

# Cardiff School of Social Sciences Working Paper Series

[www.cardiff.ac.uk/socsi/research/publications/](http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/socsi/research/publications/)



Working Paper 144: Unincluded Union Members - evidence from the Labour Force Survey

Author: Surhan Cam

ISBN: 978-1-908469-03-8



## **Unincluded Union Members: evidence from the Labour Force Survey**

### **ABSTRACT**

Trade unions are widely regarded as functional for members, despite growing concerns over their effectiveness. However, specific analyses of members whose conditions are not affected by unions are absent from the debate. The present paper explores the relation of these members to workplace characteristics, flexible employment and work-status, hoping to provide a contribution to the examination of membership patterns. We analyse Labour Force Survey data from autumn 2010, using logistic regression modelling to identify the segments of members beyond the reach of unions. The results suggest that such a membership position is linked to the range of work-related circumstances considered, with a varying degree of influence on men and women. In particular, it correlates with educational and occupational levels, especially among male members.

### **KEY WORDS**

Trade unions / effectiveness / unrepresented / gender / flexible work / occupations

## Introduction

The long-term decline in union density – from 54% in 1980 to 25% in 2010 (LFS 1980 and 2010) – has spawned a growing body of literature on trade unions. Much concern has been raised about the weakened effectiveness of trade unions as iconically captured by the concept ‘hollow-shell’ (Hymen 1997). In an attempt to reverse ‘the demise’, trade unions sought to deploy renewal policies (Fairbrother 2002) together with, for example, interventions in workplace learning and work-life balance (Budd and Mumford 2004). As a British answer for ‘social dialogue’ in Europe (Sisson and Marginson 2002), unions also took part in partnership schemes in order to protect employees’ interests by seeking to align them with those of their employers (Brown 2000).

However, renewal attempts were occasionally criticised for failing to produce satisfactory outcomes. Observers, for example, pointed to uneven distribution of the benefits of work-life balance practices between employers and employees for favouring the former whilst intensifying the pressure on the latter (Gregory and Milner 2009; Rigby and Smith 2010). Likewise, workplace learning programmes were reported to have consolidated inequalities between the worse-off and the rest (McIlroy 2008). It was also contended that union membership hampered employees’ job satisfaction (Guest and Conway 2004).

The effectiveness issue of trade unions has paved the way for a growing interest in non-union alternatives (Blyton and Turnbull 2004; Gollan 2007). Research on this front underlined managers’ willingness, as well as capacity, to bolster workers’ job satisfaction through, for example, ‘direct consultations’ with employees (Hodson 2005). It was noted that works committees might encourage fairer workplace practices in Britain –as in Europe (Marginson *et al.* 2004) and the UK-based multi-nationals (Mueller 2010).

However, doubts over the effectiveness of works councils (Gold *et al.* 2007) and direct consultation (Butler 2009) were not unfounded, either. The shortcomings of non-union methods in general were empirically documented, especially among ‘vulnerable workers’ (Pollert and Charlwood 2009). A catalogue of the ill-treatment of such employees by managers, including bullying, was compiled Beale and

Hoel 2010). A recent exploration into NGOs has also flagged up representational deficiencies of such organisations in workplaces (Williams *et al.* 2011).

The weaknesses of non-union models keep invigorating reconsiderations of unions' performances. It was stressed, for example, that unions' backing was indispensable for the success of non-union initiatives (Walters 2004). Furthermore, research highlighted that the egalitarian posture of unions largely remained intact under partnership agreements (Harrisson *et al.* 2009; Samuel 2007). Far removed from being 'hollow shell', trade unions were also claimed to have been the 'sword of justice', especially for the low paid (Hoque and Noon 2004) and migrant workers (Fitzgerald and Hardy 2010). In particular, statistically inverse associations between trade union membership and job satisfaction were deemed to be spurious (Bryson *et al.* 2004) whilst further evidence stressed a positive correlation with life satisfaction (Flavin *et al.* 2010). Even so, specific analyses of unions' effectiveness are less developed compared to the wealth of trade union debates in general.

Effectiveness:

Much of the academic interest into union effectiveness has been driven by practical matters about 'organising effectiveness'. Researchers have sought to map out the factors that assist or challenge union organising. Some scholars have pointed to the lack of support by employers amid the increasing structural obstacles of recent decades with adversarial legislation and policy preferences (Taylor and Bain 2003). Some others, however, put the emphasis on strategic potentials by taking internal constraints on board. These encompassed the likes of restrictions on the selection of union representatives (Charlwood 2004) and limited commitment to organising from the union leadership (Heery and Simms 2008). Further, organising effectiveness and unionisation levels were related to, inter alia, occupations (Snape and Bamber 1989), education (Hundley 1988), full/part-time jobs (Green 1991), industries (Bacon 1999), temporary contracts (Cam *et al.* 2003), establishment size (Fenn and Ashby 2004) and public/private sectors (Edwards 2009). Speaking historically, gender was also included in the equation

due to, for example, 'mutual hesitation between unions and women', especially in low pay jobs (Sinclair 1995).

