

NEW TRENDS AND COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS ON UNIONIZATION AMONG PROFESSIONALS: THE CASE OF TURKEY

Ulku Dicle and Özgür Önday

Yeditepe University Dept. of Business Administration

Abstract

There has been an increasing interest in unionization and decrease in union membership both for blue and white collar workers during the recent years in all over the world. For quite some time, public employment remains the largest group of union membership. However, this seems to be changing due to recent developments in professional workers' demand for unionization mostly via professional associations, although "not surprisingly, professionals and managerial personnel have been less likely to approve of labor unions and exhibit less confidence in organized labor and labor leaders than blue-collar workers (Brint, 1985)". This paper attempts to shed light on what we know and don't know about new trends in unionization and unionization among professionals. Paper mainly includes 4 sections. It starts with the introduction and in that part unionization is broadly defined. In the first section, unions' historical development will also be investigated. More importantly, paper will try to answer what it means to be a career person and professional employee in the 21st century business world. These trends will be analyzed in three regions which are Europe, Asia and U.S.A. In section 2, theoretical roots in other words literature review on the subject will be presented. Causes of general decline will be explained and unionization among professionals such as teachers, professors, engineers, librarians, accountants and lawyers et cetera will be discussed in detail. In section 3, after explaining the historical development, unionization among professionals in Turkey will be brought up for discussion and comparison with these 3 regions. Section 4 will include unionization industry foresight for 2025, further research, discussion and conclusion. Besides giving insight about unionization in Turkey for comparison purposes between different regions of the world, the purpose of this paper is to provide information for the potential researchers about basic aspects of new trends in unionization and professionals' attitudes and behaviors toward unions.

Keywords: Unionization, Professionals, National Politics, Professional Associations.

1. INTRODUCTION

Unions are legal corporate entities established with laws on behalf of workers. Their main duties include protecting labor rights in terms of pay, benefits, services, occupational health & safety, discrimination, bullying and other work-related problems via presenting legal, financial, training and insurance advices and acts. There are three main types of trade unions. They include craft or trade, industrial and public-employee unions.

Due to globalization, a growing trend in outsourcing, legal constraints, and employer sponsored outsider forms of employee participation caused a crucial fall in union membership and the coverage of collective bargaining over the past 30 years. Instead of classic working conditions, salaries and benefits, most workers want an organization that concentrates on professional development and quality of services that they use. It is clearly seen that unions should institutionalize more to catch the potential members through changing their characters. In other words, they need to behave like a professional organization.

Professionals are mostly defined as white-collared, salaried employees, with above average income.¹ Their definition for trade unionism, and the role of unions generally based on the perspective gained in terms of the expectations of the middle class members with whom they work and among whom they live. It can be expected that professionals would have a different and varying orientation towards important elements of the trade union process than industrial workers. According to the Merriam Webster, professional person is ``someone who does a job that requires special training, education, or skill: someone who is a member of a profession``. Among the characteristics of the professional employees we can point out the following: Professional employees are highly trained and qualified. The training and qualifications are usually given by an institution of higher education, although some professions have gained their own profession through an examining and certifying body. Professional judgements and decisions are made by peer groups which means that there can be no outside body which defines standards and norms on the profession.² In other words, professional workers base on their personal independent judgement. These judgements are, of course, made in the light of accepted professional standards. Professional employees have a responsibility to third parties. Professional work is that the practitioner must take into account not only the direct effects of his activities hut also any effects on other interested people or groups in the organization (Stanford, 1975).

Moreover, while unions concentrate on compensation, working conditions, salaries, benefits and job security; professionals are taken role in associations because of information, professional development and networking. Associations offer knowledge and expertise while unions provide bargaining power. Unions should act similarly to professional associations. Associationstake place for their members' interests in the industry, serve as a resource for collaboration and provide opportunities for individual career development and advancement.³Unions need to base on international regulatory instruments, professional development, information exchange, and alliances with civil society organizations more. Upcoming years will be challenging for the trade unionism.

¹ (Goldstein, 1959)

² (Stanford, 1975)

³ (Vernuccio, 2014)

Unionization also differs at regional level that Asian trade unions are often decentralized and work on a company level. Cultural factors can easily explain why trade unions are generally weak in Asia (compared to e.g. Europe). Trade unions have been strong in Europe for many years. And, they have influenced European societies in many different areas. Trade union density is especially strong in the Northern parts of Europe, in countries like Denmark, Sweden and Finland. In southern parts of Europe the density seems generally to be quite lower as can be seen in France, Spain and Portugal.⁴ Trade unionism in US always been characterized as market based trade-unionism. It means that trade unions are mostly oriented toward securing the little group of interest more than developing a broad welfare state attitude toward demands. (Jensen, 2006) For Turkey situation is not so different. Current union structure is at %5 level totally and does not meet the requirements of the workers. Furthermore, it makes formidable for them to adapt to existent conditions. It is a reality that Turkish union structure has been under the effect of the local factors instead of global ones.

Both Turkey and other countries, how they will respond to the challenges and opportunities will be main critique determinant for their level of influence at work and beyond in the workplace in the 21st century. 21st century professional employees will join to unions only if unions become agile and fast adequate to worker's changing demands and concerns.⁵

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The role of trade unions has changed crucially over the past 30 years. Global competition, a growing trend in outsourcing, legal constraints, and employer sponsored forms of employee caused a decline in union membership and the coverage of collective bargaining. The coming decade seems to be equally challenging for the trade union movement. How they respond to the challenges and opportunities over the next few years will be the most important thing in identifying their level of influence at work and beyond in the future.⁶

From a sociological perspective, Ebbinghaus et al. (2011) define union membership in terms of Max Weber's 4 general categories of social action: the decision to unionize can be related to instrumental-rational motives or on ideological convictions, individuals may feel emotionally collaborative with the community of other union members, or traditional motives may play a crucial role such as unionization at the workplace or in the family.⁷

The most recent figures for U.S.A indicate that membership levels remain high in industries such as education (52 per cent), public administration and defense (52 per cent), electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply (44 per cent), transport and storage (42 per cent), and human health and social work (41 per cent), information and communication (13 per cent), wholesale, retail trade and motor repair (12 per cent), professional and administrative services (10 per cent), accommodation and food services (4 per cent) (Achur, 2011).

Union-based voice mechanisms for non-union ones indicates a belief among employers that union-only voice does not 'add value' to their business or organizational objectives. However, various studies have shown that unions continue to be the most effective mechanisms for representing worker interests, and also that non-union mechanisms create limited benefits for management in terms of productivity (Butler, 2009; Heery, 2010). Recent studies point out

⁴ (Jensen, 2006)

⁵ (Hurd and Lakhani, 2008)

⁶ (Achur, 2011)

⁷ (Schnabel, 2012)

the positive role played by unions in helping to resolve workplace disputes. Research by Richard Saundry and colleagues found that autonomy from management and greater dispute resolution skills and expertise allowed union representatives to play a more helpful role than non-union representatives. Managers in union-recognized workplaces generally felt that union representatives helped to ensure that disciplinary hearings operated in a more procedurally fair and efficient manner. Such outcomes were most likely occur in workplaces where there were high levels of trust exist between union representatives and managers (Saundry et al., 2011, 203-208).

Current union movement is in trouble and workers could be better served. Unions are starting to move in small ways to meet the new demands of the 21st century worker, but there is much more that they need to do. The most fundamental change will be moving away from relying on compulsion and monopolistic privileges to winning member support by providing valuable services.⁸

Union growth is pro-cyclical. In particular, price and/or wage inflation increase union membership growth at least in the short term. In contrast, an increase in unemployment tends to decrease union growth and density.⁹ The probability of unionization is usually expected to rise with establishment size because union costs getting lower in larger units, and union services may be valued most highly in large, bureaucratic organizations where workers are likely to be treated impersonally and feel a greater need or higher peer pressure for representation (see, e.g., Riley 1997, Schnabel 2003). This argument also supports Max Weber and the empirical evidence clearly supports such a positive relationship. On the contrary, once one controls for age and size, union status appears to have surprisingly little effect on firm failure rates, although unionization is associated with slower employment growth (Freeman and Kleiner, 1994; Dunne and Macpherson, 1994).

