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**Introduction**

The National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) possesses wide discretion in establishing policies to safeguard the conduct of union representation elections held pursuant to statutory procedure. The Board's function is "to assure the employees full and complete freedom of choice" in voting for or against union representation. Recognizing that employer or union misconduct during an election can impair this free choice, the NLRB has sought to guarantee that elections be conducted under "laboratory conditions." The elections are thus viewed as experiments to determine the employees' real preference. When the laboratory conditions are impaired by employer or union conduct, the Board will set aside the election and direct that a new one be held.

In a 1962 decision, *Hollywood Ceramics Co.*, the NLRB held that gross misrepresentation about a material election issue is one factor which interferes with the expression of free choice and disturbs laboratory conditions. In 1977, the Board announced in *Shopping Kart Food Market, Inc.* that it would no longer probe into the truth or falsity of campaign statements nor set aside elections on the basis of misrepresentation. Twenty months later, the NLRB reinstated the *Hollywood Ceramics* rule in *General Knit of California*. This comment will examine the Board's reasons for re-establishing the frequently criticized *Hollywood Ceramics* rule.

---

2. Section 9(c)(1) of the Labor Management Relations (Taft-Hartley) Act, 29 U.S.C. § 159(c)(1) (1970), provides for the filing of a petition for a representation election by the employees, the employer, or a union. If upon the basis of the petition the Board determines that it has reasonable cause to believe that a question of representation affecting commerce exists, it orders a hearing. "If the Board finds upon the record of such hearing that such a question of representation exists, it shall direct an election by secret ballot and shall certify the results thereof." Id.
5. Id.
6. Id.
7. Id.
8. Id. at 223.
9. *Id.* at 1311, 1313.
10. *Id.* at 1311, 1313.
Laboratory Conditions and Misrepresentation

Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) broadly outlines employee rights "to self-organize, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of [the employees'] own choosing, and . . . to refrain from any or all of such activities . . . ." The NLRA specifically prohibits as unfair labor practices actions which coerce, interfere with or restrain employees in the exercise of these organizational rights. The laboratory conditions required for union elections are not specifically mandated by the NLRA, but originated in the Board's General Shoe Corp. decision.

General Shoe held that speech or conduct during an election campaign which falls short of constituting an unfair labor practice may still violate laboratory conditions, requiring invalidation of the election. Thus the NLRB has overturned an election where a non-coercive campaign speech was made on company time within twenty-four hours of an election. Non-coercive employer interviews have also been held to interfere with free choice because of the circumstances under which they were conducted.

Problems of Campaign Regulation, 56 N.C.L. Rev. 389, 390 n.8 (1978) [hereinafter cited as Problems of Regulation]. Observers noted the possibility of its being overruled after a change in Board membership. Id. at 406 n. 102; Note, Misrepresentations in Union Organizational Elections: The Death of Hollywood Ceramics, 9 U. Tol. L. Rev. 399, 419 (1978) [hereinafter cited as Death of Hollywood Ceramics]. The Shopping Kart majority consisted of Member Pennello, then-Member Walter and then-Chairman Murphy; Members Fanning and Jenkins dissented. New Member Truesdale joined Jenkins and Chairman Fanning in the General Knit decision, with Members Penello and Murphy dissenting.

15. 77 N.L.R.B. 124 (1948).
16. The case was the Board's response to the enactment in 1947 of § 8(c) of the Labor Management Relations (Taft-Hartley) Act, which provides:

The expressing of any views, argument, or opinion, or the disseminations thereof, whether in written, printed, graphic, or visual form, shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice under any of the provisions of this Act, if such expression contains no threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit.

29 U.S.C. § 158(c) (1970). Congress intended this section to allow employers greater freedom of expression than they had enjoyed under the Board's pre-1947 policies. However, the Board held that the section would apply only to unfair labor practices and announced it would continue to regulate campaign behavior. See generally Problems of Regulation, supra note 11, at 392 n.24, 393 n.28.
17. Peerless Plywood Co., 107 N.L.R.B. 427 (1953). The Peerless Plywood rule is based on the Board's belief that last minute speeches on company time to massed assemblies of employees "tend to interfere with that sober and thoughtful choice which a free election is designed to reflect." Id. at 429.
18. E.g., Peoria Plastic Co., 117 N.L.R.B. 545 (1957) (interviews at employees' homes);
In *Hollywood Ceramics*, the Board applied the laboratory conditions standard to misstatements made during an election campaign, and announced the following rule:

We believe that an election should be set aside only where there has been a misrepresentation or other similar campaign trickery, which involves a substantial departure from the truth, at a time which prevents the other party . . . from making an effective reply, so that the misrepresentation, whether deliberate or not, may reasonably be expected to have a significant impact on the election.  