Despite a recent furthering of the evidence over the link between organising performance and union effectiveness in general (Vernon 2006), this linkage is treated with caution, not least because of a long-disputed 'clash of ideologies' among trade unions (Bacon and Blyton 2004). Comparing trade unions in the UK and France, for example, Sullivan (2010) argued that French unions were more influential despite a lower union density in France. There were calls to debate alternative strategies and politics of organising (Simms and Holgate 2010). Such interventions correspond with inquiries into the representational effectiveness of trade unions from a broader perspective. Specific attention in terms of representational effectiveness was given to collective bargaining. A number of factors were associated with bargaining coverage including policy implementations (Brown 1993), public/private sectors (Bach and Winchester 1994), legal background (Elliott and Bender 1997), occupations (Broughton 2001), establishment size (Schnabel *et al.* 2006), gender (Sayce *et al.* 2006), industry (Nergaard *et al.* 2009) and skills/education (Arrowsmith and Marginson 2011).

Nevertheless, collective bargaining has become less informative about union effectiveness since the beginning of a decentralisation and 'individualisation' process in 1987 (with the introduction of separate agreements for miscellaneous groups of the white- and blue-collar). The reason for this was because the decentralisation of pay bargaining did not only undermine collective bargaining (Brown 1993), but also complicated the role of unions in pay settlements. As Elliott and Bender (1997) argued, even in the absence of collective bargaining, dialogs between unions and the government would help determine, for example, the ceiling of pay rises for the public sector employees. Likewise, unions may improve the outcomes of employee ownership, profit sharing schemes (Robinson and Wilson 2006) and variable pay negotiations (Nergaard *et al.* 2009) for employees as well as restricting variations in base pay (Arrowsmith and Marginson 2011).

Although pay agreements are an important indicator of union effectiveness, especially because of their implications for the wage premiums of membership, unions' effectiveness is related to a whole range of the issues within the overall

frame of working conditions. There is no systematic research into union effectiveness from a comprehensive perspective of working conditions. This paper will try to rectify the gap in the literature by examining the effectiveness of trade unions in terms of both working conditions and pay agreements in general.

Unincluded members:

The Labour Force Survey specifically asks participants whether or not their pay and working conditions are affected by union agreements with management. Due to hitherto noted complications, some respondents are probably unaware of the ways in which their conditions may be influenced by unions. Nonetheless, an historical review of replies to this question reveals that, before New Labour came to power in 1997, over 90% of union members had been affected by the agreements between unions and management in addition to the 63% of non-members –or ‘free-riders’ (Cregan and Stewart 1990). The introduction of the 1999 Act brought these proportions down to 78% and 17%, respectively (LFS 1996; 2000). The proportion for ‘free-riders’ did not change substantially in the following decade. Once the recession started to unfold, however, unions’ agreements with management became less inclusive for their members –down to 71% in 2010 (LFS 2010). Keeping this in mind, our analyses will specifically focus on unions’ membership base.

Unfortunately, LFS gathers no further data to stipulate the extent to which pay and working conditions are affected when participants answer the question affirmatively. Lack of such a specification weakens the consistency of meaning across responses as the influence of unions markedly differs from one section of workers to another (Broughton 2001). To tackle this issue in part, we will study the members whose pay and conditions are not affected by agreements between unions and management at all, calling them *unincluded members* (or *unincluded membership*) for the sake of convenience. Turning the focus specifically on *unincluded members* is also hoped to shed some light into this segment of union members who remain under-investigated, arguably not least because of the optimistic implications of earlier research evidence: In a UNISON survey by

Prowse & Prowse (2006), for example, none of 119 participant members appeared to uphold the proposition that 'unions are no use to me'.

Because of the lack of systematic research specifically into unincluded members from a comprehensive perspective of pay and working conditions, we will present an explorative analysis of the main issues addressed by the existing debates related to union effectiveness as underlined above. It seems to be possible to sum up these issues within three broader categories: workplace characteristics including establishment size, public/private sectors and industries; flexible work including temporary and part-time jobs; and finally work-status nominators including educational attainments and occupational ranks.

In particular, the present study pays specific attention to gender. One reason for this is that, although the gender gap has been eradicated in terms of union density, unions are largely ruled by men (Kirton 2006) at the expense of detrimental implications for recruitment (Heery and Simms 2008). We also established that there was a gender difference in terms of unincluded membership: 26% of male members were unincluded in 2010 whereas the proportion was 31% among female members (LFS 2010). Nor was there a decline in gender disparity in recent years. When the male 'unincludedness' was recorded as 18% in 2000, for example, that of female members was around 22% (LFS 2000). Therefore, both separate and joint models will be run for men and women.

## Methods

Data:

Data is analysed from the autumn 2010 UK Labour Force Survey (LFS), a large household-based survey conducted by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) between October and December 2010 –see *LFS Technical Report* (ONS 2010). The LFS deploys a multi-stage sampling design to achieve a probability sample of households and individuals in Britain in order to explore the labour market status of employees in general and unincorporated members, in particular.