Parallel to sectoral changes in the economy, the structure of the workforce has changed in all advanced countries in the last decades. Mostly the employment shares of women, foreign-born workers, atypically employed people, white-collar workers and highly-skilled individuals have increased over time, and this is expected to inhibit unionization. (Visser 2006, Schnabel and Wagner 2007a, Ebbinghaus et al. 2011).

The structural composition of the workforce in all developed countries is also increasingly affected by demographic change. A rising average age of the workforce and cohort replacement effects may affect union density level. Descriptive evidence for European countries presented by Ebbinghaus (2006) presents that union density tends to be relatively low among young workers (Visser 2006), increases with age, and falls when employees are near retirement. Such a concave relationship is also obtained in several multivariate analyses. With cross-sectional data for individuals from a large number of countries, Blanchflower (2007) finds that the probability of being unionized follows an inverted U-shaped pattern in age, maximizing in the mid- to late 40s in 34 of the 38 countries investigated. It is also safe to conclude that younger employees are least likely to be unionized (Bryson et al., 2005, Böckermann and Uusitalo 2006, and Martin and Brady 2007), probably because they are less interested in joining organizations that they perceive match with primarily the interests of older workers (Ebbinghaus 2006) or because unionization is just an experience good and more importantly there is greater unsatisfied demand for union representation amongst young

⁸ (Vernuccio, 2014)

⁹ (Schnabel, 2012)

workers (Bryson et al., 2005). This runs contrary to the claims of Shister (1953) who claimed that younger workers are likely to show a greater interest to unionize because their shorter lengths of service will make them less loyal to their employers. It is also inconsistent with the views of Bain and Price (1983a) who define that older workers will have a higher want and demand to join because they have fewer opportunities and if economy goes down over time they will be the group who will have more need for unions.

Unionization may also depend on a country's structure of collective bargaining, more centralized bargaining generally said to cause to higher union density (see, e.g., Scruggs and Lange 2002).

In comparison with some of the institutional variables discussed above, the empirical evidence for the impact of globalization on unionization is more discussable. Although economic globalization such as countries' increasing openness concerning trade, financial flows and foreign direct investment, is often said to be undermine unionization by weakening union bargaining power and thus unions' attractiveness to employees.¹⁰ On the contrary, unions can also benefit from globalization in various ways, for example by serving as vehicles of insurance against volatile global market forces (Scruggs and Lange 2002 and Brady 2007). While the theoretical relationship between globalization and de-unionization is thus open, the evidence has started to become more and more univocal. Weak evidence for globalization effects is only provided by Western (1997) who finds that trade openness cause a decline in unionization in the 1980s, and by Blaschke (2000) who reports that there is effect for trade openness on changes in union density in some of her specifications for the period 1970 to 1995 whereas the liberalization of financial markets and foreign direct investment show no systematic effect on unionization.

On the contrary, Scruggs and Lange (2002) are able to show that controlling for cyclical and demographic features there are no robust significant relationships between union density and increasing financial market openness, direct investment flows, or increased trade flows for 16 advanced countries in the period 1964 to 1994. Similarly, Sano and Williamson (2008) do not find a certain impact of FDI and trade openness in a pooled sample of 18 OECD countries from 1980 to 2005, and for a panel of 14 European countries Checchi and Visser (2005) present that changes in union density are unaffected by increased globalization such as trade openness and financial liberalization.

Given that all of the countries were at approximately the same level of economic development and all were subjected to the same kinds of pressures from globalization and technological progress from their governments, it can be strongly suggested that more globalization and better technology do not lead to lower unionization rates. Instead, that national politics, not globalization or technology, are the most important determinants of unionization trends over time. (Schmitt and Mitukiewics, 2012). These patterns are harmonic with the view that national politics are a more important determinant of recent trends in unionization than globalization or technological change. But, probably the most common argument by Western (1997), Blaschke (2000), Scruggs and Lange (2002) supports the idea that unions are incompatible with the emerging, increasingly globalized, high-tech and service economy.¹¹

¹⁰ (Schnabel, 2012)

¹¹ (Schmitt and Mitukiewicz, 2012)

In summary, first of all it is not the case that unions are losing members and are about to finish everywhere. While union density has fallen most of the advanced countries, this is not wholly true for union membership, and even union density has remained quite high in some European countries. Second, union growth and decline is not mainly due to changes in the sectoral structure of the economy and the structural composition of the workforce. Third, the economic globalization observed in the last decades does not seem to decline or undermined unionization. Fourth, the relationship between centralization of collective bargaining and unionization is open both theoretically and empirically, bargaining decentralization thus does not necessarily cause de-unionization.¹²

The broad national political environment, however, does appear to explain much of the existed variation in unionization trends.¹³ Countries strongly identified during the postwar period as social democratic parties – Sweden, Denmark, Norway, and Finland have generally seen small increments in union coverage and only small downtrend in union membership since 1980. Over the same period, countries defined as “liberal market economies” – the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, Canada, and Japan – have generally seen strong drops in union coverage and membership. Countries in the broad Christian democratic tradition, also known as “coordinated market economies” or “continental market economies” – Germany, Austria, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, France, and Switzerland typically have had outcomes somewhere in between the social democratic and liberal market economies, with small drops in union coverage and moderate declines in union membership.

For almost every country, membership rates were lower than coverage rates. In many countries, this gap between coverage and membership rates is large. In Austria, for example, about 99 percent of workers were covered by a collective bargaining agreement, but only 30 percent were members of a union. In France, about 90 percent of workers were covered, but fewer than 10 percent were union members. Other countries with large gaps between coverage and membership include Belgium, Spain, the Netherlands, Italy, Greece, Portugal, Germany, Switzerland, and Australia.¹⁴

While there is some variation within each political grouping, the change in coverage rates is strongly influenced by national political tradition. Between 1980 and 2007, differently the social democratic countries saw coverage rates increase, on average, five percentage points, the continental market economies experienced a small decline in coverage that averaged four percentage points and coverage rates fell in all of the liberal market economies, with an average decline of 26 percentage points (20 percentage points at the median). In the ex-dictatorships, the average change over the period in coverage was close to zero. The change in membership rates also clusters by political category. Membership rates fell across all four types, but the average changes differ substantially across the groups. On average, membership rates declined 5 percentage points for social democratic countries; 14 percentage points for continental market economies; 23 percentage points for liberal market economies; and 18 percentage points for ex-dictatorships. (Schmitt and Mitukiewics, 2012).

More importantly, within relation to this labor unions have reached out to include not only the less skilled clerical and blue collar workers, but semi- or sub professionals, such as nurses, teachers, social workers, librarians, and others, and technical professionals such as engineers,

¹² (Schnabel, 2012)

¹³ (Schmitt and Mitukiewicz, 2012)

¹⁴ Ibid.

chemists, physicists, and designers.¹⁵ The extension of union organization to these new categories of employees has significance for the union movement, industry, and society at large, since it represents a fundamental shift in outlook and organization by large numbers of people.

“Within the ranks of the white-collar workers the number of people employed in professional, technical, and managerial tasks is now greater than the number in clerical and sales work and the rate of growth of the former remains higher.” (Lipset, 1962/1967: 527).

Since the industrial process has evolved, the role of the salaried employee and the nature of white-collar work have changed to make the salaried employee somewhat more responsible to unionization. Huge increase in the number of white-collar employees, as well as the decline in the rate of manual worker organization in recent years, have, in turn, helped direct the attention of the union movement to this potential source of new members namely white-collar employees. The central argument here is that salaried professionals, because of their educational background, their occupational culture, and their position within the firm, have created a form of trade unionism that significantly differs from traditional trade unionism. Traditionally, professionals have changed their way to their professional society for the protection of their interests. But these societies occurred to meet the needs and further the interests of independent professionals. Severe unemployment, salary cuts, and demotions, the problem of job security became repressive for salaried professionals.¹⁶

White-collar workers view themselves as having higher status than blue-collar workers.¹⁷ This sense of greater prestige ego appeared to have showed a drawback to union growth among the non-manuals. With the exception of large business owners and managers, professionals as a group are the most privileged and satisfied stratum in the society. They receive more prestige by the general public and receive higher pay than other occupational categories. Therefore, it is not surprising that given their high income and occupational prestige, professionals are more likely to see themselves in the middle and upper classes. Those in professional positions have been found to expose a high degree of job satisfaction, perhaps, because they provide more autonomy, freedom for personal decision and individual creativity than other occupations.

