

What do Health Care Unions do?

A Response to Manthous

Michael Ash, PhD,* Jean Ann Seago, RN, PhD, FAAN,† and Joanne Spetz, PhD‡

Abstract: In response to Manthous, we discuss the role of unions in health care. The ethical quandary that Manthous perceives in health care worker unions is overstated because patient and worker interests are frequently aligned. The search for a “selfless” union overlooks the importance of adequate compensation for providing excellent care. The collective actions employed by health care workers’ unions need not include strikes or slowdowns and can be consistent with patient safety and well-being.

Key Words: nursing, nursing unions, healthcare workers

(*Med Care* 2014;52: 393–397)

Manthous¹ has written a provocative and potentially constructive analysis of the role of collective action by health care workers, recognizing challenges to patient safety posed by corporate health care’s profit motive. He argues that physicians, registered nurses (RNs), and other health care workers can play a crucial role in protecting patient safety through collective action, but worries that health labor unions’ pursuit of their workers’ self-interest puts patients at risk. His proposed alternative for empowering health care workers to protect patients, but not to pursue their own self-interest, is out of touch with the law, structures, and practice of labor relations, and how these institutions function in US health care.

Manthous’s essay shows little familiarity with the state of unionization or the institution of collective bargaining. Manthous describes health care as having low union density (p. 2), but the 20% unionization rate for RNs, compared with 7% in the private and nonprofit sector,² is notably high (although rates vary enormously across the United States, with unions representing over half of RNs in some regions and none in others). The proposed structures and functions

already exist within health care labor unions and the alternative institutions are neither feasible nor desirable. Empowering workers to use their familiarity with the workplace to pursue policy goals is more likely to achieve Manthous’s aims.

We first consider Manthous’ ideas regarding physicians, then turn to labor-market institutions for RNs and less-credentialed health care workers. We make 3 main points: (1) because health workers’ working conditions are patients’ care conditions, their interests often align on issues of staffing, scheduling, and process; (2) RNs’ main methods for advocacy have been workplace and policy campaigns that protect or enhance patient safety; and (3) the concentrated power of health care employers requires strong equalizing institutions to protect workers and patients.

PHYSICIANS’ UNIONS

Manthous focuses his discussion on physicians’ unions, including a description of the short-lived Physicians for Responsible Negotiation. Physician unionization has an interesting history in the United States.³ However, the fact that US physicians are most often self-employed or employed in group practices limits the prospects for their unionization.

Budrys³ argues that physicians’ unions could become important, particularly at the intersection of physician concern for patient well-being and diminishing physician autonomy as corporate entities increasingly control health care. Yet (as Manthous describes), physician unionization has not taken off. The Department for Professional Employees at the AFL-CIO estimated that only 5.5% of practicing US physicians in 1999 (42,000 of 755,000) belonged to unions, with perhaps as many as 20% of this small number being resident physicians employed by hospitals⁴ who rapidly leave unionized positions for practice. Given the limited importance of physicians’ unions in US health care, Manthous’ plea (to pursue patient well-being rather than self-interest) would be better directed at physicians’ professional organizations than to their unions.

NURSE CARING CONDITIONS ARE PATIENT CARE CONDITIONS

Just as teachers’ unions define common ground with students and parents with the observation that “teacher working conditions are student learning conditions,” the working conditions of RNs are, largely, patient care conditions. RNs’ bargaining, regulatory, and legislative goals typically protect both working conditions and patient care;

From the *Department of Economics and Center for Public Policy and Administration, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA; †School of Nursing; and ‡Philip R. Lee Institute for Health Policy Studies and Center for the Health Professions, University of California, San Francisco, CA.

Supported by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) under Grant R01 HS014207.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Reprints: Michael Ash, PhD, Department of Economics and Center for Public Policy and Administration, 200 Hicks Way, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003. E-mail: mash@econs.umass.edu.

Copyright © 2014 by Lippincott Williams & Wilkins
ISSN: 0025-7079/14/5205-0393

conflict over staffing ratios, scheduling, and overtime, as well as wages, dominate RN collective bargaining.

Our most important objection to Manthous is that the complaint against nursing unions perpetuates the dangerous fallacy that physically and mentally demanding, high-quality work can be supported other than through good pay and good working conditions. These are necessary for attracting and retaining skilled practitioners and enabling good work.

