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## Data Brief: Blacks in Unions: 2012

## Part I: Introduction

April 4 marked the $45^{\text {th }}$ anniversary of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King. He was killed in Memphis as he supported the effort of Black sanitation workers to form a union. His endorsement of unionization as a central strategy to improve the lives of the Black community was not a recent one. From the very beginning of his prominence as a civil rights leader, he viewed the civil rights movement as being deeply intertwined with the struggle of workers to organize for power and dignity on the job. ${ }^{2}$

In January, the Bureau of Labor Statistics released its annual report on unionization. ${ }^{3}$ Overall union density - the proportion of the workforce comprised of union members declined. At the same time, the union premium - the positive differential between wages received by union members relative to non-union members - still existed. In light of the declining presence of unions, the continued benefits of unionization, and Dr. King's strong support of unions, this Data Brief presents a picture of Blacks in unions that goes beyond the data in the BLS report. Part II examines overall Black unionization disaggregated by gender. Part III presents data on Black unionization disaggregated by gender and region. Part IV examines Black unionization with a focus on the largest 10 metropolitan areas. The Appendix presents the same analysis as the brief, but disaggregates the data by race and ethnicity.

Key findings in this brief include:

- A greater proportion of Black workers were union members compared to the proportion of non-Black workers who were union members. In 2012, 13.1\% of all Black workers in the United States were union members; $11.0 \%$ of non-Black workers in the United States were union members.

[^0]- Black workers were disproportionately in unions relative to their share in the overall workforce. In 2012, 13.3\% of all union members in the United States were Black; Blacks comprised $11.4 \%$ of the overall workforce in the United States.
- These differences were magnified when limiting the analysis to the ten most populous metropolitan areas in the United States. Among U. S. workers, Blacks were $19 \%$ more likely to belong to unions than non-Blacks; however, among workers in the largest metropolitan areas, Blacks were $42 \%$ more likely to belong to unions compared to non-Blacks.


## Part II: Black Unionization

This Brief presents data on the proportion of Black workers who are union members (Black union density); the proportion of all union members that is Black (Black share of union members); and the proportion of the workforce that is Black (Black share of the workforce). ${ }^{4}$ To place this data in a context, the Black union density is compared to the union density among non-Blacks and the Black share of union members will be compared to the Black share of the workforce.

As indicated in Table 1, Black union density is a greater than the union density among non-Blacks: $13.1 \%$ of all Black workers are union members compared to $11.0 \%$ of all non-Black workers. Black union density exceeded non-Black union density when the data was disaggregated by gender.

| Table 1 <br> Union Density - |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Proportion of Workforce in Unions |  |  |  |

In addition, union membership is disproportionately Black when compared to the entire workforce. $13.3 \%$ of all union members were Black; this is larger than the Black share of the entire workforce that was $11.4 \%$. This disproportionality was true for Black men and Black women.

[^1]Table 2
Black Share -
Proportion of Union/Workforce that is
Black

|  | All | Men | Women |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Union | $13.3 \%$ | $12.1 \%$ | $14.8 \%$ |
| Workforce | $11.4 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ | $13.0 \%$ |

## Part III: Black Unionization by Region

Tables 3-7 present the same analysis at the regional level. The same pattern exists: Black union density is higher than non-Black union density and the share of union workers that are Black is larger than the share of all workers that are Black.

Table 3
Union Density and Black Share -
By Region
Union Density Black Share
Northeast
Black 23.8\% Union 14.2\%

Non-Black $16.5 \% \quad$ Workforce $\quad 10.3 \%$
Midwest

| Black | $16.1 \%$ | Union | $11.5 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Non-Black | $11.8 \%$ | Workforce | $8.7 \%$ |

South

| Black | $7.7 \%$ | Union | $23.9 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Non-Black | $5.4 \%$ | Workforce | $18.0 \%$ |


| Black | $22.7 \%$ | Union | $7.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Non-Black | $13.9 \%$ | Workforce | $4.4 \%$ |

Table 4
Union Density and Black Share By Region and Gender: Northeast Union Density Black Share Men

| Black | $23.2 \%$ | Union | $11.9 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Non-Black | $17.2 \%$ | Workforce | $9.1 \%$ |
|  | Women |  |  |
| Black | $24.3 \%$ | Union | $16.7 \%$ |
| Non-Black | $15.7 \%$ | Workforce | $11.4 \%$ |