Moreover, not surprisingly, professionals and managerial personnel have been less likely to approve of labor unions and show less confidence in organized labor and labor leaders than blue-collar workers (Brint, 1985: 394-395). “Among low-level white-collar workers, strong unionism is generally found in situations where the work conditions are similar to those of the manual workers, often also involving the employment of a significant number of males.” (Lipset, 1962/1967: 534). Actors, musicians, journalists, air pilots and flight engineers, ship captains, marine engineers, teachers, nurses, and social service employees had their own unions or professional associations involved in collective bargaining. The professions that currently show the highest interest for unionization are quite similar, teachers and nurses have gained the most.

In addition, among those professionals who were willing the need for group action, there was the general feeling that the trade union movement was not capable of understanding the point

¹⁵ (Goldstein, 1955)

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ (Lipset and Katchanovski, 1999)

of view of professional employees and their problems.¹⁸ Since the production workers comprise a majority in most elections, the professionals felt their fate was in alien hands. Most of them, under the pressure of lagging salaries, poor personnel policies, and other grievances, and strong competition from other unions in the field.

In contract negotiations, the main idea is on acting like gentlemen instead of pounding the table, in placing the plain facts before management rather than base on emotion. On the issue of strikes, though there have been militant exceptions, there is a tendency to behave nicely and argue from this that strikes are a costly and inefficient means for producing the wanted ends.¹⁹

The trade union movement is tied to the struggle by working people for economic, political, and social rights. It has a rich backgrounded songs, heroic leaders, staunch picket lines, bloody strikes and massacres. However, the unions of salaried professionals that have come into being in the past decade have no relation to this tradition. They accept from the union movement those tools and techniques that seem compatible with their professional code, and refer to themselves as guilds, or associations, or societies. They bargain collectively, have even conducted a few militant and effective strikes, but they think of themselves as something different from than unions, in the traditional sense. In short, professional workers have much to gain from trade unionism, trade unionism can learn much from professional workers. (Goldstein, 1955).

2.1 HISTORY OF TRADE UNIONISM IN THE WORLD

Origins of unionism comes from UK. UK was a farming country and economy up to 1815s. It was altered by the industrial revolution after 1789. This caused a tremendous growth in trade union movement in UK. The working class was growing. With the usage of water and steam became new sources of motive power: steam was used for machinery. Imbalance caused by war with France (1793-1815) and caused rising food prices. Combination Acts 1799-1800 banned every kind of trade unions.

Between the years 1815-1834, aristocracy was very powerful and still few people could vote. There was one huge union called the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union. Even the government killed 6 people to close up the union. The Combination Act repealed in 1824 and trade unions started to be governed by the 1825 Combination Act which also banned every kind of trade unions but not so fiercely. Unions were so active in textile industry and women were also active. 1832 Reform Act gave the right to vote to bosses but not to workers. These were all things to form unions.

After 1834 until 1850; 3 mass campaigns were to be in place which were called short time committees, mass opposition and Chartism. Short time committees were related to regulations of working conditions and hours of work in the factories. Mass opposition vilified the poor to the hated workhouses and Chartism more importantly related to the formation of the first working class political party. 1848 was the year of revolution throughout Europe and Chartism in Britain failed.

¹⁸ (Goldstein, 1955)

¹⁹ Ibid.

After 1850s, second phase of industrialization occurred. The completion of the railway network had forced the growth of coal, iron, steel, engineering and cotton industries. New model of unionism organized workers by trading activities. Negotiation, strikes and arbitration became official and accepted activities. Women mostly seem to be excluded from craft unions and the working class was important to both parties and the Tories – liberals used them.

Between the years 1880 -1914, Britain's industrial leading position challenged by the economics of Germany and the USA. The National Federation of Women Workers was established in 1906 and in 1884 the 3rd Reform Act gave right to vote to the majority of adult men. Two organizations, the Social Democratic Federation (SDF) founded in 1883, and the Independent Labor Party (ILP), in 1893. In 1899, Ruskin College was formed an Oxford education to the working class. This was followed in 1903 by a huge effort in the form of the Workers' Educational Association. ILP defended the labor movement, too. Also TUC supported the socialists, co-operators and trade unionists. Between 1889-91, doubled its numbers from something like three-quarters of a million, the expansion of 1911-1914 doubled it again from about 2 to about 4 million, and even during the worst part of the WWI recession it never again felt.

After 1914, in 1917 Russian Revolution gave hope to all working class on the world. 35 million working days were lost in strike in 1919 and this was the most steady strike have ever seen until yet. Post-war boomed and anti-fascist movement occurred. In 1945, welfare state concept came into action and major industries nationalized to increase massive win through increasing production after the war. After that also Trade Disputes and Trades Unions Acts were repealed – union membership of Labor Party increased in huge amount. The growing rates of unionization at the end of the First World War brought it to about 8 million people. The trade union expansions after 1889 shown a move to the left, with the creation of a new leaders and policy-makers mostly inspired by socialism and the association of the movement with an independent working-class political party and, after 1918, a socialist approach.

During 1960s, there was a rise in trade union memberships and women's participation increased from 2 million to 4 million in 1979 at U.S.A. In 1963, under the Conservative government of Harold Macmillan, the Contracts of Employment Act was passed, which was requiring employers to give workers a minimum period of notice when terminating their contracts and to give written particulars of any verbal contract when a written contract was not provided. The Labor government also presented the union movement by signing the Equal Pay Act 1970.

The challenge facing unions today is bigger than ever but at the same time, they have a great opportunity to make the case in their favor. The scale and pace of change in the workplace is greater and faster than at any time in history. It is also a time for them to provide the knowledge, experience and support of their employees need more than in the past.²⁰

Turkey also holds on a working class with its role in society and politics. The working class of Turkey was born after the establishment of the early factories during the 19th century.²¹ With the signing of 1838 Anglo-Turkish Commercial Treaty, local industrial economy

²⁰ (Trade Union Congress – TUC, 2002)

²¹ (Ataov, 1967)

developments in Ottoman Empire devastated and more foreign industrial centers located. After the embryonic working class existence, commercial treaties signed between the years 1838-1842 caused Western domination over the feudal Ottoman Empire economy. It was because of that agricultural products and raw material exported and finished goods imported.

Although there is no certain information on the earliest' workers movement in Ottoman Empire, articles state that workers' attempt for unionization blocked and workers who leave their jobs be punished indicate that workers had already started to look after their interests. Following this, after Dilaver Pasha new regulations were made in 1865. However, first worker association was founded in 1871 with the name of Ameleperver Cemiyeti and the first strike Kasimpasa Naval Docks in Istanbul came in 1872. In the pre-1908 era before the Second Constitutional Government working hours per day was reached to 16 hours and hourly wages dropped to 6-7 kuruş in the cities and even 1-2 kuruş in the rural areas. Child labor was predominant in many factories, too.

The very first months of 1908 Constitutional Government termed as the months of strikes. In 1909, strikes and union organizations were prohibited in public services and utilities. Formerly organized unions were also prohibited as well. The Work Stoppage Act was prepared by Kamil Pasha Government and it was also banned the strikes to serve foreign interests. New strikes were not only happened among the tailors, barbers and Cibali tobacco factory workers but also there was an attempt to establish the Ottoman Socialist Party in 1910. The working conditions of workers did not develop during the war years of 1914-1918. For instance 15.000 women and children was working for only an average 1.6 kuruş per day in Carpet Manufacturing Co.

The 1919-1923 period also known as the War of National Liberation, was better organized against foreign firms, foreigners in general and was more abundant politically. Numerous strikes done to attack imperialism and a Socialist Party of Workers and Peasants was formed. Also during these years, The Nationalist Government seemed very affirmative to labor caused issues. More importantly, The Izmir Economic Congress of 1923, regarded as crucial from the point of view of the working class. 1135 delegates came together to present proposals on the issues of maximum 8-hours of working per day, pays on holidays, annual vacations, social insurance, better health conditions and prohibition of child labor for under age 12. The Izmir Economic Congress made some contributions to the working class and helped in the long run but did not solve problems wholly. Also in spite of several liberal provisions in the new 1924 Constitution, the Work Stoppages Act (1909) was still remain in full force and effect. Moreover, the Restoration of Peace Act hugely restricted worker's rights and prohibited the establishment of unions. This Act ended unionism in Turkey until 1946.