The major data collection instruments were face to face and telephone interviews with a small amount of postal surveys. Research is conducted with a worker or the representative of sample households on behalf of the workers investigated (proxy interview). A total of 106,886 questionnaires were filled. The LFS achieved a response rate of 86%. Such a response rate is common for labour force surveys due to the burdens of questionnaire completion (ONS 2010). However, non-response is only a source of bias to the extent that those who respond are different from those who do not with respect to characteristics of interest. Various studies have shown that non-responders in surveys cannot be identifiable according to any socio-demographic factor indicating that any biases introduced by nonresponse are not strongly related to commonly used explanatory variables (Chatzitheochari and Arber 2009). We employ the individual level unweighted weight which corrects for non-response.

*Dependent variable: unincorporated membership*

Labour Force Survey asks the question concerning whether pay and working conditions are affected by union agreements in the workplaces where there is a trade union recognised by the management. It covers all in employment (employees, self-employed and unpaid family workers).

Three caveats should be borne in mind regarding our dependent variable of unincorporated membership. First, union membership is asked by the LFS only in the final quarter of each year (which is why we used the autumn quarter of the



survey). This means that it is not possible to measure quarterly changes in responses to the questions concerning union membership and the impact of agreements on working conditions or pay, if at all.

Second, the wording of the union membership question refers to the membership of both trade unions and associations, although interviewers actually aim to find out trade union membership (Brook 2001).

Third, it is not possible to filter unincorporated union members who may opt out from union agreements with the management voluntarily. This would be particularly the case among those who have variable earnings through bonuses, profit-related pay, piecework payment or payments by results (Arrowsmith and Marginson 2011). However, the proportion of variable income holders is relatively low among unincorporated members, circa 5%, as in the case of the rest of members, whereas the proportion is over 20% among non-members (LFS 2010).

#### *Independent variables*

In broader terms, the models developed in this study control the relation of unincorporated membership to workplace characteristics, flexibility and work-status nominators.

Workplace characteristics (as well as flexibility and work-status variables) refer to main jobs. The first variable in this group, establishment size is based on the number of employees reported by the respondent, and it is collapsed into five bands corresponding with conventional brackets: less than 20, 20-49, 50-249, 250-499 and finally 500 and more (Forth *et al.* 2005). In particular, this classification allows checking the impact of the lack of statutory recognition of trade unions in the smallest category pursuant to the 1999 Trade Unions Act.

The second variable within workplace characteristics is a dichotomous variable of respondents' self-report as to whether they work in the public or private sector. The third variable, industry is based on the standard international classification of industries, SIC-2005 at two-digit level (i.e. 'industry sectors'). Due to small sample size, however, we excluded agriculture, forestry and fishing, whilst collapsing

mining, quarrying, manufacturing, electricity, gas, air conditioner supply, water supply, sewerage, waste and construction under the generic category of industry (as opposed to services).

Among the flexible work variables, temporary employment is defined by participants' perception of a contingent continuation in casual, seasonal, agency, on-call and fixed-term contract works (regardless of the length of the time that the respondent had actually worked in the job referred to). As for part-time work, official definitions of part-time work based on various working hours had been abandoned in the late 1970s because of a bias generated by the arbitrary determination of hours, although this practice is still common in some other countries such as the US (Lee and Mowry 2009). Part-time work in LFS is currently based on the self-definitions of participants. Therefore there is no consistency across the sample.

Among work-status nominators, the variable concerning education is based on the highest qualification obtained, with five main categories from 'no qualification' to 'degree or equivalent'. The other work-status nominator, occupation is derived from the standard international classification of occupations, SOC-2005 at one-digit major level. Due to small sample size, however, process, plant and machine operatives are excluded.

Analytical technique:

The analysis uses logistic regression, which is widely employed when modelling binary outcomes and for predicting the probability of an event. The dependent dichotomous variable is whether or not trade union members' working conditions and pay are affected by union agreements with the management (unincluded membership); and the binary response is yes/no. The logistic models predict the probability of being a trade union member with working conditions and pay that are not affected by union agreements with the management.

Separate logistic regression models for male and female members are specified in order to examine the differential effects of work-related circumstances on men's and women's unincluded membership. In the models, independent variables are

successively added to the model in sequential blocks, which allows observation of changes in the predictors' relationship to the outcome variable and assessment of the relative importance of each predictor in the model. These blocks are made up of the three broader categories of independent variables: workplace characteristics (establishment size, public/private sectors and industries), flexible work (temporary and part-time employment), and finally work-status variables (educational attainments and occupations). Neither the order of variables within the blocks nor that of blocks within the models makes a significant difference in the results. However, taking the workplace characteristics within Model 1 and then adding flexible work to Model 2 proved better than other combinations for the goodness of fit.

## **Results**

Descriptives:

Table I provides chi-square results for the relation of workplace characteristics (establishment size, sector and industry), flexible work (temporary and part-time jobs) and work-status indicators (education and occupations) to gender differences in terms of uninvited membership.

The link between establishment size and gender gap is not straightforward. Working in an establishment with fewer than 20 employees, for example, implies little gender difference at a high level of uninvitedness (36% of male and 38% of female members), compared to the companies employing between 50 and 249 workers (24% and 29%, respectively). Even so, establishments accommodating up to 500 employees do not present a significant gender gap either: roughly 27% of both male and female members.

