days, make sure the lowest paid workers on this campus are paid a living wage, because that’s going to benefit me. Also, they stop marginalizing employees and making us work out of class.”

**Angie**

When Angie was asked what her marital status was she started out by saying, single, but when she was asked if she’d ever been married she said it was illegal for her to get married; she said she had a domestic partner. She has a high school diploma with some college credits. She said she was currently making around $49,000 a year. Her position on campus is that of a Stationary Boiler Operator, a traditionally male oriented job.
When given the question of whether she had needs she felt the union could address she said, “I have employment needs but I don’t think the union can address them. We need more operators and I don’t think the union can convince them that we need more operators.” Asked if it was a matter of working overtime or too much work to do she said, “Do you want an example? Last July I took … almost three weeks’ vacation. I had six due to all the overtime I was doing and all this. I got 6 days of vacation and they called me back because one guy retired, one guy quit, and one guy went back to facilities. Because when you only have six operators and three of them leave, you’re in trouble. At the same time at the sixth day my mother went into hospital with quintuple bi-pass. I still had five weeks’ vacation I could have gone and helped care for her. I couldn’t do it, basically because the people in charge chose not to replace an operator that retired that September 2009; just to save some money”

She said the boilers had to be manned 24/7; that it couldn’t go unmanned at all, the person that she relieves cannot go home until she shows up and she can’t go home until her relief shows up even if it means staying an hour or so.

When asked if she had contacted the union about her situation or the situation in general, she said, “No, what are they gonna do?” And even though she felt that another union, the International Brotherhood of Electrical 1245, would have handled her issues better, she in general felt this university union was a pretty good union for other people that work regular hours. She made the comment that the men she worked
with called the union the “secretaries’ union” because it seemed to them that was who the union was geared towards.

Laurel

Laurel was another participant who had had a situation where she had an employment need but had not considered contacting the union because she thought the problem was a Human Resources problem.

Laurel is a divorced mother of one who has her Bachelors in Psychology and is working on Post-bach courses. Her position is an Office Specialist 2. The problem she encountered was when she was working for a different department on campus. She had been taking classes during the day but when there was a change from Student Affairs to Academic Affairs she was told she could no longer do that.

She said Human Resources (HR) had told her that Academic Affairs could not control her lunch, but was told she could only take classes between 11:30 and 1:30 which is the standard lunch period. Because she was unhappy with the change she left and sought a different job in another department where they allowed employees to use flex time for their schedule.

So when asked if she had contacted the union, she said she had considered it but had not followed through. She thought that it would have been nice to know “someone had your back.” Although she said she generally did not think about the union very much and that although she understood how furloughs worked she said she
would be okay with them if everyone had to take them. She said “It wasn’t fair that we are the only ones to have to take them.”

Janice

Janice was newly married after 11 years of singledom following a divorce. She wasn’t sure what her pay scale was but that she was at the top of it. An Administrative Program Assistant, she said that her job entailed a wide variety of “stuff.” She said she had one term of college and decided it wasn’t for her so she left and went to work.

At first she didn’t think she had much to tell me but once we started talking she discovered that she did have something she would like addressed and that was lack of acknowledgement. She had been a good and loyal employee since she started working for the university in 1987 and that she was always available to take care of things unlike some employees that had children who always needed to take time off to take care of them. She understood that they needed the time but felt that those classified who didn’t and were always reliable should have some recognition for that.

About the union she said, “Well I guess the right term is ‘fair share’ and I am not a voting member of the union. I never have joined fully in that way but the union has been representing me technically since 1987.”

When asked if she participated in any way with the union she said she had always kept up with what was going on and if there was anything to subscribe to she would subscribe. When she first came to the university she didn’t know anything
about unions but saw there was money being taken out of her paycheck every month. She actually sent a memo to the union asking them to give her an overview of what the union was and what it did. She said she never heard back so she built up a bit of resentment towards them. She was never in contact, back then, with anyone who would have made a difference. She said,

More recently, I struggle between having a stereotype of even though ‘I are one’ you know, I still struggle with seeing a lot of what’s visible to the world and to the press, photos online, photos in newsletters, stories on TV, the newspaper. … Seriously, I have a problem seeing it as a very positive look to the union; that they seem loud and belligerent and uneducated. It’s how it comes off, to me. And I hate to say that because I know some individual members who I don’t see as that way. But that’s just where I end up feeling most of the time whenever something is being shown to the public and I don’t want to be affiliated with that sometimes.