Finally, an Act on the trade unions passed in 1947. Collective agreements rights gained and it was stated by articles in Act that labor unions could not be suspended without the decision of the court. Article 1. of the Trade Unions Act of 1947 had stated that workers, as defined by the Labor Code and employed in the same branch of activity or on types of work belonging to the said branch of activity, could form a trade union. In practice, the lowest level of organization became the "local union" Local unions in a certain branch of activity could establish "federations" on a regional or national basis. Also, regardless of the occupation or industry they represented, locals of an urban or regional area could constitute, among themselves, *birlik*s (regional associations). In summary, following years the working class took important steps in organization, but was still facing with legal restrictions and increasing control of the

ruling political circles. So on the specific law dated July 15, 1963 under the rule of 1961 Constitution unions were no longer seen as suspicion-drawing centers but also strong part of a more democratic and advanced society. (Ataov, 1967) Trade unions have been accorded new functions by the Trade Unions Act of 1963. At the same time, as organizations subject to the Associations Act they possess all the powers of other associations plus the specific functions they are entitled to perform under Article 14. of the Trade Unions Act. ``According to this article trade unions may:

- (a) Deal with collective disputes;
- (b) Provide collective agreements;
- (c) Present their views to the authorities related, to conciliation and arbitration boards and labor courts on any labor disputes, and request information from them;
- (d) Provide legal assistance for members;
- (e) Direct representatives to organizations established under the provisions of law and international agreements;
- (f) Establish aid funds for social and cultural purposes, and conclude insurance contracts on behalf of members;
- (g) Administer the strike or lockout;
- (h) Organize lectures and courses to improve the vocational and general education of workers; establish health and recreational organizations;
- (i) Assist in the formation of co-operative societies on behalf of their members;
- (l) Lease, loan or donate raw or semi-finished materials, tools and machinery to members;
- (k) Conduct research dealing the welfare and occupational interests of members``. (Tuna, 1964)

The new Trade Unions Act of 1963 has also declared that trade unions should be comprehensive organizations and that no discrimination on behalf of grounds of race, language, religion and political affiliation should be made with respect to membership and elections in unions, whose services should be offered equally to all members. The new system success hugely depends on mutual understanding, between workers and their unions, employers and the government.

2.2 UNIONIZATION IN ASIA, EUROPE AND UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

There is occurrence of huge differences in the character and the size of trade unionism and trade unions in Asia. This is due to many reasons, especially due to different level of economic development and political systems among the countries in the region. Some nations - like e.g. Japan is highly economically developed and post-industrial characteristics dominate its economy. Other countries - like China or India are very economically diversified. In these countries some sectors are very technologically advanced, while others are not and mastered by pre-industrial modes of production. This situation is also seen in relation to the different political systems in the Asian region. In some countries the ruling political parties are strictly anti-union in their politics, other countries fundamentally accept trade unions as part of being a democratic society, while a third group of countries (e.g. Taiwan and South Korea) are in the middle of the process of democratization.²²

Asia and the Industrial Relations (IR) systems that take place in the region, it is possible to say that in Asia, there is a number of typical systems. Kuruvilla and Erickson argue that it is

²² (Jensen, 2006, p.10)

possible to identify six distinct types of IR-systems in Asia: "...the Japanese flexible-workplace model, the tripartite Singapore model, the state employer- dominated model (Malaysia and Indonesia), the pluralist decentralized and fragmented IR model (the Philippines), the politicized multi-union model (India and the rest of South Asia), and the transitory model (a catch-all category that includes South Korea, Taiwan, China and Vietnam)" (Kuruville & Erickson, 2002, p. 172).

It is certain that most part of the labor force are not organized. In most Asian countries except China, below 20 percent of the workforce are member of a trade union. And very often the level is below ten percent. Labor force often either work in the informal sector or in the agricultural sector. Trade union membership level is generally higher in the formal sector or in the industrialized sector (Kuruville & Erickson, 2002). History seems to play a crucial role if one tries to explain the reality of industrial relations in today's Japan.

As stated by Kuruville & Erickson (2002): "There is a general agreement that the central features of the Japanese IR system have included workplace-focused enterprise unions, lifetime employment systems, broad-based training and seniority-based wages" (Kuruville & Erickson, 2002, p. 180). "The enterprise-oriented system of unions has influenced the fundamental relation between management and labor so that although industrial disputes are rather common, they seldom lead to strikes" (Wad, 1996). The economic crises during the 1990s have however changed the management-labor relation characteristics in some way. First of all Japanese managements have tried to develop new types of more flexible employment conditions. Outsourcing, has been applied part of this strategy during this process. All in all this has meant that the Japanese trade unions have faced decreasing memberships and decreasing membership loyalty (Kuruville & Erickson, 2002). According to some authorities, these trends are seen as major changes in Japanese industrial relations describing individualized system of employment relations (Kuruville et al., 2002).²³

Respectively, trade unionism in Korea,²⁴ it seems necessary to look upon trade unions before and after democratization started in 1987. Before 1987 independent trade unions were prohibited by the political authorities in Korea, and governments had interdicting attitude toward trade unions and trade union politics. "Prior to mid-1987, besides low union membership and rate of unionization, labor had little or no effective collective voice even in unionized firms" (Jeong, 2001, p. 60).

In Korea, labor market was substantially regulated by the state in the 1960s and in the 1970s, and governments worked more for rapid economic developments than for securing the development of an independent trade union (Kim & Kim, 2003). And even if employees had rights due to labor law in relation to employment security, trade unionism stand in the way. As pointed out by Kim & Kim: "While American-style labor laws were enacted in 1953 and guaranteed full-fledged trade unions rights, throughout the 1960s and 1970s labor law was revisited frequently to put substantial restrictions on union activities. For example, labor legislation was amended in 1972 to suppress unions, and strikes were prohibited until 1980." (Kim & Kim, 2003, p. 349).

²³ibid., pp. 6-7.

²⁴ibid., pp. 7-8.

Trade union density in Taiwan is at a higher level than in the rest of Asia except for China. This is partly due to the fact that membership of a trade union is mandatory and regulated by Taiwan laws. "Trade unions in Taiwan are regulated by the Labor Union law ... The law sets forth the structure, formation and obligation of trade unions. A union can be organized along craft/occupation or industrial lines when there is a minimum of 30 workers in an establishment... only one union is permitted per plant, and membership in the union is mandatory. Workers who refuse to join a recognized union can be suspended from their jobs at the behest of the union, although in practice many workers do not join unions because this measure of the law is not implemented effectively." (Chen et al., 2003, p. 320).

In summary;²⁵

- 1) Asian trade unions are mostly decentralized and work on a company level. Company based unions seem especially to dominate in some of the countries. For instance, Japan and Korea have a long tradition of company based trade unions.
- 2) In a number of countries located in Asia, trade unions have been under pressure for the last ten years. This is like what happen in Japan. Among the causes to this pressure it is shown that increased competition on the global market, which has led companies to be more interested in flexible and performance based pay systems. Existing national employee protection has been under standards due to labor laws' being under pressure and due to the intensified competition. Companies are questioning the principle of mutual loyalty between the employees and the employers for lifelong employment.
- 3) In some Asian countries - like Taiwan or Korea - trade unions have played a crucial role for democratization of the country. In these countries, trade unions have gained influence and although trade union density has decreased trade unions still seem to be getting stronger.
- 4) Cultural factors used to explain why trade unions are generally weak in Asia (when it is compared to e.g. Europe). Cultural factors are often used when relations between management and labor in Japan are to be explained.
- 5) In many Asian countries, it is possible to distinguish between an official and an unofficial trade union movement. In some countries - like in Korea and Taiwan - the unofficial trade unions mostly gain more influence due to the nature of work life.
- 6) In many Asian countries trade unions - and IR-systems have been established in connection with western colonial powers. In that respect, trade unions have been used by governments for a nation building project. Therefore independent trade unions have been unusual in a number of Asian countries, and the main purpose of trade unions has been to prevent conflicts between employers and employees in the name of the nation. As economic growth has dominated some Asian countries, trade unions have found themselves in the situation of more oriented toward working for more specific employee interests and nation building.