Manthous' "selfless" union (p. 10) is the institutional analogue of the selfless nurse whom Heyes⁵ celebrates in "The economics of vocation or 'why is a badly paid nurse a good nurse'?" Both rely on sex-stereotyped, "angel of mercy" nurses, an image rooted in the free services offered by churches and other charitable institutions until the rigorously scientific Florence Nightingale (not her mythic "lady of the lamp" persona) invented the profession of nursing and lobbied it into existence.⁶

In responding to Heyes, Nelson and Folbre⁷ argue that high RN salaries contribute to high-quality care by enabling hospitals to select RNs from larger pools of highly skilled workers. Earlier⁸ they had observed that nurses' commitment to patient well-being can lead them to stretch themselves to compensate for inadequate staffing. Hospitals can—and do—exploit this excess commitment; US health care relies on substantial unpaid contributions from RNs who forego breaks or continue to work after "clocking out." The US Department of Labor recently ordered a Texas hospital to reimburse nurses for unpaid overtime and meal breaks.⁹

Eventually, however, the cynical strategy of exploiting selflessness unwinds, as would-be RNs pursue alternative careers, reducing the stock of highly qualified workers, or take second jobs, to make ends meet.¹⁰ Gordon¹¹ describes the reluctance of older RNs to encourage young people to pursue an undervalued profession.

Manthous's ideal organization would exclude "wage issues or work conditions that do not impact the quality of care or patient safety" (p. 10). Yet workplace conditions—staffing, cleanliness, security, exhaustion—manifestly do affect patient care.¹² The health care shop floor is experienced collectively by workers, frontline managers, and patients alike, albeit with substantial variation in intensity, privacy, and power. Thus, the form, conditions, and control of the workplace matters greatly for providers, managers, and consumers. Mandatory overtime or inadequate staffing, for example, can create an unpleasant and dangerous situation for patients and RNs alike.

Even the desire for a middle-class wage, which might seem removed from the immediacy of the workplace, affects care quality. Health care workers who feel the need for second jobs, or are anxious about their own health insurance, child care, or mortgage, may be more prone to errors. Ultimately, wages contribute importantly to staffing availability in the short run, to recruitment and retention in the medium term, and to the long-term sustainability of a high-quality workforce.

The institutions that treat patients and employ health workers focus on profit and costs as well as care. Whether led by physicians¹³ or hospital administrators,¹⁴ both non-profit and for-profit hospitals are large health care labor

buyers and act similarly.^{15,16} Hospitals have substantial control over the price, quantity, and quality of their inputs and products. Especially in isolated markets, RNs often face a single, monopsonist buyer, able to enforce a below-market wage, to provoke excess turnover and to be slow to fill vacancies.¹⁷

The classic complaint against unions is that by controlling the labor supply they can demand higher wages than would occur in a competitive labor market.¹⁸ And, indeed, hospital unionization can increase costs.^{19,20} Manthous worries that higher wages may constrain hospital activity in dimensions that benefit patients, for example, by reducing the number of patients served or the quantity or quality of nursing and other inputs. But there is a health care exception. Expensive equipment is a likely marketing point, and Rosenthal²¹ and Spetz and Baker²² observe that in the "medical arms race" among competing hospitals, buying expensive but underused equipment often takes precedence over ongoing operational costs like nursing. The strongest incentive is to cut the quantity and quality of nursing labor at the margin where it is least likely to generate an actionable mistake²³; union rule enforcement, rather than wage advocacy, matters most here.

Hospitals may not face adequate market discipline for safety consequences because many patients have only one realistic choice, dulling their sensitivity to hospital quality and safety information. As hospitals become more profit-focused, the tendency to exploit the twin advantages of monopoly on the patient side and monopsony on the worker side, grow. Health care workers' unions provide counterweights to these hospital advantages.

Health care products are often complex, involving affect and communication, such as in pain management. The work often requires complex decision making and attentiveness to physical and emotional needs, and the relations between effort and outcomes are uncertain. Worker engagement and cooperation is needed for effective care, but such efforts are neither fully observable by managers nor enforceable by contract.