Private companies predict a significantly higher proportion of uninvitedness among women members: over 41% among female members in such companies are not affected, compared to 30% of male members. In the public sector, on the other hand, these proportions are considerably smaller, but the gender gap is still significant, 24% for female and 18% for male members.

Industrial differences have bearings for gender variations in unincluded membership. The general category of 'industry' in Table I denotes a significant gender difference: circa 25% of male members are not affected, compared to 32% of women members. The proportions are very similar in the health sector and, despite a lower degree of unincludedness, the gap is also evident in education: 23% of male and 27% of female members.

Neither of two flexible work indicators, temporary and part-time employment, conforms to a significant gender gap unlike permanent and full-time jobs, whilst raising unincludedness. Temporary jobs, in particular, constitute a unique category among all work-related covariates used in this study by suggesting a lower level of unincludedness among female members (35%) compared to male members (39%). This contradicts a significantly higher level of unincludedness among female members (30%) in permanent jobs than circa 24% for male members. As for part-time and full-time jobs, although 30% of both male and female members are equally unincluded in part-time jobs, the proportion in full-time jobs turns out to be significantly low for male members (23%), compared to female members (27%).

Lastly, Table I displays the relation of educational attainments and occupational categories, as work-status nominators, to gender gap in unincludedness. Female members' unincludedness is higher than that of men across all educational levels. However, the difference is substantial only for the holders of GCSE grades A-C or equivalent (20% of male and 26% of female members); and those of higher degree as the unincludedness of women members reaches 32% among them.

Looking at the impact of occupational variations, it is possible to say that there is no significant gap between female and male members' unincludedness at the top of the occupational ranking: circa 30% among manager/senior members and one quarter among professional members regardless of gender. Nor is there a significant gender gap at the lower end of the occupational hierarchy: the proportions are almost the same for female members, for example, in sales and costumer services as well as elementary jobs, although they are down to 27% and 20% for male members, respectively. By contrast, there is a significant gender gap

in middle-rank occupations. In skilled trades, for example, female members' unincludedness turns out to be over 41% compared to less than 24% for male members.

**Table I: Unincludedness among male and female trade members**

	Men		Women	
	N <sup>†</sup>	% <sup>‡</sup>	N <sup>†</sup>	% <sup>‡</sup>
<b>Workplace Characteristics</b>				
<i>Establishment size</i>				
Less than 20	180	33.7	264	35.6
20-49	146	27.9	333	30.8
50-249	307	24.2	423	28.6***
250-499	124	27.3	99	26.6
500+	229	19.7	324	23.5 **
<i>Sectors</i>				
Private Sector	672	27.0	521	36.2***
Public Sector	364	19.4	973	24.7***
<i>Industries</i>				
Industry	293	24.8	57	31.7 **
Distribution, hotels and restaurants	95	32.3	129	34.0
Transport and communication	124	17.8	27	15.5
Banking and finance	118	30.9	102	28.8
Public administration and defence	124	18.7	115	17.7
Education	120	22.6	467	26.8***
Health	77	24.8	410	32.1***
<b>Flexible Work</b>				
<i>Temporary Work</i>				
Permanent	986	23.7	1409	30.2***
Temporary	50	39.1	88	35.5
<i>Full/part-time Work</i>				
Full-time	83	23.1	585	27.1***
Part-time	952	29.5	912	29.6
<b>Work-status variables</b>				
<i>Education</i>				
Degree or equivalent	328	25.8	560	26.3
Higher education	98	19.2	315	31.9***
GCE A Level or equiv	308	24.6	229	28.5 *
GCSE grades A-C or equiv	138	20.4	239	26.0***
No qualification	49	22.1	47	25.5
<i>Occupations</i>				
Managers and Senior Officials	150	31.4	119	29.2
Professional occupations	210	24.2	363	25.6
Associate Professional, Technical	189	23.1	386	29.6***
Administrative & Secretarial Services	45	19.8	151	22.3
Skilled Trades Occupations	139	23.4	23	41.5***
Personal Service	39	22.5	282	31.6***
Sales and Customer Service	29	27.5	80	31.0
Elementary Occupations	96	19.6	80	25.0

\* $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\* $p < 0.001$

<sup>†</sup> : Number of unincluded union members

<sup>‡</sup>: Unincluded members as % of all union members in each category

Source: LFS Autumn 2010, w eighted

Overall, Table I shows that the gender gap between male and female members' unincludedness is significantly altered by the independent variables of workplace characteristics, type of jobs and work-status indicators, although female members' unincludedness tends to remain higher in general.

Logistic regression models:

To examine the differential effects of work-related circumstances on men's and women's unincluded union membership, both separate and joint logistic regression models are specified in Table II. For each predictor variable, the last category in bivariate analyses is defined as the reference category.