Trade unionism in Europe, trade unions have been always strong in Europe for many years. And they have influenced European societies in many different areas. Trade union density is especially strong in the northern parts of Europe, in countries like Denmark, Sweden and Finland. In southern parts of Europe is different and trade union density seems to be quite lower as can be seen in France, Spain and Portugal. Although Europe consists of different countries and different IR-systems, it is possible to say that similarities among the IR-systems

²⁵Ibid., pp. 9-10.

and among the trade unions exist within Europe. This is especially the case when we compare Industrial Relations in Europe with the IR systems in Asia and U.S.A.

In summary;²⁶

1) All in all, the Industrial Relations Systems in Europe can be defined as orientated toward integration of labor representatives, whether this inclusion is established by collective bargaining or by law and it is state guaranteed. There exists a high degree of labor inclusiveness in the different European countries.

2) Class based formation dominate the trade unions in Europe. Generally the structure of trade unions in Europe related to the European class society which comes from the end of 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. In general, this means that trade unions in Europe very often have been related to broader concepts of policy making in the interests of workers. Trade unions have not only worked for better pay and working conditions, but also worked for political, civil and social rights in the European societies.

3) Labor force is traditionally dominated by male working class.

4) In those European countries, where the trade unions have been able to deal with a more stratified labor force (women, white-collar workers, part-time employment etc.), did not encounter with decreasing trade unions density problem.

5) More flexible collective agreements has been one of the major challenges for trade unions in the last decade. But in many European countries especially in the Northern parts of Europe - trade unions seen as an opponent, by the employers. Thus this situation for Europe seems to be not solved at all.

6) In some European countries like France and Germany, different kind of extension mechanisms exists. Extension mechanisms defines the problem of free riding on the labor market, and in some cases underline that workers are not interested in becoming a member of a trade union.

7) The principal organizational structure in European trade unionism is that workers are either categorized of the sector they work in, or in relation to their skill or education. Company based trade unions is very uncommon. Horizontal and vertical ties is therefore generally very strong.

U.S.A employers had never been in the same way for structuring nationwide negotiations with the trade unions like what happen in Europe. Sadly, trade unionism in US was traditionally and mostly oriented toward specific groups. Male, white, fulltime workers in the industrial sectors is the core element of the trade unions movement. And the union movement strategies were specifically oriented toward fulfilling the needs of these groups. Conservative and sectional practices grew, with racial and gender discrimination, institutionalized. Increasingly, unions were not able to benefit from the opportunities opened by growth of new industries and the diverse workforce.” (Carter (2001), p. 186). Other important factors include the

²⁶ibid., pp. 17-18.

general downsizing of the traditional industrial sectors in relation with the emergence of new employment sectors, which have no culture for unionization (Troy, 2000).

Trade unionism in U.S.A mostly worked out as market based trade-unionism.²⁷ This means that trade unions are mostly oriented toward securing the narrow group of interest of their members more than developing a broad welfare state attitude. On the whole, it is possible to explain the U.S. system of industrial relations as a system oriented vs. the single employee instead. Generally, it is possible to observe a growing employer opposition toward trade unions and organized labor. Also, it is very weak in relation with post-industrial workforce, and the made changes in the labor force tell most of the story in the decline of trade union density for the last 20 years.

Trade unions, as unions located in Asia, Europe and U.S.A differ quite a lot when it comes to look upon the fundamental characteristics of the organizational structure of the trade unions. It is so clear that both the horizontal and the vertical relations between trade unions are strongest in Europe. European trade unions have strong ties between industrial lines or educational lines. And very often it is possible to locate organizations at a national level in Europe. This is the case in Denmark, Sweden, Germany and other countries. Correspondingly, strong corporative traditions in European countries secure trade union influence on governmental policies in a broader spectrum of subjects. Asian and U.S.A trade unions are much more based on single company (Asia) or to a single sector (U.S.A).

It is also possible to define some differences on social and institutional basis of trade unions in Europe, Asia and USA. European trade unions are generally formed on the basis of a class society. Trade unions deal mostly with traditional interests of the working class. This happens when they focus more narrowly on pay and working conditions, but also when trade unions focus on broader political and social rights dealing with the working class. In that sense, once again one can talk about European trade unionism as what could be called as class based trade unionism. US trade unions have also a social base in the American working class. However, from very early in the American trade union history, trade unions focused mostly on the narrow interests of their members. Broader political initiatives and interests have only played a secondary role in American trade unionism. In relation to this, one could talk about US-trade unionism as what could be called as market based trade unionism. Asian trade unions differently related to both class and market conditions. Because in some Asian countries, trade unions have also played an important role in nation building processes. Trade unions have taken role in the pay and working conditions of the employees, policies have been related to the general interests of the nation. In that sense, one could talk about Asian trade unions as what could be called as nation-based trade unions.

The question of globalization and flexibility is the final subject can be mentioned in this context, although other differences and similarities between the trade unions in US, Asia and Europe also could be mentioned. Both in Europe, in Asia and in U.S.A, trade unions are challenged by what is called globalization. Employers argue in all three regions, that global competition directed them to a more individualized and a more market based system of handling pay and working conditions. Decentralized collective agreements have spread around in the three regions. It seems that the challenges from globalization most felt in Europe and Asia will cause problems also for U.S.A. The American economy is still very

²⁷ibid., p.19.

much an internal and national economy. However, all in all globalization seems to be one of the biggest challenges for the trade unions movement in the beginning of the 21st century. Trade unions are fundamentally connected to nation states, and although attempts have been made to internationalize the trade union movement as a response, these attempts seem to be inadequate.²⁸

3. UNIONIZATION AMONG PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES

The transformation of society and economy into knowledge-based means continuous changes in the way of work is organized in professional requirements. This draws a picture that is equally evolving, able to understand the innovations and the new challenges in non-formal skills and competences such as autonomy, responsibility and initiative on behalf of professionals and managers.²⁹ Professional and managerial staff count around 19% of employees in the European Union. At almost a fifth of all employees, this is a significant proportion of the labor force. This figure has been changing upward for several years. Also, other employment categories have faced with downward movement, particularly in the least qualified groups, reflecting a new balance in the composition of the employed workforce with a growth in the numbers of professional and managerial employee. Among 35 million professional and managerial staff – P&MS – (according to the international classification of occupations, ISCO groups 1 and 2), more than 6 million are members of trade unions, within a large variety of organizations. A large variety of types of structures coexist, and particularly P&MS can be trade union members through: >> P&MS unions, or >> P&MS structures within white-collar unions, or >> P&MS structures within general unions.³⁰

The work environment is changing. P&MS are facing with changing work and labor conditions. P&MS represent a growing part of the workforce with an distribution between men and women. Their level of qualifications is increasing, with degrees and diplomas getting crucial. They have to reinforce their abilities and more than in the past they have to encounter job insecurity and unemployment. On the contrary, there is a tension between guarantees provided by collective agreements and individualized processes. Another trend within the P&MS group is a higher level of qualifications. Degrees and diplomas are becoming important in getting a professional or managerial post. The responsibilities of P&MS vary within companies in the technical, economic and social fields. But companies cannot exist in isolation, and their environment reflects back the consequences of their activities. The growing trend towards flexibility and its impact on labor market is a much debated issue in Europe. The deregulation of labor markets has led to a increasing amount of workers in a range of atypical employment situations with individualized provisions. The group of P&MS is particularly affected by this trend towards flexibility and individualization. There are three main trends: individualized provisions in collective agreements, individual employment contracts and the growth in self-employment.

Various number of characteristics and trends affect professional and managerial staff in Europe today. Despite the differences brought to light by this comparative study, major common features emerge. Firstly, P&MS form a identified group, inter alia in European

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 21-22.

²⁹ (EUROCADRES, 2009)

³⁰ Ibid.

statistics. Their significance cannot be ignored in the European workforce, since they represent an average of 19.3% of employees and more than 25% in some of the countries studied. As a proportion of the workforce, they have tremendously increased in number for recent years. However, the study shows that national statistical systems must be better coordinated for an evaluation of professional categories. Legal definitions of P&MS are often imprecise, and generally depend on the concept of autonomous powers and levels of education. This means that in most European countries, it is the provisions and definitions contained in agreements which have to be considered again. Their qualifications, their capacity for initiative and the exercise of their responsibilities are key factors in their professional identity. Their expertise and their capacity have taken on crucial roles for the development of the trade union representation of P&MS, influenced by history and traditional relationships in each country. It should be noted that the legal and contractual advances in countries are to the credit of P&MS trade union organizations. Finally, individualization is a fast-growing phenomenon which is challenging the role of collective bargaining and collective agreements. If this is true for employees as a whole, then P&MS are most affected, which is encouraging their organizations to attempt to influence this process.