However, no matter how startlingly negative her feelings were about how the union was represented she still felt they did a good job, over the years, of negotiating contracts. She conceded that there must be “learned, intelligent people in the rooms doing the talking.” She even felt that the few times classified workers went on strike that it was a good thing. The union was doing everything they could to keep benefits and attain raises when they could.

When asked if she thought her experience with the union could have been different she said probably if she had chosen at some point to get more involved. She said she probably couldn’t complain too much when she didn’t participate to make
things better. Although, she said who was she to think that as one person she could have changed things. Janice said it wasn’t where she chose to put her energy; that was in professional development.

She used to think that she had always negotiated her own raises and why would she now need someone to do that for her and then she came to work at the university and started to understand the whole state system. She realized she was in another world and eventually saw how things worked and realized, yes, she did need someone to step up and negotiate for her.

When asked whether there was anything else she would like people to know about the union she said,

That it represents more than just those few dozen, maybe that many faces that you might see at a rally or an event. It represents a very broad spectrum of people who are very diligent and committed and loyal and hard-working and a part of this university in a way no other professor could be, you know. That the union represents more people than what they are seeing and shouldn’t, as I fight, not to have a stereotype on just what it’s all about.

Patti

Patti is a divorced single woman of eleven years who has a Bachelors degree in accounting and an MBA. She has an Accountant 1 position at step 7 so makes approximately $47,054.00 without furlough pay taken out. She had been an
Accountant 2 or the head accountant for one of the university’s departments but when her department was reorganized in order for her to stay with the college she had to take a lesser position. She says she took a voluntary demotion.

She said for the most part she is happy where she is and had no needs that the union could address. She felt that the union had been helpful in doing away with bully bosses, but she like others felt dissatisfied with how things played out with the furlough issue. However, she felt that the furlough issue was not the union’s fault that they were lied to.

Patti’s experience with the union is considerable. She went through steward training and was officially designated as a steward but eventually decided she wasn’t temperamentally suited to be one. She felt that a steward needed to be able to keep a cool head in difficult situations like having to advocate for employees who were having sensitive meetings with employers.

She also said that steward training gives you a good indication of why when dealing with the university you have to make sure you “dot your i’s and cross your t’s;” that there are departments on campus that are very hostile toward the union.

She also seemed to think that being a classified employee limited how you can move up in positions. She said she had applied for professional/faculty, management jobs and was turned down because she was classified. Like other participants in the study, she also was unhappy with the trial period requirement for classified people
who changed jobs. After taking the demotion to Accountant 1 she was made to go through the trial period again.

Although Patti at first said she had no needs that the union could address she seemed to communicate situations that she would have liked to have turned out differently. Her feeling that she had no need was, like other participants, somewhat based on her perception of what the union could actually do for her.

**Marion**

The last of study participants was Marion. She said she was single, never married, had a Masters degree and had worked for the university for thirty years. She earned about $35,000 a year. Of the twelve participants she was the most adamant about not having any needs that the union could address. She was straight forward and to the point and when asked if there was anything she wanted people to know about the union she said, “There’s so much the union can do and so much that they can’t. Things that are specific to the work place or to the university, the union has very little power to do anything about.”

She was asked if she thought that the union was influential in state-wide issues instead. She said no that right now the union wasn’t very powerful. She, like other study participants, felt that people on the street had little sympathy for union members. She thought that the union should be showing what was really true for union members
and that many did not have the same salaries or benefits that people thought they did.

She wanted people to know that union members are struggling just like they are.
Chapter 5: Analysis

Today’s classified staff has a range of benefits that the union has fought for and won. They have paid vacations and sick leave, maternity and family leave as well as a retirement plan and medical insurance, but the face of the traditional employee has changed. It is no longer the man that brings home the bacon or the wife that brings home a little extra to help out the family. Today over half the workforce is now female and a good proportion of those are single women. In the past, unions sought to get better wages and shorter hours for women with families. Today, women with families are looking for flex time and other ways to spend more time at home so that they can be with and care for their families whether that means spouses, young children or aging parents.