Model I includes three indicators of workplace characteristics, establishment size, public/private sectors and industries. Establishment size negatively correlates with the likelihood of union members' unincludedness in general ( $p < 0.001$ ). Even so, establishment size appears to be more influential among male members. The odds ratio (1.92) for their unincludedness, for example, is almost twice higher in companies with less than 20 employees compared to the ones with 500 or more employees –the reference category. This difference in the case of female members, on the other hand, is just above fifty percent; and the odds ratio in the establishments with  $250 < 500$  employees (1.13) is not significantly different –from the reference category.

Model I also indicates a significant sectoral effect among both female and male members ( $p = 0.001$ ). Union members in private companies are twice more likely to become unincluded than their counterparts in the public sector. In particular, a stronger sectoral effect on female members' unincludedness (OR= 2.31) compared to male members' (OR= 1.87) turns out to be a component of overall gender gap in terms of unincludedness.

Model I further examines how the constraints stemming from industrial differences impinge upon the chances of members becoming unincluded. Such variations show a strong explanatory power in general ( $p < 0.001$ ) as the reference category of health sector implies a significantly higher level of unincludedness than the rest. However, this is particularly the case among female members since male members' unincludedness in health is not significantly different from certain industries such as distribution, hotels and restaurants (OR= 0.88); education (0.91); as well as banking and finance (OR= 0.98).

Model II adds flexible work with temporary and part-time jobs. Compared to union members in permanent jobs, the ones in temporary jobs are more likely to report that their pay and working conditions are not affected by agreements between management and trade unions ( $p = 0.001$ ). Likewise, part-time working union members are more likely to be unincluded compared to full-time working members ( $p = 0.001$ ). However, gender plays a different role in each type of job. The gap between temporary and permanent workers is particularly significant in the case of male members (OR = 1.69) whereas such a gap between part-time and full-time workers is more pronounced in the case of female union members (OR = 1.27).

Model III which adds educational attainments as a work-status nominator, shows that education has a significant effect on unincludedness among male trade union members ( $p = 0.001$ ). However, this result reports the aggregated impact of education on men's unincludedness since the individual categories specified in Table I are not significantly strong. Further, education has no significant influence on women members' unincludedness at all.

In Model III, the second works-status nominator highlights the significant affect of occupational groups on union members' unincludedness in general ( $p < 0.001$ ). The evidence suggests that male members in high-rank occupations are more likely to become unincluded compared to their counterparts in lower and elementary occupational groups. The odds ratio is 1.77 for managers and senior officials, 1.63 for professionals and 1.74 for associate professional and technical groups. Middle rank-occupations, on the other hand, do not have significantly different implications for male members' unincludedness compared to elementary occupations. These results contradict the case of female members since it is not the top occupational groups, but the middle ones which tend to predict a higher likelihood of unincludedness among female members compared to elementary occupations. Notably, the likelihood of becoming unincluded among female members in skilled trade occupations is almost three times higher (OR = 2.88,  $p < 0.001$ ) compared to elementary occupations.

**Table II: Unincludedness among Union members**

	Odds Ratios for All			Odds Ratios for Men			Odds Ratios for Women		
	Model I	Model II	Model III	Model I	Model II	Model III	Model I	Model II	Model III
<b>Workplace characteristics</b>									
<i>Establishment size</i>	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Less than 20	1.70***	1.93***	1.77***	1.92***	2.14***	2.15***	1.56***	1.67***	1.56***
20-49	1.55***	1.59***	1.55***	1.36***	1.43***	1.48***	1.64***	1.67***	1.60***
50-249	1.32***	1.34***	1.33***	1.24***	1.28***	1.26***	1.39***	1.40***	1.40***
250-499	1.28***	1.29***	1.32***	1.40***	1.43***	1.47***	1.13	1.13	1.18
500+									
<i>Private sector</i>	2.06***	2.52***	2.61***	1.87***	2.42***	2.53***	2.31***	2.65***	2.78***
<b>Industries</b>									
Industry	0.45***	0.38***	0.46***	0.66***	0.43***	0.58***	0.56***	0.50***	0.51***
Distribution, hotels and restaurants	0.57***	0.44***	0.58***	0.88	0.56***	0.79	0.49***	0.41***	0.51***
Transport and communication	0.30***	0.25***	0.30***	0.48***	0.32***	0.43***	0.22***	0.20***	0.20***
Banking and finance	0.58***	0.49***	0.56***	0.98	0.67 **	0.80	0.46***	0.40***	0.46***
Public administration and defence	0.50***	0.48***	0.53***	0.74 *	0.60***	0.70 *	0.45***	0.44***	0.48***
Education	0.71***	0.65***	0.71***	0.91	0.70 **	0.73 *	0.66***	0.64***	0.70***
Health									
<b>Flexible Work</b>									
<i>Temporary Work</i>		1.36***	1.27 **		1.69***	1.62***		1.17 *	1.20 *
<i>Part-time Work</i>		1.16***	1.22 **		1.12 *	1.14 *		1.27***	1.26***
<b>Work-status variables</b>									
<i>Education</i>						***			
Degree or equivalent						1.24			
Higher education						0.70			
GCE A Level or equiv						1.02			
GCSE grades A-C or equiv						0.94			
No qualification									
<i>Occupations</i>			***			***			***
Managers and Senior Officials			1.77***			2.14***			1.26
Professional occupations			1.45***			1.63***			1.18
Associate Professional, Technical			1.66			1.74***			1.45 **
Administrative & Secretarial Services			1.10			1.17			0.99
Skilled Trades Occupations			1.27			1.30			2.88***
Personal Service			1.50***			1.18			1.34
Sales and Customer Service			1.10			1.32			0.97
Elementary Occupations									
? df	8	8	8	7	8	8	7	8	8
-2 LLR	9276.8	9151.5	8359.7	4041.9	3941.9	3468.3	5230.8	5188.6	4792.2
? -2LRR		125.3	791.8		100.0	473.6		42.2	396.4
Significance of ? -2 LRR					***	***			