Overall view stresses for trade union intervention, inter alia through legislative or contractual measures. Many of the problems are common to different countries, which makes it clear that national organizations need to improve their co-operation throughout Europe.³¹

4. CONCLUSION

For some twenty years now, it has been common to refer to a crisis of trade unionism. What the future seems increasingly uncertain. For many trade unionists as well as academics, unions in most countries appear as victims of external forces outside their control, and often also of their own conservative inertia. But unions have the capacity to shape their own future. In all countries, they have powerful traditions and inherited structures; these all too frequently constitute a resource for creative initiative.³²

In majority of the countries respondents expect some decrease in trade union density rates by 2025. In more than half of the observed countries, the expected changes by 2025 are around -5 to +5 percentage points.³³

- In the majority of EU15 countries trade union density rates will decline. The most remarkable decrease is expected in Sweden and Denmark and some increase in Germany, France and Spain.
- In the majority of EU12 countries trade union density rates will decrease by 2025. The most dramatic decrease is expected in Malta and Cyprus, while the highest increase in Lithuania and Latvia.
- In Global 7³⁴ countries majority of respondents expect some decline in the trade union density rates by 2025. In China, Japan, U.S and Australia decrease would be around 3 to 5 percentage points, while in Indian some increase.

³¹ Ibid.

³² (Hyman, 2002)

³³ (Kauppinen, 2012)

³⁴ Global 7 countries (Australia, Brazil, China, India, Japan, South Africa, and the U.S.)

- On average, in public sector unionisation is much higher than in the private sector. However, the decline of trade union membership in public sector is not expected to be as dramatic as in the private sector.
- Majority of the EU15 countries will see modest decline in employer organisations density rates. Only in Spain and Germany, respondents expect deeper decline.
- In majority of EU12 countries employer organisations' density rates will increase by 2025. Highest increase is expected in Lithuania and Latvia and biggest decline in Malta.
In Global 7 countries the employer organisations' density rates will be lower than 20% in 2025 but in China 41% compared today's unionisation of 62%.

Industrial relations foresight 2025 survey respondents had a joint view that liberalism in economic policy will increase as well as individualism in everybody's life. Working life flexibility will increase and more and more people are working as self-employed and in atypical employment relations. Job security is also weakening and inequality in incomes is widening by 2025. Globalization trend in industrial relations is also observable from respondents' replies. Benchmarking the EU and the Global 7 countries shows that China's industrial relations are in a pressure of liberalization out from state and communist party control. Japanese spring negotiation offensive, shunt, is losing its meaning at the same time when employee unionization is weakening. In Australia and South Africa industrial relations are expected to continue like today. In India, there are some weak signs of strengthening of industrial relations as well as in Brazil. Benchmarking these trends against quite Global 7, the general weakening of EU industrial relations shows that some "weak signals" on globalization of industrial relations exist.

In order to avoid this, recommendations include:

- Trade unions world-wide should adopt their working agenda to new situations in the business environment,
- More effort should be put on brand development of trade unions in order to create image of that institution,
- Trade unions should merge and try to join as many trade unions as possible,
- Trade unions should adopt new strategies to attract new members, especially how to attract young workers,
- Trade unions should become more member oriented and try to add value in the eyes of their members,
- Trade unions should focus more on after-work education which is nowadays a necessity,
- Trade unions should be more active in aiding the unemployed and should establish public relations offices.

5. REFERENCES

Achur, James (2011) 'Trade Union Membership 2010', Department for Business, Innovation and Skills: London.

Ataöv, Türkkaya, "The Place of the Worker in Turkish Society and Politics", No. VIII, 1967, pp.85-148.

Bain, G. and R. Price (1983a), 'Union growth: dimension, determinants and destiny', in G. Bain (ed.), *Industrial Relations in Britain*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 3–34.

Blanchflower, David G. (2007): *International Patterns of Union Membership*, *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 45, pp. 1-28.

Blaschke, Sabine (2000): *Union Density and European Integration*, *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 6, pp. 217-236.

Böckerman, Petri and Uusitalo, Roope (2006): *Erosion of the Ghent System and Union Membership Decline: Lessons from Finland*, *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44, 283-303.

Brint, Steven. 1985. "The Political Attitudes of Professionals." *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 11, pp. 389-414.

Bryson, Alex, Gomez, Rafael, Gunderson, Morley, and Meltz, Noah (2005): *Youth-Adult Differences in the Demand for Unionization: Are American, British, and Canadian Workers All That Different?*, *Journal of Labor Research*, 26, pp. 155-167.

Butler, Peter (2009) 'Non-union employee representation: Exploring the riddle of managerial strategy', *Industrial Relations Journal*, 40(3): pp. 198-214.

Carter, Bob (2001): "Lessons from America: Changes in the US Trade Union Movement" review article, pp. 185-194, in *Work, Employment and Society*", vol. 15, no. 1.

Checchi, Daniele / Visser, Jelle (2005): *Pattern Persistence in European Trade Union Density: A longitudinal analysis 1950-1996*, *European Sociological Review*, 21, 1-21.

Chen, Shyh-Jer, Jyh-Jer Roger Ko & Lawler, John (2003): "Changing Patterns of Industrial relations in Taiwan", pp. 315-340 in *Industrial Relations* Vol. 42, no.3.

Dunne, Timothy, and David A. Macpherson. 1994. "Unionism and Gross Employment Flows." *Southern Economic Journal* 60 (January): pp. 727-38.

Ebbinghaus, Bernhard (2006): *Trade union movements in post-industrial welfare states. Opening up to new social interests?*, in: Armingeon, Klaus and Bonoli, Giuliano (eds.), *The Politics of Post-Industrial Welfare States*, London and New York, pp. 123-142.

Ebbinghaus, Bernhard, Göbel, Claudia, and Koos, Sebastian (2011): *Social capital, 'Ghent' and workplace contexts matter: Comparing union membership in Europe*, *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 17, pp. 107-124.

Freeman, Richard B., and Morris M. Kleiner. 1994. "Do Unions Make Enterprises Insolvent?" *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 4797* (July).

Goldstein, Bernard. "Some Aspects of the Nature of Unionism among Salaried Professionals in Industry," *American Sociological Review* 20:pp. 201-02, April 1955.

Goldstein, Bernard. *The Perspective of Unionized Professionals*. Institute of Management and Labor Relations, Reprint No. 7, 1959.

Heery, Edmund (2010) 'Worker representation in a multiform system: A framework for evaluation', *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 52(5) pp. 543-559.

Hurd, Richard W, and Tashlin Lakhani. 2008. "Unions, Associations and Twenty-First Century Professionals." Report prepared for Union Network International, Nyon Switzerland.

Hyman, R. (2002). *The future of unions*, *Just Labour*, 1, pp. 7-15.

Jensen, C. Strøby (2006): "Trade Unionism: Differences and Similarities a Comparative View on Europe, USA and Asia", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 48(1):.pp. 59-81.

Jensen, C. Strøby. *Comparative Perspectives on Social Division in US, Asia and Europe: A Stratification and Social Division analysis in a regional perspective*. Paper submitted for the 102th ASA Conference, 2007, New York.

Jeong, Jooyeon (2001): "Pursuing centralised bargaining in an era of decentralisation? A progressive union goal in Korea from a comparative perspective", pp.55-70 in *Industrial Relations Journal*.

Kauppinen, Timo. (2012). *Industrial Relations Foresight 2025: The EU Member States and the Seven Other Major Economies*.

Kim, Dong-One & Seongsu Kim (2003): "Globalization, Financial Crisis and Industrial Relations: The case of South Korea" pp. 341-367, in *Industrial Relations*, vol.42, no. 3.

Kuruvilla, S. & Erickson, C.L. (2002): "Change and Transformation in Asian Industrial Relations", pp. 172-225, in *Industrial Relations*, vol.41, no. 2, 2002.

Lipset, Seymour Martin, and Ivan Katchanovski. "White-Collar Workers and Professionals Their Attitudes and Behavior towards Unions II." Unpublished Manuscript, 1999.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. "White-Collar Workers and Professionals - Their Attitudes and Behavior towards Unions." in Faunce, William A. *Readings in Industrial Society*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

Martin, Nathan D. and Brady, David (2007): *Workers of the Less Developed World Unite? A Multilevel Analysis of Unionization in Less Developed Countries*, *American Sociological Review*, 72, pp. 562-584.