*Hollywood Ceramics* weighed the right of the employees to an "untrammeled choice" against the right of all parties to wage a free and vigorous campaign. On balance, the Board determined that the former consideration prevailed. However, the Board noted that its intervention in the election process should be limited, since directing new elections upsets plant routine and prevents stable labor-management relations.

In addition, the review process used by the Board to determine whether a new election should be held also had unsettling effects. Losing parties could delay certification of election results by filing post-election objections to campaign conduct with the NLRB. Further...
ther, the United States courts of appeal often disagreed with the Board’s application of its own standards for reviewing election objections. The frequent refusal of the courts to enforce Board bargaining orders in misrepresentation cases compounded the uncertainty in these situations.24

Stating that it could no longer support a standard of review that “operates more to frustrate free choice than to further it,”25 the Board in Shopping Kart Food Market, Inc. abandoned the Hollywood Ceramics test. In overruling Hollywood Ceramics, the Board primarily relied on a single empirical study of employee voting behavior known as the Getman study.26 The study concluded that employees are generally inattentive to election campaigns.27 The Board also acknowledged the criticism of its election procedures.28 The Shopping Kart decision stressed that employees are capable of ferreting out misleading campaign propaganda.29 Conse-

newly certified union. Such refusal would prompt unfair labor practice proceedings, resulting in a Board order to bargain. Enforcement of the order could be sought in the circuit courts, § 10(c), 29 U.S.C. § 160(c) (1970), where the employer could raise campaign conduct objections. This review process can be extremely lengthy. See note 48 infra.

In Modine Mfg. Co., 203 N.L.R.B. 527 (1973), the Board recognized that the problem of delay was one of the inherent dangers in the Hollywood Ceramics rule. The Board expressed concern over such factors as the time and money spent on hearings and re-elections, and the need for caution in applying rigorous election safeguards. Although these dangers made it tempting to overrule Hollywood Ceramics, the Board declined to do so at that time. Id. at 530.

24. See WILLIAMS, supra note 20, at 60. The study noted that routine objections by losing parties and a high volume of litigation were likely to continue under Hollywood Ceramics and recommended that it be overruled. But see General Knit of Cal., 239 N.L.R.B. No. 101, 99 L.R.R.M. 1687, 1691 (1978) which noted that relatively few misrepresentation cases are appealed.


27. Getman, supra note 26 at 283. A key finding was that slightly over 80% of the employees in the sample had voted in accordance with their pre-campaign intentions and attitudes. Id.


29. “Despite the many difficulties in administering the Hollywood Ceramics rule, we, too, would nevertheless choose to continue to adhere to it if we shared the belief that employees needed our ‘protection’ from campaign misrepresentations.” 228 N.L.R.B. at 1313.
quently, elections would no longer be set aside on the basis of misrepresentations. The Board declared that it would continue to intervene in cases involving the misuse of Board processes or the use of forged documents.

Two Board members objected to the policy shift, arguing that the Board should continue to investigate claims of misrepresentation so that the parties to an election would have a "minimum of lingering doubt" as to its fairness. These dissenting opinions laid the groundwork for the reversal which came in General Knit.

**General Knit: Return to Board Review**

The facts in *General Knit of California* did not present a strong case for overruling *Shopping Kart*. On election day, the union had distributed a leaflet describing the financial condition of both the employer and its parent corporation. The employer claimed that

---

30. Since *Shopping Kart* involved only a misrepresentation—the union's representative told employees that company profits for the previous year had been $500,000, though in fact the profits were $50,000—the Board overruled the employer's objection and certified the union. *Id.* at 1314.