In the past married and single women unionists have had to voice and fight for things they needed like rest breaks, shorter work hours and paid medical leave (Deslippe, Rights, Not Roses, 2000). There was, however, a problem that married women had to deal with. Deslippe says, “… as the scores of letters written by women to Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt in the 1930s attest, most working-class women were in accord with male unionists and middle-class reformers about the need to defend the ‘provider’s wage’ against the less-deserving women, especially those who were married (Deslippe, 2000).” Married women were in the middle of the fray fighting for their rights and themselves.
But now no one, especially women themselves looks to see if single union women need or would like help in any way. According to Bella M. DePaulo and Wendy L. Morris just being single stigmatizes people. They say, “As such, they are targets of negative stereotyping, interpersonal rejection, economic disadvantage, and discrimination (DePaulo, 2005).” Part of the problem is in the fact that many single women are single parents so they have the same or more of the same needs that their married counter-parts have. In addition, women are still raised with family and parenthood as a goal in life. By preschool age girls still have the goal of being a mommy when they grow up, while boys do not choose the goal of being daddy (Kaschak, 1992) so many women do not think of themselves as separate from someone or something else. Their thoughts and cares or needs are in relationship to others instead of themselves alone. It was not evident from the participants that voiced needs that their needs were based on being single. Nor was it evident that their needs would be different if they were to be married.

For women to be apart from their identities that have been assigned to them by their communities or culture they would have to be examples of abstract individualism which would mean they were individuals of pure reason unaffected by what goes on around them (Tong, 2009). Realistically, this does not happen. Rosemary Tong in her book *Feminist Thought* says that we are basically “self-less- that is, our very identities are determined by our socially constituted wants and desires.” And so, even though the
majority of women will be working single women, at least for some part of their lives, they are not raised with the goal as or think of themselves as single.

In this study, it was obvious that the majority of the single women had trouble expressing their employment needs. Of the twelve only two were able to articulate their needs at the beginning of the interview process. It took some talking and in some cases joking to get the women to even consider that they had unmet needs that could be addressed. While some eventually asked for things like lactation rooms for nursing mothers these needs were not specifically for themselves.

The women talked about help for other women or for women in general. They did not appear to be able to think of themselves specifically. This has some roots in how women are raised. Carol Gilligan, in her book *In a Different Voice* says that women are raised in terms of relationships and that for a girl who comes of age it is not required that she separate from her mother and so has difficulty as an adult with individuation. She says, “The elusive mystery of women’s development lies in its recognition of the continuing importance of attachment in the human life cycle.”

Women are raised with a different world view to men; one that involves their relationship to others and how they have a responsibility to do for others i.e. making the world a better place (Gilligan, 1982).

Because women are raised to deal in relationships rather than logic their focus is not on themselves and what would make their lives better or easier, but on how to make things better for others or show responsibility for their lives. Despite Elizabeth
Cady Stanton’s belief that “Self-Development is a higher duty than self-sacrifice,” many women have been raised to believe the reverse. Women are likely to feel a responsibility to be fair even when it goes against what is best for them. Gilligan also says, “how the opposition between selfishness and responsibility complicated for women the issue of choice, leaving them suspended between an ideal of selflessness and the truth of their own agency and needs.” She says that the moral ideal is not cooperation or interdependence but rather to repay a debt or obligation without taking anything for oneself.

**The Women Who Feel They Have No Needs**

According to Vanessa M. Bing and Pamela Trotman Reid in “Unknown Women and Unknowing Research (Bing, 1996),” there is a misconception about the poor in the United States. They say that even though the perception is that the majority of the poor are people of color the reality is that the majority are white women. They say, “There has been some indication that class differences exert influences on a variety of factors including aspirations and social perception.” Some of the women in the study voiced needs of aspiring to higher levels of employment but few felt that it was a realistic view considering their treatment in the university. They felt that their being labeled as classified caused them to be dismissed from the pool of viable applicants for positions that were outside the union level. Because of this impression
they could see nothing to challenge it and so gave up any idea of trying. Patti said she had applied for a management job but wasn’t even interviewed because she is classified.

Janice said, “Because of the way the system is set up, my abilities may vary very widely from what the written position description is and what the state has me locked into being.” She like other participants felt that she was doing jobs that should have been graded at a higher level, but because of the way the system is set up departments can get away with assigning work set outside their pay grade. Meghan also felt the university should stop “marginalizing employees and [making] them work out of class.” This practice of assigning work outside pay grades keeps the classified employees from being promoted to higher positions, but from what the study participants expressed, even though they knew it was going on they felt there was nothing to be done about it so stopped thinking about it.