Source: LFS Autumn 2010, weighted

Significance of difference from reference category \* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\* $p < 0.001$



Finally, the addition of flexible work and work-status characteristics into our logistic regression in two separate blocks enabled us to comment on the implications of these covariates for the significance of the difference in the log-likelihood ratios. The inclusion of these characteristics in Model II and III has entailed no significant change in the likelihood of female trade union members' uninclusiveness. The inclusion of flexible work in Model II, on the other hand, substantially improved the male model by reducing the likelihood of uninclusiveness to a significantly low level in distribution, hotels, restaurants, banking and finance compared to the reference category of health. Even so, the significant impact of these industries disappeared once the work-status variables are taken into consideration in Model III. In other words, the explanatory strength of these industries is influenced not only by flexible work but also work-status nominators.

### **Discussion and conclusions**

Taking into account that work-related circumstances have bearings for uninclusiveness, this article has identified which segments of trade union members are more likely to experience uninclusiveness. Our findings illustrate that uninclusiveness exhibits substantial variations within the working population with certain groups of union members facing a higher likelihood of uninclusiveness. We provided evidence on the work-related correlates of uninclusiveness, and thereby sought to rectify the lack of systematic research in this area.

Gender difference in uninclusiveness is one of the results that this paper stipulated: female members present a higher tendency toward uninclusiveness than men across almost all work-related benchmarks used in the analyses. This substantiates critical concerns over the persistent gendering of benefits yielded by union membership (Kirton 2006).

The workplace characteristics included in our models helped predict the probability of uninclusiveness. Citing financial constraints on smaller companies due to their spatial dependency on local trade, the government refuses statutory recognition of trade unions in companies with less than 20 employees (Edwards and Ram 2006). Accordingly, these companies embed a higher likelihood of uninclusiveness

membership. However, medium and larger establishments also conform to a negative correlation between size and unincludedness, especially among male union members. This mirrors the complexity of driving forces behind unincludedness.

Sectoral variations have an explanatory power for unincluded membership, but it works differently for male and female members providing further evidence of gender segregation at work (Sayce *et al.* 2006): unincludedness is higher in the private sector, but this is particularly the case among female members. Public sector, on the other hand, accounts for a large part of unincludedness as the conventional bastion of trade unions (Edwards 2009). In particular, the health industry where three quarter of the workforce is accommodated in the public sector (LFS, 2010), predicts a considerably higher likelihood of unincludedness for female members.

As the conventional nominators of disadvantaged employment terms, temporary (Cam *et al.* 2003) and part-time jobs (Pollert and Charlwood 2009) boost the likelihood of unincludedness. Taking this with the over representation of women in part-time jobs across the British labour market helps explain why female members' unincludedness in general is higher compared to male members. Stronger affect of part-time jobs on female members' unincludedness also highlights the relevance of 'industrial segregation in part-time jobs' as defined by the density of part-time jobs in public administration, education, health, distribution hotels and restaurants (Millar *et al.* 2006). Arguably, a high level of unincludedness among flexible workers at large adds further to the challenges for organising effectiveness (Charlwood 2004).

Educational attainments and occupational categories, as two work-status nominators impinge differently upon the unincludedness of male and female members. Educational attainments do not affect female members' unincludedness but higher occupational categories significantly consolidate the likelihood compared elementary occupations. This inconsistency between educational and occupational ranking in terms of their implications for the unincludedness of female members is probably contributed to by long-term increases in both over-

qualification and managerial layers (Felstead *et al.* 2007). However, male members' unincludedness is correlated not only with occupational but also educational ranking, and this is largely a positive relationship. More likelihood of unincludedness in higher-rank occupations may partly be related to variable pay (Arrowsmith and Marginson 2011). Even so, the evidence of unincludedness in such jobs also contributes to specifying the long-emphasised weaknesses of unions in delivering benefits to their members (Hymen 1997).

Because trade unions are more influential in the lower ends of the labour markets, as measured by a relatively limited unincludedness, one needs to consider the work-status of members for more elaborated assessments of unions' effectiveness (Hoque and Noon 2004). Nevertheless, the findings presented in this paper still point to a substantial proportion (circa one-quarter) of members whose pay and working conditions are not affected by agreements between unions and management in lower-rank jobs such as personal, sales and customer services as well as elementary occupations. This pertinence to lower work-status renders unincluded membership an explorable area for the students of precarious employment both empirically and conceptually (Anderson 2010; Kalleberg 2009).