31. Then-Chairman Murphy stated in her concurrence that she would also set aside an election where a party makes an egregious mistake of fact, but only in the most extreme situations. *Id.*

As an example of the "Board processes" exception, the Board cited L. Ray McDermott & Co., 215 N.L.R.B. 570 (1974) (flyer containing partisan statements along with a reproduction of a Board document might have led employees to believe that Board had endorsed union; second election directed). *But see Death of Hollywood Ceramics, supra note 11, at 417 n.121* ("Board processes" exception inconsistent with Board policy of treating employees as mature and sophisticated voters).

Before development of the *Hollywood Ceramics* doctrine, the Board limited its review to factual situations involving forgery. *See, e.g.*, United Aircraft Corp., 103 N.L.R.B. 102 (1953) (one union distributed copies of a forged telegram from an opposing union's president, purporting to apologize for campaign misconduct; election set aside because employees could not have recognized the forgeries as propaganda).

32. 228 N.L.R.B. at 1315.


34. The leaflet stated in part:

"WHO IS FOOLING WHO???

GENERAL KNIT CAN CRY POOR MOUTH IF THEY WANT, BUT LET'S LOOK AT THE FACTS.

IN 1976, GENERAL KNIT HAD SALES OF $25 MILLION.

GENERAL KNIT IS OWNED BY ITOH WHO HAS A NET WORTH IN EXCESS OF $200 MILLION.

THIS COMPANY HAD AN INCREASE OF 12.5% IN SALES FOR [THE] PERIOD ENDING MARCH 31, 1977.

DURING THIS PERIOD THIS COMPANY HAD A PROFIT OF $19.3 MILLION.

DON'T BE FOOLED BY GENERAL KNIT AND THEIR HIGH PRICE LAWYERS.

ITOH WHO OWNS GENERAL KNIT IS MAKING IT BIG AND CAN AF-
the union had misrepresented the parent corporation's profits of $19.3 million as those of the employer, when in fact General Knit had lost $5 million.\textsuperscript{35}

The Acting Regional Director correctly overruled General Knit's objections on the basis of \textit{Shopping Kart}. The Board, however, decided to reinstate \textit{Hollywood Ceramics} "to maintain the integrity of Board elections and thereby protect employee free choice."\textsuperscript{36} The case was remanded for factual findings on the misrepresentation issue.\textsuperscript{37}

The \textit{General Knit} majority emphasized the stability of the bargaining relationship which results from the free election process. The \textit{Hollywood Ceramics} test, it claimed, "has been a significant factor in the Board's electoral success, since the parties, knowing the serious consequences of their acts, have been deterred from engaging in conduct which would tend to interfere improperly with a free election."\textsuperscript{38} Further, the Board relied on its past experience in conducting elections and rejected \textit{Shopping Kart}'s conclusion that employees ignore campaign propaganda.\textsuperscript{39} The majority also responded to charges of unreasonable delay in certifying election results which had been leveled in \textit{Shopping Kart} and reiterated in a strong dissent in \textit{General Knit}.\textsuperscript{40} It noted that such delays are inher-
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ent in any appeal of a Board order and are not peculiar to misrepresentation cases.41

RECURRING PROBLEMS OF THE HOLLYWOOD CERAMICS APPROACH

The opinion in General Knit acknowledged two specific criticisms of the Board’s application of the Hollywood Ceramics rule. One major objection was the difficulty in predicting whether the Board would find a particular misrepresentation material under all the circumstances. The flexibility of the rule and the need for detailed factual determinations in each case produced inconsistent results over the years before Shopping Kart.42 The General Knit Board’s only response to this criticism was to set as its goals strict adherence to the reinstated rule and equal application of the rule to employers and unions.43 The Board emphasized its intention to allow parties to campaign vigorously.44

It is unclear how strict adherence to a flexible standard can produce uniform decisions. Reestablishing review of misrepresentation objections once again places the NLRB in an adjudicative role, analyzing facts and applying the rule on a case-by-case basis.45 Since General Knit failed to establish specific guidelines for determining materiality of misrepresentations, consistent and predictable results remain unlikely.

The inherent uncertainty in the decisions also contributes to the use of objections as a vehicle for delay.46 According to Member Penello’s dissent in General Knit, the delays involved in Board review standard were applied. The court was unsure, however, of the proper standard of review because in the interim before rehearing, the Board had decided Shopping Kart. The case was remanded to the Board solely for a determination on the retroactive application of the new standard. Although it recognized that Shopping Kart could dictate a different result in the case, the court specifically did not pass on the correctness of that decision. Id. at 1119. Member Penello’s reliance on the mere fact of remand is therefore misplaced.