Table 5
Union Density and Black Share By Region and Gender: Midwest
Union Density Black Share Men

| Black | $18.7 \%$ | Union | $10.1 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Non-Black | $13.4 \%$ | Workforce | $7.5 \%$ |
|  | Women |  |  |
| Black | $14.1 \%$ | Union | $13.4 \%$ |
| Non-Black | $10.0 \%$ | Workforce | $9.9 \%$ |

Table 6
Union Density and Black Share -
By Region and Gender: South
Union Density
Black Share
Men

| Black | 9.3\% | Union | $21.6 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Non-Black | $6.2 \%$ | Workforce | $15.5 \%$ |
|  | Women |  |  |
| Black | $6.5 \%$ | Union | $27.3 \%$ |
| Non-Black | $4.5 \%$ | Workforce | $20.7 \%$ |

## Table 7

Union Density and Black Share -
By Region and Gender: West Union Density Black Share

Men

| Black | $24.4 \%$ | Union | $7.1 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Non-Black | $13.7 \%$$\quad$ Workforce | $4.1 \%$ |  |
|  | Women |  |  |
| Black | $21.0 \%$ | Union | $6.8 \%$ |
| Non-Black | $14.2 \%$ | Workforce | $4.7 \%$ |

## Part IV: Black Unionization in the Ten Most Populous Metropolitan Areas

Tables 8 and 9 provide data on Black unionization in the ten largest metropolitan areas. ${ }^{5}$ In the largest 10 metropolitan areas, $16.3 \%$ of Black workers are in unions in contrast to $11.5 \%$ of non-Blacks workers. This pattern of greater union density among Black workers relative to non-Black union density is repeated when the data is disaggregated by gender. In addition, as seen in the analysis for the entire population, the proportion of union members that is Black exceeds the share of the entire workforce that is Black.

| Table 8 <br> Union Density - <br> Largest 10 Metropolitan Areas |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All | Men | Women |
| Black | 16.3\% | 17.6\% | 15.3\% |
| Non-Black | 11.5\% | 11.9\% | 11.0\% |
| Table 9 |  |  |  |
| Black Share - <br> Largest 10 Metropolitan Areas |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | All | Men | Women |
| Union | 20.5\% | 18.2\% | 23.3\% |
| Workforce | 15.4\% | 13.1\% | 18.0\% |

Table 10 presents the data for the entire U.S. population and largest 10 metropolitan areas and then compares the relative union densities at the two levels of geographies. For the U.S. population, Black workers were $19 \%$ more likely to be union members

[^2]than non-Blacks (13.1/11.0 = 1.19). However, when the analysis is restricted to the ten most populous metropolitan areas, Black workers are $42 \%$ more likely to be union members than non-Black union members (16.3/11/5 = 1.42). This increased probability of being a union member is true when the data is examined by gender.

Table 10
Union Density

| U.S. - All |  |  | Top 10 Metro Areas -All |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Black | Non-Black | Ratio | Black | Non-Black | Ratio |
| 13.1\% | 11.0\% | 1.19 | 16.3\% | 11.5\% | 1.42 |
| U.S. - Men |  |  | Top 10 Metro Areas -Men |  |  |
| Black | Non-Black | Ratio | Black | Non-Black | Ratio |
| 14.6\% | 11.7\% | 1.25 | 17.6\% | 11.9\% | 1.48 |
| U.S. - Women |  |  | Top 10 Metro Areas - Women |  |  |
| Black | Non-Black | Ratio | Black | Non-Black | Ratio |
| 11.9\% | 10.3\% | 1.16 | 15.3\% | 11.0\% | 1.38 |

Table 11 provides a measure of disproportionality: Blacks are members of unions at a rate greater than their share of the entire workforce. For the U.S. population, this disproportionality is $16 \%(13.3 / 11.4=1.16)$. However, this disproportionality increases when examining the largest metropolitan areas. For all Blacks in the largest metropolitan areas, the disproportionality is $33 \%(20.5 / 15.4=1.33)$.

## Table 11

## Black Share

| U.S. - All |  |  | Top 10 Metro Areas -All |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Union | Workforce | Ratio | Union | Workforce | Ratio |
| 13.3\% | 11.4\% | 1.16 | 20.5\% | 15.4\% | 1.33 |
| U.S. - Men |  |  | Top 10 Metro Areas - Men |  |  |
| Union | Workforce | Ratio | Union | Workforce | Ratio |
| 12.1\% | 10.0\% | 1.22 | 18.2\% | 13.1\% | 1.39 |
| U.S. - Women |  |  | Top 10 Metro Areas - Women |  |  |
| Union | Workforce | Ratio | Union | Workforce | Ratio |
| 14.8\% | 13.0\% | 1.13 | 23.3\% | 18.0\% | 1.30 |