Since the beginning of recession, concerns have been expressed about the 'time-to-stay-out-attitude' of trade unions (Devereux and Hart 2010). Such unfavourable perceptions of unions are exacerbated by the upward trends in unincludedness amidst redundancies and spending cuts. Reversing this trajectory requires more proactive interventions by unions including a decisive campaign for statutory recognition in small companies. Because unincludedness is particularly relevant to women members in the lower end of the labour market, it is also important to promote a progressive mainstreaming of gender. However, union renewal efforts in general should be synergised with wider debates on alternative organising strategies and political re-orientation of trade unions (Simms and Holgate 2010).

There is a need for research to examine the relationship between unincludedness and some potentially important issues beyond the scope of this study including motivation, commitment, productivity and the range of demographic variations. Recent increases in unincludedness also lend further justification to rectifying the

lack of systematic research on satisfaction with unions since the late 1970s (Glick *et al.* 1977). In particular, LFS can usefully expand its coverage to nurture such undertakings. Whilst mediating scholarly disputes generated by secondary data analyses (Bryson *et al.* 2004; Guest and Conway 2004), qualitative investigations into the implications of union membership for job satisfaction would also inform a grounded account of attitudes toward uninclusiveness.

## References

- Anderson, B (2001) Migration, immigration controls and the fashioning of precarious work, *Work, Employment and Society*, Volume 24 (2): 300–18
- Arrowsmith, J and Marginson P (2011) Variable Pay and Collective Bargaining in British Retail Banking, *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 49(3): 54–79
- Bach, S and Winchester, D (1994) 'Opting Out of Pay Devolution? The Prospects for Local Pay Bargaining in UK Public Services', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 32(2): 263–82
- Bacon, N (1999) 'Union Derecognition and the New Human Relations: A Steel Industry Case Study', *Work, Employment and Society*, 13(1): 1–17
- Bacon, N and Blyton, P (2004) 'Trade union responses to workplace restructuring: exploring union orientations and actions', *Work, Employment and Society*, Volume 18 (4): 749–73
- Beale, D and Hoel, H (2010) 'Workplace bullying, industrial relations and the challenge for management in Britain and Sweden', *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 16(2): 101–18
- Blyton, P and P. Turnbull (2004) *The Dynamics of Employee Relations*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed, Basingstoke: Macmillan
- Brook, K (2001) 'Trade union membership: an analysis of data from the autumn 2001 LFS', *Labour Market Trends - July 2002: National Statistics Feature*
- Broughton A (2001) 'Collective Bargaining in the Arts and Culture Sector: An Examination of Symphony Orchestras in Germany and the UK', *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 7(3): 327–45
- Brown, W (1993) 'The contraction of collective bargaining in Britain', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 31:189–200
- Brown, W (2000) 'Putting partnership into practice in Britain', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 38: 299–316
- Bryson, A, Cappellari, L and Lucifora, C (2004) 'Does Union Membership Really Reduce Job Satisfaction?' *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 42(3): 439–59
- Butler, P (2009) 'Non-union employee representation: exploring the riddle of managerial strategy' *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 40(3): 198–214
- Budd, J. W and Mumford, K (2004) 'Trade unions and family-friendly policies in Britain', *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 57(2): 204–22.
- Cam, S., Purcell, J. and Tailby, S. (2003) 'Contingent Employment in the UK' in O. Bergstrom and D. Storrie (eds) *Contingent Employment in Europe and the United States*, London: Edward Elgar: 52-78
- Charlwood, A (2004) 'Influences on Trade Union Organizing Effectiveness in Britain' *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 42(1), pp-69–93
- Chatzitheochari, S. and Arber, S (2009) 'Lack of sleep, work and the long hours culture: evidence from the UK Time Use Survey', *Work, Employment and Society*, Volume 23(1): 30–48