Realistic models for organizing worker contributions to patient well-being must consider US law and institutions of collective bargaining, with the efficiency case for collective bargaining principally deriving from the shared workplace. Workers must coordinate among themselves and with employers in establishing workplace forms and conditions. This sometimes produces trade-offs between employers and workers, for example, employers agree to higher wage rates in exchange for increased discretion in setting hours. In other cases, coordination may mean aggregating disparate worker preferences. For example, some workers prefer higher pay rates for overtime, whereas others prefer to limit overtime altogether. But today's workplace collective action goals are more likely to involve resisting *mandatory* overtime and demanding adequate staffing than higher wages.

COMMUNICATION AND CONTROL

We agree with Manthous that worker autonomy and open communication can contribute to patient safety. Power

is important in any workplace, as managers give workers both explicit and implicit instructions. Hospitals add the wrinkle of physicians, who are neither hospital employees nor managers yet provide labor and also manage the labor of other health care workers; indeed, hospitals are noteworthy for their highly structured and hierarchical array of occupations.

Because RNs have specific institutional and case-based knowledge, effective communication between health care workers and hospital management is good for patients. Unions institutionalize this communication, through their "voice" function.^{24,25} Labor law (Section 8(a)2 of the National Labor Relations Act) prohibits negotiations between management and nonunion employee organizations. The idea is to prevent management from creating "company unions" that would exploit opportunities for enhanced communication and cooperation without adequate reward or true participation. Employers may hesitate to initiate shared governance or collaborative committees because working with employee organizations without the collective bargaining relationship violates labor law. Also, employees may be reluctant to participate in potentially coopted employee organizations. Thus, the collective bargaining relationship is in a unique position to facilitate other formal modes of communication between RNs, hospital management, and the medical staff, such as quality circles. Baskin and Shortell,²⁶ Shortell and Hull,²⁷ Shortell et al,²⁸ Shortell et al,²⁹ and Ferlie and Shortell³⁰ have shown that these improve patient outcomes. We,^{31,32} have also found positive associations between the presence of RN unions and favorable patient outcomes.

Decades of studies show that hierarchical hospital employment structures can inhibit communication between RNs and MDs.^{33–39} Unions can improve communication in several ways. Longer RN tenure, enabled by higher wages, may increase trust between RNs and MDs as respect for the judgment of particular individuals' increases with years of experience.

In a much cited article, surgeon-journalist Gawande⁴⁰ argues that checklists can significantly reduce medical errors. Although checklists are tools for managing information, they can also be tools for redistributing power. An essential paragraph describes how a health-services researcher

y persuaded the hospital administration to authorize nurses to stop doctors if they saw them skipping a step on the checklist. This was revolutionary. Nurses have always had their ways of nudging a doctor into doing the right thing, ranging from the gentle reminder (Um, did you forget to put on your mask, doctor?) to more forceful methods (I've had a nurse bodycheck me when she thought I hadn't put enough drapes on a patient). But many nurses aren't sure whether this is their place, or whether a given step is worth a confrontation. The new rule made it clear: if doctors didn't follow every step on the checklist, the nurses would have backup from the administration to intervene.⁴⁰

The essay describes reduced infections, deaths, and costs attributable to this innovation. One possible interpretation is that good administrators can empower the right

people (without labor unions). However, labor unions provide an efficient, institutionalized way to transfer power—and a significant improvement on "nudging." Checklists may be particularly effective in the highly structured operating room, but open communication can help anywhere. Unionization may encourage RNs to speak up in ways that improve patient outcomes, but that might jeopardize a nonunion career.^{11,41} By protecting RNs from arbitrary dismissal or punishment, RN unions help offset the hierarchical relationship between RNs and medical staff or hospital administrators.

Many managers resist RN unionization, assuming that it is difficult to manage in a union environment.^{42,43} Breda⁴⁴ and Flarey et al⁴² report some RNs' view on union activity as adversarial and unprofessional.⁴² Unionization is associated with lower employee morale and job satisfaction,^{43,45–47} but why? Do unions make RNs dissatisfied? Do RNs dissatisfied with a workplace incline towards unionization? Do unionized RNs feel freer to complain? In truth, we do not know.