## Part V: Conclusion

An analysis of 2012 Current Population Survey data reveals that Black workers have a higher union density compared to non-Black workers and Blacks workers comprise a disproportionate share of the union membership relative to their share of the overall workforce. These patterns exist when the data is disaggregated by gender and region. In addition, the pattern is more pronounced when examining data from the 10 most populous metropolitan areas in the country

The relatively high proportion of Black union members in large metropolitan areas might hold rising importance as the labor movement seeks new ways to improve the conditions facing workers in the United States. In recent years, while union density has been declining, public policy campaigns to raise labor standards have been successful at the state and local level. Local authorities have passed legislation to raise minimum wages, provide paid sick days, and combat wage theft. To the extent Blacks are disproportionately members of unions, a pathway to great public policy success might lie through a stronger relationship with Black communities and their elected officials.

## APPENDIX

Table A1

| UNION DENSITY - |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proportion of Workforce in Unions |  |  |  |  |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |
| White | Black | Latino | Other | Total |
| $11.4 \%$ | $13.1 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ | $11.2 \%$ |
| MALE |  |  |  |  |
| White | Black | Latino | Other | Total |
| $12.3 \%$ | $14.6 \%$ | $10.1 \%$ | $9.2 \%$ | $12.0 \%$ |
| FEMALE |  |  |  |  |
| White | Black | Latino | Other | Total |
| $10.4 \%$ | $11.9 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ | $10.2 \%$ | $10.5 \%$ |

Table A2

| UNION DENSITY - Northeast |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |
| White | Black | Latino | Other | Total |
| 17.0\% | 23.8\% | 17.1\% | 9.6\% | 17.2\% |
| MALE |  |  |  |  |
| 17.9\% | 23.2\% | 17.7\% | 9.0\% | 17.8\% |
| FEMALE |  |  |  |  |
| 16.0\% | 24.3\% | 16.5\% | 10.2\% | 16.7\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| UNION DENSITY - Midwest |  |  |  |  |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |
| White | Black | Latino | Other | Total |
| 12.1\% | 16.1\% | 10.3\% | 6.3\% | 12.2\% |
| MALE |  |  |  |  |
| 14.0\% | 18.7\% | 11.0\% | 6.3\% | 13.8\% |
| FEMALE |  |  |  |  |
| 10.2\% | 14.1\% | 9.1\% | 6.3\% | 10.4\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| UNION DENSITY - South |  |  |  |  |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |
| White | Black | Latino | Other | Total |
| 5.9\% | 7.7\% | 3.9\% | 4.1\% | 5.8\% |
| MALE |  |  |  |  |
| 6.8\% | 9.3\% | 4.2\% | 5.0\% | 6.7\% |
| FEMALE |  |  |  |  |
| 4.9\% | 6.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.2\% | 4.9\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| UNION DENSITY - West |  |  |  |  |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |
| White | Black | Latino | Other | Total |
| 14.5\% | 22.7\% | 12.9\% | 13.8\% | 14.3\% |
| MALE |  |  |  |  |
| 14.4\% | 24.4\% | 12.8\% | 12.7\% | 14.1\% |
| FEMALE |  |  |  |  |
| 14.7\% | 21.0\% | 13.0\% | 14.8\% | 14.6\% |

Table A3

| UNION DENSITY - Top 10 Metro Areas |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |
| White | Black | Latino | Other | Total |
| 12.4\% | 16.3\% | 10.7\% | 8.7\% | 12.2\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| MALE |  |  |  |  |
| White | Black | Latino | Other | Total |
| 13.1\% | 17.60\% | 11.0\% | 8.2\% | 12.6\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| FEMALE |  |  |  |  |
| White | Black | Latino | Other | Total |
| 11.6\% | 15.3\% | 10.4\% | 9.3\% | 11.8\% |

Table A4
GROUP SHARE -

| GROUP SHARE - |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion of Union/Workforce that is of the Group |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | White | Black | Latino | Other | Total |
| Union | $67.5 \%$ | $13.3 \%$ | $13.8 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Workforce | $66.6 \%$ | $11.4 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| MALE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Union | $68.6 \%$ | $12.1 \%$ | $14.6 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Workforce | $66.5 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ | $17.3 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| FEMALE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Union | $66.3 \%$ | $14.8 \%$ | $12.9 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Workforce | $66.6 \%$ | $13.0 \%$ | $14.1 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Table A5