Riley, N.-M. (1997). 'Determinants of Union Membership: A Review'. *Labour*, 11: pp. 265–301.

Sano, Joelle and Williamson, John B. (2008): *Factors Affecting Union Decline in 18 OECD Countries and their Implications for Labor Movement Reform*, *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 49, pp. 479-500.

Saundry, Richard, Carol Jones and Valerie Antcliff (2011) 'Discipline, representation and dispute resolution – Exploring the role of trade unions and employee companions in workplace discipline', *Industrial Relations Journal*, 42(2): pp. 195-211.

Schmitt, John and Mitukiewicz, Alexandra (2012): Politics matter: changes in unionization rates in rich countries, 1960-2010, *Industrial Relations Journal*, 43, pp. 260-280.

Schnabel, C. (2003). 'Determinants of trade union membership' In J.T. Addison and C.Schnabel (eds.), *International Handbook of Trade Unions*. Cheltenham: pp. 13–43.

Schnabel, C. and Wagner, J. (2003). 'Trade Union Membership in Eastern and Western Germany: Convergence or Divergence?' *Applied Economics Quarterly*, 49:pp. 213–232.

Schnabel, Claus (2012). "Union membership and density: some (not so) stylized facts and challenges." IZA Discussion Paper, 6792.

Schnabel, Claus and Wagner, Joachim (2007a): Union density and determinants of union membership in 18 EU countries: evidence from micro data, 2002/03, *Industrial Relations Journal*, 38, pp. 5-32.

Scruggs, Lyle and Lange, Peter (2002): Where Have All the Members Gone? Globalization, Institutions and Union Density, *The Journal of Politics*, 64, pp. 126-153.

Shister, J. (1953), 'The logic of union growth', *Journal of Political Economy*, LXI, pp. 413-433.

Stanford JD (1975): The employed professional and trade unionism. *Australian Journal of Physiotherapy* 21: pp. 88-92.

Troy, L. (2000): "U.S. and Canadian Industrial Relations: Convergent or Divergent", 695-713, in *Industrial Relations*, vol. 39, no.4.

Vernuccio, Vincent (2014). "Unionization for the 21st Century: Solutions for the Ailing Labor Movement. Mackinac Center for Public Policy.

Visser, Jelle (2006): Union membership statistics in 24 countries, *Monthly Labor Review*, 129, pp. 38-49.

Vogt, Marion, and Gyes Van Guy. (2006), 'Professional and Managerial Staff in Europe and their Trade Unions in the 21st Century,' Brussels: Eurocadres.

Wad, P. (1996) 'Enterprise Unions: From backward to vanguard unionism?' IKL Working Paper 7, Frederiksberg: Copenhagen Business School.

Western, Bruce (1997): *Between Class and Market – Postwar Unionization in the Capitalist Democracies*, Princeton.

APPENDIX 1

Table 1. United States of America union affiliation of employed wage and salary workers by occupation and industry, 2013-2014 annual averages

[Numbers in thousands]

Occupation and industry	2013					2014				
	Total employed	Members of unions ¹		Represented by unions ²		Total employed	Members of unions ¹		Represented by unions ²	
		Total	Percent of employed	Total	Percent of employed		Total	Percent of employed	Total	Percent of employed
OCCUPATION										
Management, professional, and related occupations.....	47,723	5,726	12.0	6,490	13.6	48,890	5,835	11.9	6,612	13.5
Management, business, and financial operations occupations.....	18,334	804	4.4	961	5.2	18,717	870	4.6	1,016	5.4
Management occupations.....	12,174	493	4.1	596	4.9	12,550	562	4.5	653	5.2
Business and financial operations occupations.....	6,159	311	5.0	365	5.9	6,168	308	5.0	362	5.9
Professional and related occupations.....	29,389	4,922	16.7	5,529	18.8	30,173	4,965	16.5	5,597	18.5
Computer and mathematical occupations.....	3,767	163	4.3	208	5.5	4,057	169	4.2	223	5.5
Architecture and engineering occupations.....	2,666	194	7.3	224	8.4	2,635	160	6.1	190	7.2
Life, physical, and social science occupations.....	1,178	118	10.0	147	12.5	1,232	122	9.9	149	12.1
Community and social service occupations.....	2,263	361	16.0	390	17.2	2,373	358	15.1	396	16.7
Legal occupations.....	1,424	76	5.4	88	6.2	1,440	86	6.0	107	7.5
Education, training, and library occupations.....	8,457	2,986	35.3	3,304	39.1	8,437	2,976	35.3	3,279	38.9
Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media occupations.....	2,043	120	5.9	138	6.8	2,071	117	5.6	137	6.6
Healthcare practitioner and technical occupations.....	7,591	903	11.9	1,029	13.6	7,928	977	12.3	1,115	14.1
Service occupations.....	23,390	2,491	10.6	2,701	11.5	23,481	2,498	10.6	2,740	11.7
Healthcare support occupations.....	3,364	314	9.3	347	10.3	3,326	305	9.2	346	10.4
Protective service occupations.....	3,107	1,096	35.3	1,160	37.3	3,128	1,103	35.3	1,166	37.3
Food preparation and serving related occupations.....	8,037	341	4.2	375	4.7	8,021	338	4.2	389	4.9
Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance occupations.....	4,708	488	10.4	534	11.3	4,916	504	10.2	560	11.4
Personal care and service occupations.....	4,174	252	6.0	295	7.1	4,090	248	6.1	279	6.8
Sales and office occupations.....	30,637	2,008	6.6	2,220	7.2	30,903	2,023	6.5	2,277	7.4
Sales and related occupations.....	13,316	381	2.9	437	3.3	13,529	415	3.1	499	3.7
Office and administrative support occupations.....	17,321	1,627	9.4	1,783	10.3	17,374	1,608	9.3	1,778	10.2
Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations.....	11,195	1,866	16.7	2,000	17.9	11,627	1,782	15.3	1,909	16.4
Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations.....	861	19	2.1	22	2.5	935	24	2.5	30	3.2
Construction and extraction occupations.....	5,809	1,119	19.3	1,181	20.3	6,196	1,104	17.8	1,167	18.8
Installation, maintenance, and repair occupations.....	4,525	729	16.1	797	17.6	4,496	655	14.6	711	15.8
Production, transportation, and material moving occupations.....	16,165	2,438	15.1	2,617	16.2	16,530	2,438	14.8	2,614	15.8
Production occupations.....	7,936	1,070	13.5	1,156	14.6	8,098	1,066	13.2	1,150	14.2
Transportation and material moving occupations.....	8,229	1,367	16.6	1,461	17.8	8,432	1,372	16.3	1,464	17.4
INDUSTRY										
Private sector.....	108,681	7,318	6.7	8,128	7.5	111,228	7,359	6.6	8,224	7.4
Agriculture and related industries.....	1,096	11	1.0	13	1.2	1,199	14	1.1	19	1.6
Nonagricultural industries.....	107,585	7,307	6.8	8,114	7.5	110,028	7,345	6.7	8,205	7.5
Mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction.....	1,026	55	5.4	67	6.6	1,040	50	4.8	61	5.9
Construction.....	6,474	915	14.1	967	14.9	6,968	968	13.9	1,023	14.7
Manufacturing.....	14,195	1,431	10.1	1,558	11.0	14,471	1,409	9.7	1,517	10.5
Durable goods.....	8,933	883	9.9	956	10.7	9,111	876	9.6	944	10.4
Nondurable goods.....	5,262	549	10.4	602	11.4	5,359	534	10.0	572	10.7
Wholesale and retail trade.....	17,998	838	4.7	927	5.2	18,372	769	4.2	892	4.9
Wholesale trade.....	3,235	163	5.0	184	5.7	3,232	107	3.3	129	4.0
Retail trade.....	14,763	675	4.6	743	5.0	15,141	662	4.4	763	5.0
Transportation and utilities.....	5,563	1,144	20.6	1,212	21.8	5,750	1,153	20.1	1,217	21.2
Transportation and warehousing.....	4,888	920	18.9	974	20.0	4,814	945	19.6	966	20.0
Utilities.....	675	225	33.3	238	35.3	636	209	32.8	251	39.5
Information.....	2,582	231	9.0	251	9.7	2,681	231	8.6	255	9.5
Publishing, except internet.....	541	26	4.8	30	5.5	581	21	3.6	22	3.8
Motion pictures and sound recording industries.....	337	32	9.5	34	10.0	347	25	7.3	29	8.2

See footnotes at end of table.