Increased staffing levels may improve care quality and, thus, patient outcomes.^{48,49} Staffing levels have been a particular focus of RN union activism. In California, RN unions started turning to government regulation to mandate staffing ratios in all—not only unionized—hospitals.⁵⁰ These efforts, with variable success,⁵¹ have spread to other states and to broad efforts to mobilize regulators, legislatures, and the public to give RNs a voice in staffing levels.

TACTICS OF HEALTH CARE UNIONS

Even with shared goals, the means employed by RN unions can jeopardize patient well-being. Manthous is concerned that health workers' unions will use strikes or slowdowns to enforce higher wages through the workers' monopoly on hospital labor. In fact RN unions more typically use nontraditional workplace tactics including work-to-rule, regulatory interventions, lobbying, and community, patient, and stakeholder mobilization. RN strikes are highly regulated, requiring advance notice and other patient safeguards.

Although RN strikes can affect care quality,⁵² strikes and slowdowns are rare in health care. The Bureau of Labor Statistics⁵³ identified only 8 health care work stoppages involving 1000 or more workers; 7 involved nurses. Unlike the other 11 large work stoppages in 2012, all 8 were short; 5 lasted for 5 days and 3, just 1 day each. Shorter actions are often symbolic rather than intended to shut down the activity of the hospital. With over 3 million RNs in the United States, this is not a lot of nurse-related work stoppages. Furthermore, Bureau of Labor Statistics does not distinguish between strikes and employer lock-outs, so it is not clear as to how many were union-controlled.

In health care, noncooperative job actions, the union's "stick" in negotiations with management, are unlikely to involve strikes or slowdowns, with their potential to jeopardize patient health; more likely, they employ work-to-rule, to seek enforcement by the state or accreditation agencies of regulations (especially concerning staffing ratios and mandatory overtime), and to inform patients and

communities about safety concerns or hospital shortcomings. Indeed patient mobilization in the interest of both RNs and patients is an important strategy. Budd et al⁵⁴ tells how a union local applied both traditional and nontraditional means to secure gains for patients and workers.

In summary, in US health care today, the means that health care workers' unions actually use to force hospital management's hand do not deny care to advance self-interest, which limits the relevance of the ethical quandary that concerns Manthous.

SUCCESS AND VULNERABILITY: RN UNIONS AND LESS-CREDENTIALED HEALTH CARE WORKERS

Finally we examine an area of health care labor relations that Manthous has overlooked: the sometimes fraught relations between RNs and health care workers with lower formal qualifications.

RN organizing success—for both patient and self-interest—has been based on integrating a craft-union model, in which control over the supply of skilled labor is the basis of workplace power, and a professional model, in which workers adopt and internalize ethics and norms.

Nurse managers often resist integrating professional and worker identities; as RNs they are drawn to a professional ethic, but as managers, they may be unfavorably disposed towards unions (eg, American Organization of Nurse Executives⁴⁵).

RNs have struggled to address the tension between the craft-union and professional-union models. In 1995, the California Nurses Association (CNA), then the nation's largest labor union for RNs, severed its ties with the American Nurses Association (ANA), the leading professional association, because of the ANA's ambivalence towards unionization and CNA's collective bargaining strategies.^{47,55} By 2006, following 2 decades of transition in health care and union organization by RNs, ANA forcefully denounced the National Labor Relations Board attempt to reclassify RNs so as to exclude them from unions. The President of the ANA called the National Labor Relations Board's position:

y an assault on the rights and preferences of nurses regarding whether or not they choose to join a union. We recognize that collective bargaining may not be the choice for everyone, but protecting and preserving that right is fundamental to the safety and well-being of both nurses and the patients they serve.⁵⁶

An underappreciated concern is that RNs are firmly within the craft-union model, with ongoing tensions between their unions and those of less-credentialed health care workers—certified nurse assistants, nurses' aides, orderlies, attendants, food-service workers, custodial staff, and other hospital workers. For example, Service Employees International Union represents many types of health care workers, but RNs can feel that their power is diluted when Service Employees International Union negotiates as a single group. CNA itself faces this problem when negotiating for highly credentialed nurse practitioners, a relatively small group within their union.