**The Not So Hidden Message**

Despite the participants not feeling like they had needs that had not been met, there was one clear theme throughout the study that might have something to do with the reticence these women had about considering their employment needs. This obstacle to their being forthright about these needs was the class system or marginalization that they felt was at work on the university campus. Some called it
hierarchical while others said it was a lack of value for what they do. It all boiled down to the same thing, they felt that classified workers were considered second class citizens and none of them felt the union could do anything to change things. The system set up at the university formed a bourgeoisie, the faculty/professional staff, and proletarian, the classified unionists, class system. Just as Karl Marx had described, these women felt a form of alienation based on their experience with this system and just as Robert Heilbroner added that this set up the feelings of separation within this system because of the fragmentation that alienation causes (Tong, 2009).

Carol Gilligan says that women have a harder time with hierarchy because of their experience with relationships. Class contextually locates women’s gendered attributes (Kaschak, 1992). If the women of the study are correct then their behavior and thought processes may in part be attributable to the class system they have suffered at the university.

In addition, they felt the furlough system that was part of the contract the union had negotiated two years prior to the interviews was, they considered, based on that lack of respect for classified employees. They felt that the university system was using unfair practices when it came to who had to have pay cuts in the form of annual furloughs. The Faculty/Professional staff members, who actually have higher wages, were only required to take furloughs for a limited time. The impact of furloughs for them was minimal.
This was an area that study participants became animated and showed considerable anger towards the university. In some cases the participant felt the union had not done enough to protect their wages while others felt that the union had been misled about the financial state of the State University System and who would have to take the furloughs. They said that the union was led to believe that all employees, including professional/faculty would be making the same sacrifices but that, in the end, did not turn out to be the case.

**Classism**

The patriarchal system within which these women were raised and live is still in power. “It is the structure and system where the value of women is obscured or diminished, and where women are devalued through gender-based inequalities in areas such as employment, education, and social activities (Bing, 1996).” The salary range of the participants ran between $30,000 and $50,000. This was not the lowest end of pay range for classified but in comparison to some faculty and administration it is not what most would consider middle-class. Only two of the participants mentioned wanted more pay, but that is perhaps generally something that most would assume to be a need. The question lies in why the women were not more assertive in asking for more pay or any other needs.
The women of the study appear to feel that members of classified staff are the lower class of the university. Although, according to Iris Marion Young, class is a gender-blind category, when in combination with capitalist patriarchy women are most often found as the oppressed subjects of the system within which they operate (Young, 1981). Although the University is an institution of higher learning it is more and more taking on the trappings of capitalism as it tries to navigate a harsh economy. Classified employees appear to bear the brunt of this difficult situation and women in historically female oriented positions are made to feel it the most. Iris Marion Young says,

“Whereas class analysis looks at the system of production as a whole, focusing on the means and relations of production in the most general terms possible, a sexual division-of-labor analysis pays attention to the characteristics of the individual people who do the producing in society. In other words, a class analysis calls only for a general discussion of the respective roles of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, whereas a sexual division-of-labor analysis requires a detailed discussion of who gives the orders and who takes them, who does the stimulating work and who does the drudge work, who works more hours and who works less hours, and who gets paid relatively high wages and who gets paid relatively low wages.”

Young felt that the marginalization of women as a secondary labor force was a necessity for capitalism. The class system has historically been predicated on race, culture or ethnicity and the access to wealth was via inheritance, education or family ties and the power they bring. The women in this study have varying degrees of education i.e., high school, Bachelors and Masters degrees, but all still find because
they are in female dominated positions are relegated to the bottom of the university class system (Young, 1981).

Paul Fussell says in his book “A Guide Through the American Status System” that it is generally the middle class that has a problem with the class system. They are in a position to be kept out of the upper class while working to keep the lower classes in their place (Fussell, 1983). In this research the women felt that they were at the bottom of the classes and they really appeared to have a problem with it. They even had trouble with the way they were portrayed.

Janice said, “I struggle between having a stereotype of even though ‘I are one’ you know, I still struggle with seeing a lot of what’s visible to the world and to the press, photos online, photos in newsletters, stories on TV, the newspaper. … Seriously, I have a problem seeing it as a very positive look to the union; that they seem loud and belligerent and uneducated.” Unionists are classified people so Janice was referring to the way classified people are looked upon based on what the media shows. She felt it was a negative portrayal.

