



Polling Results on Union Salting and Union Elections

Between July 24-26, 2023, Institute for the American Worker commissioned the bipartisan research firm Big Village to conduct an online omnibus survey of a demographically representative U.S. sample of 1,010 adults 18 years of age and older.

The polling questions gauge the public's opinion on union organizing efforts involving "salts," which are paid union organizers who apply for jobs at a workplace to organize an employer. Additionally, the poll asked if respondents felt unions should need a minimum threshold of votes before representing employees.

Below are the topline results:

1. Sometimes when a union is targeting a workplace to unionize, they have union employees pretend they are unemployed and apply for jobs at the company. After being hired at the workplace, these undercover union organizers speak negatively of management in an attempt to convince other employees to join a union. **Does knowing that a union installed its own paid organizers at a workplace without telling the employer or employees make you more or less supportive of the union?**
 - a) Yes, it makes a difference in my support: 60% (net)
**Sub-net responses listed below.*
 - i) More supportive of the union (16%)
 - ii) Less supportive of the union (44%)
 - b) No, it doesn't make a difference in my support: 40%
2. When a workplace is being considered for unionization, management will often arrange for a paid consultant to talk to employees about how unionization would impact the workplace. The government requires these consultants to fill out periodic forms to ensure fair elections and protect workers. **Should union organizers also be required to fill out these forms when they are paid to talk to employees about unionization?**
 - a) Affirmative Response: 75%
Yes, union organizers who are paid to take a job to organize employees should be required to fill out the same forms that paid management consultants are required to fill out.
 - b) Negative Response: 25%
No, union organizers should not be required to fill out forms disclosing they are paid by a union and taking a job to organize employees.

3. Should employers have the ability to ask if a job applicant is a union organizer or if they are taking a job for any other reason than working at the company when they are interviewed?

a) Affirmative Response: 62%

Yes, employers should have the ability to ask a job applicant if they are a union organizer or if they are taking the job for any other reason in addition to working there.

b) Negative Response: 38%

No, employers should be forbidden from asking if a job applicant is a union organizer or taking the job for any reason besides working at the company.

4. In union organizing elections, certain types of conduct, threats, or interference from either the employer or a union can cause a unionization election to be thrown out. If a union organizer takes a job to organize employees without telling either the employer or their new coworkers they took the job for this reason, should the election be thrown out?

a) Affirmative Response: 59%

Yes, the election should be thrown out.

b) Negative Response: 41%

No, the election should stand.

5. Labor organizers taking jobs so they could organize a company is a practice that is at least 100 years old. Do you think this is still relevant today, or are there other methods that are more effective to discuss unionization with employees?

a) Affirmative Response: 39%

Yes, it is a time-tested tactic that is still relevant today.

b) Negative Response: 61%

No, with digital media, smart phones, and other technology, there are better ways to communicate with employees.

6. When a union gains enough support at a workplace, they can call for an election that is overseen by government officials. If they win the election, they represent all workers at a worksite, even workers that do not want their representation. Which of these rules for the election do you think is the fairest (keeping in mind that not all employees will show up for the vote)?

a) 84% felt the union should have to get a certain minimum to organize a workplace [two variations of this response below].

i. 39%: The union should have to get 51% of the total number of workers employed at the workplace to vote yes in order for the union to be formed.

ii. 45%: The union should only have to get 51% of the employees who show up to vote to vote yes, but there should be a minimum number of employees voting for the election to be valid. The practice is intended to prevent a union from forming if a small number of employees participated in the election.

- b) 16%: The union should only have to get 51% of the employees who show up to vote yes.
7. Some people think a certain threshold of employees should have to vote in a union election for it to be valid. The union would have to receive a majority of the vote from those participating in order to win the election. **If a company has 100 employees, what would be a fair level of employee participation for the outcome of the vote to be valid?**
- a) 74%: Yes, it matters how many employees participate in the vote (net response).
 - i. 24%: At least 25/50 employees should participate (net response)
 - 1. 4%: At least 25 employees should participate
 - 2. 20%: At least 50 employees should participate
 - ii. 50%: At least 60/70/80 employees should participate (net response)
 - 1. 17%: At least 60 employees should participate
 - 2. 13%: At least 70 employees should participate
 - 3. 20%: At least 80 employees should participate
 - b) 26%: It doesn't matter how many employees participate in the vote. If a union wins a majority of the vote from those participating, they should win the election.

For more information, visit <https://i4aw.org/resources/polling-results-on-union-salting-and-union-elections/>