Less-credentialed health care workers are usually excluded from RN unions. However, while the craft-professional hybrid model of RN unions has clearly defended patient well-being and helped make nursing a middle class profession, over time it may undermine their ability to transform health care to benefit patients and workers. Forging constructive relations with less-credentialed health care workers presents a key challenge for RN unions that could bring substantial benefits for both workers and patients.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank Arlene Ash for comments and suggestions.

REFERENCES

1. Manthous C. Labor unions in medicine: the intersection of patient- and self-advocacy. *Med Care*. 2014;52:387–392.
2. Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Union Members 2012*. Washington D.C.: Economic News Release; 2013b.
3. Budrys G. *When Doctors Join Unions*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press; 1997.
4. Carlson R. Is there a physician union in your future? *Fam Pract Manag*. 1999;6:21–25.
5. Heyes A. The economics of vocation or 'why is a badly paid nurse a good nurse'? *J Health Econ*. 2005;24:561–569.
6. Hott L, Garey D. Sentimental women need not apply: a history of the American nurse. Florentine Films; 1988.
7. Nelson JA, Folbre N. Why a well-paid nurse is a better nurse. *Nurs Econ*. 2006;24:127–130.
8. Folbre N, Nelson JA. For love or money—or both? *J Econ Perspect*. 2000;14:123–140.
9. Clark S. *Labor Department Orders Hospital to Reimburse Employees*. Brownsville, TX: The Brownsville Herald; 2011. Available at: http://www.brownsvilleherald.com/news/valley/article_a05cee21-b8ba-51f7-b861-a713e8919bcd.html. Accessed January 15, 2014.
10. Khazan O. No country for young nurses. The Health Care Blog, 2010. Available at: <http://thehealthcareblog.com/blog/2010/02/19/no-country-for-young-nurses/>. Accessed January 15, 2014.
11. Gordon S. *Life Support: Three Nurses on the Front Lines*. Boston: Back Bay Books; 1998.
12. Stimpfel AW, Aiken LH. Hospital staff nurses' shift length associated with safety and quality of care. *J Nurs Care Qual*. 2013;28:122–129.
13. Pauly M, Redisch M. The not-for-profit hospital as a physicians' cooperative. *Am Econ Rev*. 1973;63:87–99.
14. Newhouse JP. Toward a theory of nonprofit institutions: an economic model of a hospital. *Am Econ Rev*. 1970;60:64–74.
15. Seago JA, Spetz J, Mitchell S. Nurse staffing and hospital ownership in California. *J Nurs Adm*. 2004;34:228–237.
16. Spetz J, Seago JA, Mitchell S. The effect of hospital ownership on quality of health care [abstract]. *Health Serv Res*. 1999;16:313–314.
17. Staiger D, Spetz J, Phibbs C. Is there monopsony in the labor market? Evidence from a natural experiment. *J Labor Econ*. 2010;28:211–236.
18. Hirsch BT, Schumacher EJ. Monopsony power and relative wages in the labor market for nurses. *J Health Econ*. 1995b;14:443–476.
19. Morey J, Scherzer G, Lee H, et al. Impact of nurse unionization on fiscal viability and selected measures of quality in hospitals. *J Business Econ Res*. 2008;6:13–18.
20. Wilson C, Hamilton C, Murphy E. Union dynamics in nursing. *J Nurs Admin*. 1990;20:35–39.
21. Rosenthal M 2012. Higher costs resulting from medical arms race. Available at: <http://managedhealthcareexecutive.modernmedicine.com/managed-healthcare-executive/news/higher-costs-resulting-medical-arms-race>. Accessed January 15, 2014.
22. Spetz J, Baker L. *Managed Care, Hospital Competition, and the Availability of Technology: Implications for Health Care Costs*. San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California; 2000.
23. Currie J, Farsi M, MacLeod WB. Cut to the bone? Hospital takeovers and nurse employment contracts. *Indus Labor Relat Rev*. 2005;58:494–514.

24. Freeman R, Medoff J. *What Do Unions Do?* New York: Basic Books; 1984.

25. Hirschman A. *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 1970.

26. Baskin S, Shortell S. Total quality management: needed research on the structural and cultural dimensions of quality improvement in health care organizations. *J Health Admin Educ*. 1995;13:143–154.