Patti felt that classified were limited in how they were allowed to move up in job categories. She felt that they were kept to the lower levels and not allowed to move up to management positions by way of the interview process.

Another participant, Diane said, “It is extremely hierarchical. Classified people are relegated to the lowest paying jobs in the library.” She was referring to the
employment structure that exists in the library. Her thoughts convey the feeling that this structure relegated classified to the lower class based on wage level and possibly education level.

Fussell says,

Nobody knows for sure what the word class means. Some people, like Vance Packard, have tried to invoke more objective terms and have spoken about status systems. Followers of the sociologist Max Weber tend to say class when they’re talking about the amount of money you have and the kind of leverage it gives you; they say status when they mean your social prestige in relation to your audience; and they say party when they’re measuring how much political power you have, that is, how much built-in resistance you have to being pushed around by shits. By class I mean all three, with perhaps extra emphasis on status (Fussell, 1983).

His idea of class seems to coincide with what the research subjects felt. There is little prestige or no status in being a classified worker.

Alienation is felt, according to Allen Wood, if we experience our lives as meaningless or worthless. The alternative is to sustain a sense of meaning by the help of illusions about ourselves or conditions (Wood, 1981).

Robert Heilbroner suggests that fragmentation is the result of this alienation. People or things that are viewed in this way are viewed as separate. Heilbroner saw this as a result of a capitalistic culture. The structure of capitalism encourages workers to see each other as competition, distancing each one from the other, and creating anger and animosity towards others and the system. The alienation of women in a capitalistic patriarchy is oppressive. While men seek relief in their relationships with
women, women have no relief. Men are still a part of the system that oppresses women through patriarchy (Heilbroner, 1980).

The anger expressed by the women in the study was directly related to this feeling of alienation and separation created by the university class system. They were aware of the distinction made within the different groups but felt the union had no power to address this and in fact some felt the union itself was not inclusive.

The Union

This union began 90 years ago starting with the combining of 7 small flat janitor unions. This incorporation of unions was to give immigrant janitors and window washers a power to negotiate that each smaller union could not engender. It’s website says it has a “commitment to building a fair economy, providing workers a voice on the job, fighting for equality and ensuring that all working people can live with dignity... (Our History)” Originally the SEIU was affiliated with the AFL, but in 2005 it broke ties with the AFL-CIO where it lead a coalitions call the Change to Win Federation(4.5 Linear Feet).SEIU now has members in the United States, Puerto Rico and Canada.

For SEIU members, politics is about making sure the issues that are important to working families are put on the front burner by candidates and elected officials. It's about ensuring that politicians put the needs of working families before the demands of wealthy corporate donors(Communications, 2011).
By 2020 the majority of union members will be women. At the moment the figure stands at 45 percent. 10.7 percent of workers in the union are Latino which is up from 9.8 percent in 2007 (SEIU).

Of the union’s hierarchy you can see that Andy Stern, the President Emeritus is the most notable of the group. He is a man that “intends to create a new, more dynamic” labor movement. Of the rest of the upper management of the union there are six men and three women. Tom Woodruff is the International Executive Vice President. Valarie Long is the Executive Vice President; Eileen Kirlin, Kirk Adams, Mike Fishman, and Gerald Hudson are International Executive Vice Presidents while Eliseo Medina is the International Secretary-Treasurer and Mary Kay Henry is the President of the SEIU. While these numbers are far better than what was historically the norm for women in the union higher echelon it is far from being representative of the number of women who are actually unionists.

In this research the twelve women’s opinions can been split between two main themes: one, the union can and has done a good job with addressing employees needs and two the union has no power to help employees even if there are expressed needs.

Women make up a near majority of the membership of the union. The union around the world has been active and affective in many areas using “community based” activities that have been successful. These activities paid off during the 1980s in getting the wage gap between men and women members of the union to sharply
narrow. Their strategy for pay equity involved bringing in hired consultants to create an evaluation study; one that could be used in conjunction with a labor-management committee. The results were then used to adjust and implement pay equity (Cobble, 1993).

Their weakest showing has been in understanding what their surveys have meant. In one instance they surveyed members to find out their priorities for their contract negotiations. Although 70% of this units members were women, child care was not on the top of the list of priorities and so the union at first did not make that a priority, but eventually they came to realize that only the highest paid workers could make it a priority and that lower paid workers had trouble with finding before and after school child care (Cobble, 1993).