| GROUP SHARE - Northeast |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | White | Black | Latino | Other | Total |
| Union | 70.5\% | 14.2\% | 11.7\% | 3.6\% | 100.0\% |
| Workforce | 71.5\% | 10.3\% | 11.7\% | 6.5\% | 100.0\% |
| MALE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Union | 72.1\% | 11.9\% | 12.4\% | 3.6\% | 100.0\% |
| Workforce | 71.5\% | 9.1\% | 12.5\% | 7.0\% | 100.0\% |
| FEMALE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Union | 68.8\% | 16.7\% | 10.9\% | 3.6\% | 100.0\% |
| Workforce | 71.6\% | 11.4\% | 11.0\% | 5.9\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GROUP SHARE - Midwest |  |  |  |  |  |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | White | Black | Latino | Other | Total |
| Union | 81.2\% | 11.5\% | 5.4\% | 1.9\% | 100.0\% |
| Workforce | 81.3\% | 8.7\% | 6.4\% | 3.6\% | 100.0\% |
| MALE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Union | 82.1\% | 10.1\% | 6.0\% | 1.8\% | 100.0\% |
| Workforce | 81.1\% | 7.5\% | 7.5\% | 3.9\% | 100.0\% |
| FEMALE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Union | 80.0\% | 13.4\% | 4.6\% | 2.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Workforce | 81.5\% | 9.9\% | 5.2\% | 3.4\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GROUP SHARE - South |  |  |  |  |  |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | White | Black | Latino | Other | Total |
| Union | 62.2\% | 23.9\% | 11.0\% | 2.9\% | 100.0\% |
| Workforce | 61.6\% | 18.0\% | 16.3\% | 4.0\% | 100.0\% |
| MALE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Union | 64.0\% | 21.6\% | 11.3\% | 3.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Workforce | 62.7\% | 15.5\% | 17.7\% | 4.1\% | 100.0\% |
| FEMALE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Union | 59.7\% | 27.3\% | 10.5\% | 2.6\% | 100.0\% |
| Workforce | 60.5\% | 20.7\% | 14.7\% | 4.0\% | 100.0\% |

Table A5, continued

| GROUP SHARE - West |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | White | Black | Latino | Other | Total |
|  | $56.6 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ | $24.9 \%$ | $11.6 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Union | $55.9 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $27.7 \%$ | $12.1 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Workforce | MALE |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Union | $55.7 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ | $27.1 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Workforce | $54.9 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ | $29.9 \%$ | $11.1 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| FEMALE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Union | $57.5 \%$ | $6.8 \%$ | $22.4 \%$ | $13.4 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Workforce | $57.0 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $25.2 \%$ | $13.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Table A6

| GROUP SHARE - Top 10 Metro Areas |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | White | Black | Latino | Other | Total |
| Union | $51.7 \%$ | $20.5 \%$ | $21.2 \%$ | $6.6 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Workforce | $51.1 \%$ | $15.4 \%$ | $24.2 \%$ | $9.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| MALE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Union | $52.9 \%$ | $18.2 \%$ | $22.8 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Workforce | $51.1 \%$ | $13.1 \%$ | $26.3 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| FEMALE |  |  |  |  |  |
| UUnion | $50.3 \%$ | $23.3 \%$ | $19.4 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Workforce | $51.1 \%$ | $18.0 \%$ | $22.1 \%$ | $8.9 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The author wishes to thank the Economic Policy Institute for the use of their data and Sylvia Allegretto (UC Berkeley Center on Wage and Employment Dynamics) for her assistance in obtaining and analyzing the data.
    ${ }^{2}$ See King's speeches on labor in Michael Honey, ed, "All Labor Has Dignity" (Beacon Press; 2011).
    ${ }^{3}$ U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Union Member ---- 2012 (http://www.bls.gov/news.release/union2.nr0.htm; accessed March 23, 2013)

[^1]:    ${ }^{4}$ The data is based on the author's analysis of the Current Population Survey Outgoing Rotation Group microdata. In contrast to the analysis presented in the BLS report where White, Black, Other, and Latino are not mutually exclusive categories, this brief creates categories that are mutually exclusive. Hence, while the terms Black, non-Black, White, Other will be used for expository clarity, the categories are actually, non-Hispanic Black, non non-Hispanic Black, non-Hispanic White, and non-Hispanic Other. In addition, the weights used in this data set vary somewhat from those used by the BLS; therefore, there are minor variations between data reported here and data reported by the BLS.

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ The top ten most populous metropolitan areas in 2012 were: New York City; Los Angeles; Chicago; Dallas; Houston; Philadelphia; Washington, DC; Miami; Atlanta; and Boston.