27. Shortell S, Hull K. The new organization of the health care delivery system. *Baxter Health Policy Rev*. 1995;2:101–148.

28. Shortell S, Jones R, Rademaker A, et al. Assessing the impact of total quality management and organizational culture on multiple outcomes of care for coronary artery bypass graft surgery patients. *Med Care*. 2000;38:207–217.

29. Shortell S, Zazzali J, Burns L, et al. Implementing evidence-based medicine: the role of market pressures, compensation incentives, and culture in physician organizations. *Med Care*. 2001;39:1–62.

30. Ferlie E, Shortell S. Improving the quality of health care in the United Kingdom and the United States: a framework for change. *Milbank Q*. 2001;79:281–315.

31. Ash M, Seago JA. The effect of registered nurses' unions on heart-attack mortality. *Indus Labor Relat Rev*. 2004;57:422–442.

32. Seago JA, Ash M. Registered nurse unions and patient outcomes. *J Nurs Admin*. 2002;32:143–151.

33. Gjerberg E, Kjolsrod L. The doctor-nurse relationship: how easy is it to be a female doctor co-operating with a female nurse? *Soc Sci Med*. 2001;52:189–202.

34. Goodwin L, Taylor N. Doing away with the "doctor-nurse game". *Superv Nurse*. 1977;8:25–26.

35. Marsden C. Ethics of the "doctor-nurse game". *Heart Lung*. 1990;19:422–424.

36. Murray FJ. The maneuvering continues in the doctor-nurse game. *Med World News*. 1986;27:80–86, 89–92, 97.

37. Stein LI. The doctor-nurse game. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 1967;16:699–703.

38. Stein LI. The doctor-nurse game. *Am J Nurs*. 1968;68:101–105.

39. Stein LI, Watts DT, Howell T. The doctor-nurse game revisited [see comments]. *N Engl J Med*. 1990;322:546–549.

40. Gawande A. *The Checklist*. The New Yorker 83.39. 2007:86–95.

41. Gordon S, Benner P, Noddings N. *Caregiving: Readings in Knowledge, Practice, Ethics, and Politics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; 1996.

42. Flarey D, Yoder S, Barabas M. Collaboration in labor relations: a model for success. *J Nurs Admin*. 1992;22:15–22.

43. Harper E, Motwani J, Subramanian R. Collective bargaining practices in the health care industry: an empirical analysis. *Health Care Manager*. 1994;13:31–42.

44. Breda K. Professional nurses in unions: working together pays off. *J Prof Nurs*. 1997;13:99–109.

45. American Organization of Nurse Executives. When work redesign prompts unionization activity. *Nurs Manage*. 1994;24:36–38.

46. Seago J, Herrera C-N, Ash M, et al. Hospital RN job satisfaction and nurse unions. *J Nurs Admin*. 2011;41:109–114.

47. Sherer J. Union uprising. California nurses react aggressively to work redesign. *Hosp Health Netw*. 1994;68:36–38.

48. Kovner C, Gergen P. Nurse staffing levels and adverse events following surgery in US hospitals. *Image*. 1998;30:315–321.

49. Needelman J, Buerhaus P, Mattke S, et al. Nurse-staffing levels and the quality of care in hospitals. *N Engl J Med*. 2002;346:1715–1722.

50. Coffman JM, Seago JA, Spetz J. Minimum nurse-to-patient ratios in acute care hospitals in California. *Health Aff*. 2002;31:53–64.

51. Seago JA, Davidson S, Waldo D. Oregon nurse staffing law: is it working? *J Nurs Adm*. 2012;42:134–137.

52. Gruber J, Kleiner SA. Do strikes kill? Evidence from New York State. *Am Econ J.: Econ Policy*. 2012;4:127–157.

53. Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Major Work Stoppages in 2012*. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Labor; 2013a.

54. Budd KW, Warino LS, Patton ME. Traditional and non-traditional collective bargaining: strategies to improve the patient care environment. *Online J Issues Nurs*. 2004;9:9.

55. California Nurse, CNA considers action on state single payer initiative. *Calif Nurse*. 1994;11:8–9.

56. Patton RM. ANA rejects NLRB decision to block nurses freedom to unionize. Press release; 2006.