41. 239 N.L.R.B. at ____, 99 L.R.R.M. at 1691 n.28.
42. See generally Williams, supra note 20, at 55-61.
43. 239 N.L.R.B. at ____, 99 L.R.R.M. at 1690-91. Member Penello in his dissent apparently interprets “strict” adherence to Hollywood Ceramics to mean broad application of the rule. Id. at ____, 99 L.R.R.M. at 1698. However, the majority opinion implies that “strict” adherence will restrict application of the rule. Id. at ____, 99 L.R.R.M. at 1691.
44. Id. at 1690-91.
45. See Problems of Regulation, supra note 11 (Board should effectuate changes in campaign standards through rulemaking proceedings rather than through adjudication).
46. The unpredictability of the outcome in misrepresentation cases may induce employers to maintain objections of questionable validity following a union victory, in the hope that the delays engendered by the review process will dissipate the union’s support. See text accompanying note 49 infra.
47. Member Penello had urged the abandonment of Hollywood Ceramics in two dissents prior to Shopping Kart. See Ereno Lewis, 217 N.L.R.B. 239, 240 (1975); Medical Ancillary Serv., Inc., 212 N.L.R.B. 582, 586 (1974). See also Penello, Shopping Kart Food Market, Inc.:
thwart the fundamental goal of encouraging collective bargaining.48 Employers have an incentive to appeal adverse decisions because the courts refuse to enforce bargaining orders in fifty percent of misrepresentation cases.49 The majority countered that few such cases are appealed50 and concluded that “the problem of delay has been greatly exaggerated.”51 On a practical note, the Board suggested that it would hold fewer hearings on misrepresentation objections.52 The General Knit majority gave short shrift to the problems of delay and lack of predictability. Cursory treatment of these issues was justified by the Board’s finding that such considerations were outweighed by the value of preservation of free choice.53 This view begs the question whether free choice is best served by painstaking

---


49. Members Fanning and Jenkins had previously noted that the NLRB handled some 300 to 400 cases of objections based on misrepresentations out of some 10,000 elections held per year. Out of these, second elections were ordered in only seven percent, or 25 to 27 cases per year. Shopping Kart Food Mkt., Inc., 228 N.L.R.B. at 1316 (dissenting opinion). Based on these statistics, the General Knit majority found the administrative burden of regulating campaign misrepresentations slight when compared with the substantial benefit of insuring free choice. 239 N.L.R.B. at ___, 99 L.R.R.M. at 1689. See id. at ___ n.13, ___ n.62; 99 L.R.R.M. at 1689 n.13, 1701 n.62. Presumably it is unimportant whether Shopping Kart actually had the effect of deterring the filing of misrepresentation objections in the year after its decision, since it would certainly have had that effect if applied consistently for a long enough period. Mere reduction in caseload is not probative of the rule’s value. By the same reasoning, neither is the continued filing of objections.

50. See note 48 supra. Members Fanning and Jenkins had previously noted that the NLRB handled some 300 to 400 cases of objections based on misrepresentations out of some 10,000 elections held per year. Out of these, second elections were ordered in only seven percent, or 25 to 27 cases per year. Shopping Kart Food Mkt., Inc., 228 N.L.R.B. at 1316 (dissenting opinion). Based on these statistics, the General Knit majority found the administrative burden of regulating campaign misrepresentations slight when compared with the substantial benefit of insuring free choice. 239 N.L.R.B. at ___, 99 L.R.R.M. at 1689. See id. at ___ n.13, ___ n.62; 99 L.R.R.M. at 1689 n.13, 1701 n.62. Presumably it is unimportant whether Shopping Kart actually had the effect of deterring the filing of misrepresentation objections in the year after its decision, since it would certainly have had that effect if applied consistently for a long enough period. Mere reduction in caseload is not probative of the rule’s value. By the same reasoning, neither is the continued filing of objections.