This last contract negotiation also seemed to go against what classified employees were asking for. Meghan said, “If I’m going to forego salary for benefits and I’m not going to work so hard to get my salary raised then I want my benefits to be at a very high level. I don’t want to lose them.” Sadly, in this set of negotiations it was agreed that there should be, once again, furloughs, and this time there was a partial payment of medical benefits for employees to pay. There were cost of living raises which for many were so low they would not have been enough to cover the medical benefit payment that was now required so there was included an additional $40.00 given to those who made the lowest wages. With the furloughs in place, once again, employees could see a diminished paycheck. In addition, the small cost of
living raise would cause employee’s taxes to rise without their being able to see any increase in their take-home pay. The union’s bargaining team had positive things to say about the outcome of the negotiations, but for many the results were far from what they had wanted or envisioned for this time around.

The union has said that they need the support of their membership to make things happen in contract negotiations but when women have a difficult time expressing what their needs are it becomes difficult for them to participate in union activities. In addition, for many single women who have children there is the issue of time. One of the interviewees said that you only get from the union as much as you put in but for some there is nothing left to give the union once they have given to their families and their jobs.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

Twelve single women were interviewed for this research. Each had a different take on what she was in need of from her job and from her union. Most had difficulty ascertaining what those needs were. Three of the twelve found they had needs, like career ladders and extra training, which could possibly be addressed by the union. The other nine participants had difficulty trying to think of anything that was applicable. However, the majority of the participants saw there was a problem with the hierarchy system on campus and most felt betrayed by the furlough system. The participants indicated that they did think about the need of others. It is possible they were abstracting from themselves to other and including their need in those abstractions, but nonetheless their inability to articulate their own needs specifically related to their status as single women is notable.

The research suggests that patriarchy and classism have a detrimental effect on women’s ability to think of themselves as separate from someone else. They are generally raised to believe that service to others is more important than service to themselves. The women in this study were examples of how alienated women can be from their own personal needs. In general terms, however, they were not unaware of the wrongs that were being perpetuated in their work environment; they just did not see the union as being able to take on the university system to improve the situation. They were acutely aware of the class/hierarchy with the university and felt themselves
to be in lower class/status. Despite this sense of disenfranchisement, they still felt pride their work and were able to identify the ways in which they perform their jobs well.

This study faced several limitations which could be addressed in future research. First, the sample size was small, and a larger sample would provide more generalizable data. Second, most of the women were white. A follow-up study should specifically examine the experiences of single women of color to see how similar/different their experiences are from those of white women and why. Third, the study was limited to one institution. Subsequent research should examine this issue across a wide variety of institutions of higher education in various geographic regions.

This research also opens the door for continuing research in the realms of patriarchy, classism, and their effects on women in the workplace. There are several avenues for future research in these areas: 1. Do married women also struggle to see their needs in a work setting and do they rely on the union for redress? 2. Do unionized single professors have similar or different experiences? 3. Are union representatives aware of single women’s issues and do they advocate for single women’s needs? 4. Do single women in unions in other kinds of workplaces have similar or different experiences? 5. Are unions able to address the issues faced by single women in a healthy, constructive manner or are they, indeed, powerless against institutions of higher learning? 6. How does sexual identity shape the experience of single union members who identify as lesbian? 7. How do needs shift as union
members move from being married to being single through divorce or widowhood, and how does the union address those needs? 8. How do union leaders view single women members and how do they prioritize their needs in union discussion?

Unions have provided important and hard won benefits for women as a whole, but paying attention to women’s issues across differences is important in understanding the full range of women’s experiences in the union. Understanding the union and women’s experiences in the union in the context of patriarchal and classist unions offers a needed framework for a full and clear grasp of the complexities faced by single women in institutions. This study is but a beginning but suggests the need for more attention and research in these issues.

**Recommendations for the Union**

The union traditionally has attempted to be effective assessing the needs of union member. This research suggests that union findings may not be as complete as the union might hope because women union members may not be able to articulate their needs as clearly as needed. To address this issue, unions should consider a number of actions that might prove useful:

1. Make sure that surveys account for differences across members- gender, race/ethnicity, sexual identity, and marital status, for example. At least
some questions should be targeted toward members of diverse group to ascertain particular needs they may have.