[Numbers in thousands]

Occupation and industry	2013					2014				
	Total employed	Members of unions ¹		Represented by unions ²		Total employed	Members of unions ¹		Represented by unions ²	
		Total	Percent of employed	Total	Percent of employed		Total	Percent of employed	Total	Percent of employed
Radio and television broadcasting and cable subscription programming.....	538	30	5.5	34	6.3	569	40	7.0	43	7.6
Telecommunications.....	916	132	14.4	141	15.4	915	135	14.8	151	16.5
Financial activities.....	8,515	170	2.0	219	2.6	8,481	169	2.0	200	2.4
Finance and insurance.....	6,392	84	1.3	118	1.8	6,409	92	1.4	112	1.8
Finance.....	4,090	39	1.0	61	1.5	4,039	53	1.3	63	1.6
Insurance.....	2,302	45	2.0	56	2.5	2,370	39	1.6	49	2.1
Real estate and rental and leasing.....	2,123	86	4.0	102	4.8	2,071	77	3.7	88	4.2
Professional and business services.....	12,890	304	2.4	371	2.9	13,300	309	2.3	389	2.9
Professional and technical services.....	7,711	115	1.5	154	2.0	8,045	109	1.4	157	2.0
Management, administrative, and waste services.....	5,179	189	3.6	217	4.2	5,254	199	3.8	232	4.4
Education and health services.....	20,596	1,718	8.3	1,961	9.5	21,147	1,728	8.2	2,003	9.5
Educational services.....	4,169	536	12.9	628	15.1	4,338	508	11.7	599	13.8
Health care and social assistance.....	16,426	1,182	7.2	1,333	8.1	16,809	1,220	7.3	1,404	8.4
Leisure and hospitality.....	11,973	328	2.7	386	3.2	11,997	387	3.2	454	3.8
Arts, entertainment, and recreation.....	2,248	118	5.2	130	5.8	2,168	140	6.5	158	7.3
Accommodation and food services.....	9,726	208	2.1	257	2.6	9,831	247	2.5	296	3.0
Accommodation.....	1,354	95	7.0	108	8.0	1,455	130	8.9	143	9.8
Food services and drinking places.....	8,372	113	1.3	149	1.8	8,377	117	1.4	153	1.8
Other services ³	5,774	175	3.0	194	3.4	5,821	171	2.9	193	3.3
Other services, except private households.....	5,056	163	3.2	182	3.6	5,026	157	3.1	178	3.5
Public sector.....	20,429	7,210	35.3	7,900	38.7	20,203	7,218	35.7	7,927	39.2
Federal government.....	3,515	932	26.5	1,096	31.2	3,408	939	27.5	1,078	31.6
State government.....	6,353	1,966	30.9	2,147	33.8	6,264	1,867	29.8	2,056	32.8
Local government.....	10,561	4,311	40.8	4,658	44.1	10,532	4,412	41.9	4,793	45.5

¹ Data refer to members of a labor union or an employee association similar to a union.

² Data refer to both union members and workers who report no union affiliation but whose jobs are covered by a union or an employee association contract.

³ Includes other industries, not shown separately.

NOTE: Data refer to the sole or principal job of full- and part-time wage and salary workers. All self-employed workers are excluded, both those with incorporated businesses as well as those with unincorporated businesses. Updated population controls are introduced annually with the release of January data.

35

APPENDIX 2

Industry	Employee Numbers	Unionized Employee Number	Unionization Rate (%)	Employee Numbers	Unionized Employee Number	Unionization Rate (%)	Employee Numbers	Unionized Employee Number	Unionization Rate (%)
Farming and Fishing	127,037	36,383	28.64	128,881	35,909	27.9	136,252	35,498	26.05
Food and Serving Related	527,153	68,706	13.03	538,237	68,781	12.8	596,067	69,779	11.71
Mining, Quarrying, Oil and Gas	199,699	36,555	18.31	190,346	38,492	20.2	198,443	38,996	19.65
Petroleum, Chemistry, Pharmaceuticals	470,178	36,942	7.86	421,649	41,404	9.82	435,281	42,463	9.75
Manufacturing and Leather	1,012,556	87,567	8.65	1,024,139	94,214	9.2	1,041,717	95,894	9.20
Forestry and Paper	232,954	17,021	7.31	241,699	18,731	7.75	243,340	18,922	7.77
Communication	68,307	15,342	22.46	70,457	15,949	22.6	71,985	16,524	22.95
Radio and TV Broadcasting, Newsprinting	95,145	4,033	4.24	95,826	4,370	4.56	95,442	4,700	4.92
Banking & Finance and Insurance	267,312	62,412	23.35	288,719	68,532	23.7	293,801	84,189	28.66
Arts and Entertainment	2,331,306	94,630	4.06	2,368,553	97,797	4.13	2,565,114	110,533	4.30
Cement, Agricultural and Glass	179,888	27,668	15.38	173,191	28,812	16.6	188,277	30,499	16.2
Metal	1,396,755	212,443	15.21	1,413,151	22,739	15.8	1,426,744	227,569	15.95

³⁵ U.S. Department of Labor Statistics.

Construction	1.660.842	36.212	2,18	1.562.555	42.906	2,75	1.655.772	41.980	2,535
Energy	227.950	46.016	20,19	263.853	51.885	19,7	273.908	54.433	19,87
Transportation	693.664	40.267	5,8	705.378	45.135	6,4	718.171	53.779	7,4
Shipping, Material Moving	147.244	10.042	6,82	151.739	11.058	7,29	156.539	12.220	7,80
Health care and Social Assistance	280.841	7.419	2,64	278.609	7.931	2,85	275.940	10.780	3,90
Accomodation and Entertainment	772.689	29.790	3,86	707.024	29.582	4,18	820.095	29.757	3,62
Defence and Security	189.217	23.317	12,32	201.733	26.553	13,2	229.580	35.335	15,39
Other Services	748.069	139.401	18,63	774.815	145.760	18,8	864.770	175.631	20,31
Total Sum	11.628.806	1.032.166	8,88	11.600.554	1.096.540	9,45	12.287.238	1.189.481	9,68

Table 2. Unionization Distribution within Industry³⁶

APPENDIX 3

³⁶ Republic of Turkey Ministry of Labor and Social Security.

Professional and managerial staff: how many in Europe?

<i>Thousand employees</i>	Total employees	ISCO 1	ISCO 2	P&MS (ISCO 1 & 2)	Percentage of P&MS among total employees
Belgium	3731	273	786	1059	28.4%
Bulgaria	2849	116	366	482	16.9%
Czech Republic	4125	211	427	638	15.5%
Denmark	2550	143	376	518	20.3%
Germany	33649	1156	4421	5578	16.6%
Estonia	597	67	90	157	26.4%
Ireland	1749	170	310	480	27.4%
Greece	2900	60	483	542	18.7%
Spain	16760	406	2150	2556	15.2%
France	22862	1339	2940	4279	18.7%
Italy	17167	351	1482	1833	10.7%
Cyprus	301	9	49	58	19.2%
Latvia	998	64	142	207	20.7%
Lithuania	1324	112	268	380	28.7%
Luxembourg	188	6	44	50	26.6%
Hungary	3440	204	465	669	19.4%
Malta	135	9	17	26	19.0%
Netherlands	7349	525	1362	1887	25.7%
Austria	3450	179	322	501	14.5%
Poland	11666	560	2122	2682	23.0%
Portugal	3902	81	384	465	11.9%

Romania	6197	153	853	1006	16.2%
Slovenia	829	35	135	171	20.6%
Slovakia	2044	88	203	292	14.3%
Finland	2178	161	415	576	26.4%
Sweden	4060	178	786	965	23.8%
United Kingdom	25169	3662	3508	7169	28.5%
European Union	182166	10318	24906	35224	19.3%
Croatia	1266	18	135	153	12.0%
Norway	2239	132	267	399	17.8%
Turkey	12333	478	1154	1633	13.2%

Source EUROCADRES 2009, data EUROSTAT, Labour force survey 2007