51. Id. at ___, 99 L.R.R.M. at 1691.

52. Id. citing Modine Mfg., 203 N.L.R.B. 527 (1973), enforced, 500 F.2d 914 (8th Cir. 1974). “The median time from the date of election to the date of issuance of a decision by the Regional Director on objections is approximately two months.” 239 N.L.R.B. at ___, 99 L.R.R.M. at 1694 (dissenting opinion by Member Penello). However, “[t]his figure represents an average of cases in which hearings have and have not been held.” Id. at n.32, 99 L.R.R.M. at 1694 n.32. Member Penello estimated further delays as follows: review by the Board of exceptions to the Regional Director’s findings (three months); subsequent refusal to bargain resulting in unfair labor practice proceedings (nine and a half months to Board order); appeal of the order to the courts (seven and a half months to decision). But see note 48 supra (few cases are appealed).

53. “In any event, we would not . . . place a greater value on expediency of case processing than on maintaining standards to preserve the integrity of the electoral process.” 239 N.L.R.B. at ___, 99 L.R.R.M. at 1691.
review of campaign propaganda when the resulting delay effectively prevents prompt implementation of bargaining.

Examining campaign statements for truth or falsity to determine their effect on an election is logical so long as the NLRB continues to regulate both unfair labor practices and other violations of laboratory conditions. The Shopping Kart decision preserved free choice as the standard for regulating campaign conduct in areas other than misrepresentation, and the dissent there pointed out the inconsistency of ignoring misrepresentations while continuing to regulate other behavior. The dissenters noted that the Getman study, relied on by the majority, had concluded that other forms of misconduct currently recognized as grounds for setting aside an election did not influence employees' votes either.

The Board's laboratory conditions standard is not mandated by the NLRA. Although the General Knit decision may aim for the effect of treating misrepresentation consistently with other campaign misconduct, the problems of unpredictability and delay which have plagued the review process in the area of misrepresentation are not alleviated by use of the laboratory conditions standard. Surprisingly, the decision to return to Hollywood Ceramics was not accompanied by a reexamination of the propriety of this standard.

In returning to the Hollywood Ceramics rule, the Board summarily discarded empirical evidence in favor of reliance on its own expertise. The only basis offered by the General Knit opinion for its assertion that the rule deters campaign misconduct was the Board's experience in conducting elections, ninety percent of which go unchallenged. Shopping Kart may have accepted empirical data without sufficient scrutiny, but General Knit reaches the op-
posite extreme, finding support for a major policy shift in the nebu-
loous concept of Board expertise.

CONCLUSION

General Knit leaves no doubt that policy prevailed over practical-
ity in the NLRB's decision to once again exercise control over cam-
paign propaganda. Regardless of the benefits of a Shopping Kart
approach in terms of predictability of result and speedy implemen-
tation of collective bargaining, "a rule which merely eliminates a
certain classification of cases, at the expense of an important princi-
ple [freedom of choice], is not a success."60 As one Board member
noted, the Shopping Kart position runs against the current trend
toward public protection, as exemplified by recent laws requiring
truth in advertising, freedom of information, and financial disclo-
sure in political campaigns.61

General Knit brings the briefly errant standard for election regu-
lation—that relating to misrepresentations—firmly back into line
with the NLRB's laboratory conditions requirement. The
Hollywood Ceramics rule's longevity and quick recovery suggest
continuing vitality in the future, even at the expense of practical
considerations. An untrammelled free choice is meaningless if the
results of that choice cannot be implemented quickly and effect-
ively. General Knit gives no real clue as to how future decisions can
avoid the problems which persisted under the Hollywood Ceramics
approach.

KAREN DORFF

60. 239 N.L.R.B. at ___, 99 L.R.R.M. at 1689 n.13.
   Member Murphy argued that even on pure policy grounds Shopping Kart should be the
proper rule. She maintained that the Board's responsibility to insure fair elections is deriv-
itive of its more fundamental duty under the NLRA to protect employees' rights to decide to
organize and engage in collective bargaining. Id. at ___, 99 L.R.R.M. at 1699 (dissenting
opinion).
   Murphy distinguished regulation of threats from that of misstatements and justified regu-
lation of coercion on a "reasonable" assumption that employees are likely to act or consider
acting to avoid consequences of a threat. This assumption might support ignoring misrepre-
sentation while continuing to regulate other conduct, but it is inconsistent with the findings
of the Getman study relied on in Shopping Kart. See text accompanying note 55 supra.
61. Shopping Kart Food Mkt., Inc., 228 N.L.R.B. 1311, 1317 (1977) (dissenting opinion
of Member Fanning).