2. Provide consciousness-raising groups for members of traditionally marginalized groups to help members realize the impacts of difference and think about ways the union could meet needs related to difference.

3. Encourage and provide opportunities for union leaders to learn about difference and become aware of its effect on union members.

4. Develop ways to address union members’ sense of lower status and otherness with institutions of higher education.

5. Offer opportunities for supervisors to learn about unions and union member’s needs.

6. Encourage women to think of themselves as people within their circle of care, whose needs are worthy of consideration.

While this study is very preliminary, it has raised a number of important issues about women, marital status, and the union in a university setting. It suggest that more works needs to be done to facilitate women’s understandings of themselves as doing gendered work and having particular needs and to facilitate the union’s understanding of women and their needs, especially if the women are single.
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APPENDIX

Classified Job Specifications

1. Accountant 1

The Accountant 1 employs generally accepted accounting principles to record, classify and interpret revenue, expenditure, and other business data within a central or departmental office of a university. An employee in this class works with interrelated accounts in an accounting system, allocating changes to funds and accounts, reconciling accounts, analyzing accounting transactions, preparing reports, and maintain accounting controls. This is the first level of a two level series. This class is distinguished from the higher level by the absence of responsibility for coordinating agency accounting between internal institution accounting programs or with accounting programs outside the agency, and for analyzing accounting system and developing procedures and controls to ensure compliance with accounting standards or in response to special accounting problems (Oregon University System - Human Resources).

2. Accountant 2

The Accountant 2 employs generally accepted accounting principles and theory of internal control with technical theory, and statistical methods to record, analyze, and interpret revenue, expenditure, and other business data. The employee also devises, implements, or maintains general accounting systems within a central or departmental office of a university. Position in this class typically work with electronic accounting systems and perform work involving the correlation of information exchanged between internal university accounting programs or accounting programs in other agencies or entities. This is the second level of a two level series. This class is distinguished from the lower level by having responsibility for coordinating accounting between internal university accounting programs or with accounting programs outside the institution and analyzing accounting systems and developing procedures and controls to ensure compliance with accounting standards or in response to special accounting problems (Oregon University System - Human Resources).

3. Administrative Program Assistant

The Administrative Program Assistant performs non-clerical administrative projects or assignment or coordinated program element in support of an institution program or operation. The work performed is usually concentrated in a specific institution-wide program or operational area, requiring in-depth knowledge of that program or operation.
This class is the first in a two-level series. It is characterized by responsibility for the initiation and completion of projects and/or assignments, requiring the execution of a series of non-sequential steps, resulting in an outcome or “product” over which an employee has exclusive or near-exclusive control. Employees in this class may also be responsible for coordinating services or operation, which may include tracking, scheduling, and delivery of services, ensuring compliance, and explain laws, rules, regulations, and policies. This class is distinguished from the higher level by the absence of responsibility for program direction. Employees in this class have little or no general office support duties (Oregon University System - Human Resouces).

4. **Library Technician 1**

The Library Technician 1 exercises practical judgment in the application of procedures to specific library operations and services. It requires basic technical operational skills and knowledge of unit practices, procedures and software. Receives detailed instructions and training from a higher level technician or manager and uses knowledge of established library procedures to provide a wide variety of technical duties and/or patron assistance in support of library services in an operational unit or section of a university library. This is the first level of a 3 level series. At this level, employees perform routine tasks with defined responsibilities and have limited independent decision-making. The Library Tech 1 has limited responsibility for directing, coordinating, training, and scheduling work of lower level employees, students, and volunteers (Oregon University System - Human Resouces).

5. **Office Specialist 2**

The Office Specialist 2 performs a wide range of office support, technical, and/or minor administrative or business-related tasks in support of campus programs or operations. This is the third level in a three-level series. The Office Specialist 2 is distinguished from the Office Specialist 1 by the addition of either administrative and/or technical assignments or by being delegated oversight of the business operation of a remote or stand-alone unit or department within a office context. Duties at this level are performed independently and often involve the completion of varied and unrelated assignments or technical functions over which the employee has exclusive or near-exclusive control. Assignments or technical functions may involve the use of numerous guides, instructions regulation, manual, and/or precedents (Oregon University System - Human Resouces).

6. **Stationary Boiler Operator**
The Stationary Boiler Operator operates and maintains a high pressure steam boiler system and auxiliary equipment. Does related work as required (Oregon University System - Human Resources).