- Cregan, C and Stewart, J (1990) 'An Industrial Relations Approach to the Free Rider Problem: Young People and Trade Union Membership in the UK' *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 28(1): 84–104
- Devereux, P. J and Hart, R. A (2010) 'A Good Time to Stay Out? Strikes and the Business Cycle', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8543.2010.00800.x
- Edwards, G (2009) 'Public sector trade unionism in the UK: strategic challenges in the face of colonization', *Work, Employment and Society*, Volume 23(3): 442–59
- Edwards, P. and Ram, P. (2006) 'Surviving on the Margins of the Economy: Working relationships in Small, Low-Wage Firms', *Journal of Management Studies*, 43 (4): 895–916
- Elliott, R. F and Bender, K., A (1997) 'Decentralization and Pay Reform in Central Government: a Study of Three Countries', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 35 (3): 447–75
- Fairbrother, P (2002) 'Trade Unions in Britain: Towards a New Unionism', P. Fairbrother and G. Griffin (eds) *Changing Prospects for Trade Unionism; Comparison between Six Countries*, Employment and Work Relations in Context Series: London, pp: 56–93
- Felstead, A. Gallie, D. Green, F and Zhou, Y (2007) *Skills at Work: 1986-2006*, ESRC Centre for Skills, Knowledge and Organisational Performance: Cardiff, ISBN-978-0-9555799-0-5
- Fenn, P and Ashby, S (2004) 'Workplace Risk, Establishment Size and Union Density', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 42(3): 461–80
- Fitzgerald, I. and Hardy, J (2010) 'Thinking Outside the Box'? Trade Union Organizing Strategies and Polish Migrant Workers in the United Kingdom', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 48 (1): 131–50
- Flavin, P., Pacek, A. C., Radcliff, B (2010) 'Labour Unions and Life Satisfaction: Evidence from New Data', *Social Indicators research*, 98(3): 435–49
- Forth, J., Bryson, A., and Bewley, H (2006) *Small and medium-sized enterprises: Findings from the 2004 workplace employment relations survey*, Department of Trade and Industry: London
- Glick, W., Mirvis, P and Harder, D (1997) 'Union Satisfaction and Participation', *Industrial Relations*, 16(2): 145–51
- Gollan, P. J. (2007) *Employee Representation in Non-Union Firms*, London: Sage
- Gold, M., Cressey, P and Léonard, E (2007) 'Whatever Happened to Social Dialogue? From Partnership to Managerialism in the EU Employment Agenda', *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 13(1): 7–25
- Green, F (1991) 'Recent Trends in British Trade Union Density: How Much of a Compositional Effect?' *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 30 (3): 445–59
- Gregory, A. and Milner, S (2009) 'Trade Unions and work-life Balance: Changing Times in France and the UK?' *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 41(7): 122–46
- Guest, D. E and Conway, N (2004) 'Exploring the paradox of unionised worker dissatisfaction', *Industrial relations Journal*, 35(2): 102–21
- Harrisson, D., Roy, M and Haines, V. III (2009) 'Union Representatives in Labour–Management Partnerships: Roles and Identities in Flux', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8543.2009.00758.x
- Heery E and Simms M (2008) 'Constraints on union organising in the United Kingdom', *Industrial Relations Journal* 39 (1): 24–42

- Hodson, R (2005) 'Management Behaviour as Social Capital: A Systematic Analysis of Organizational Ethnographies' *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 43(1): 41–65
- Hoque, K and Noon, M (2004) 'Equal opportunities policy and practice in Britain: evaluating the 'empty shell' hypothesis', *Work, Employment and Society*, Volume 18(3): 481–506
- Hundley, G (1988) 'Education and Union Membership', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 26(2):195–201
- Hyman, R (1997) 'The Future of Employee Representation' *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 35(3): 309–36
- Kalleberg, A (2009) 'Precarious Work, Insecure Workers: Employment Relations in Transition', *American Sociological Review*, 74(1): 1–22
- Kirton, G (2006) 'Alternative and parallel career paths for women: the case of trade union participation' *Work, Employment and Society*, Volume 20(1): 47–65
- Lee, Y and Mowry, B (2009) 'Involuntary Part-Time Workers and the Deficiencies of the Unemployment Rate', *Economic Trends*, <http://www.clevelandfed.org/research/trends/2009/0509/03ecoact.cfm>, Last Visited on 8 November 2010
- LFS (1980; 2000; 2010) *Labour Force Survey*, Autumn Quarter, <http://www.esds.ac.uk/findingData/snDescription.asp?sn=6413>, Last visited on 24 January 2011
- Mcllroy, J (2008) 'Ten Years of New Labour: Workplace Learning, Social Partnership and Union Revitalization in Britain' *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 46(2): 283–313
- Millar, J. Ridge, T and Bennett, F (2006) *Part-time Work and Social Security: Increasing Options*, Department for Work and Pensions: Norwich
- Nergaard, K., Dølvik, J. E., Marginson, P., Díaz, J. A and Bechter, B (2009) Engaging with Variable Pay: A Comparative Study of the Metal Industry, *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 15(2): 125–46
- ONS, Office for National Statistics (2010) *Labour Force Survey Technical Report*, <http://www.esds.ac.uk/findingData/snDescription.asp?sn=6404>, Last visited on 12 November 2010
- Prowse, P. J and Prowse, J. M (2006) 'Are non-union workers different to their union colleagues? Evidence from the public services', *Industrial Relations Journal*, 37(3): 222–41
- Pollert, A and Charlwood, A (2009) 'The vulnerable worker in Britain and problems at work' *Work, Employment and Society*, Volume 23(2): 343–62
- Rigby, M and O'Brien-Smith, F (2010) Trade union interventions in work-life balance' *Work, Employment and Society*, Volume 24(2): 203–20
- Robinson, A and Wilson, N (2006) 'Employee Financial Participation and Productivity: An Empirical Reappraisal', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 41(1): 31–50
- Samuel, P (2007) 'Partnership consultation and employer domination in two British life and pensions firms', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 21(3): 459–77
- Sayce, S., Greene, A and Ackers, P (2006) 'Small is beautiful? The development of women's activism in a small union', *Industrial Relations Journal*, 37(4): 400–14
- Schnabel, C., Zagelmeyer, S and Kohaut, S (2006) 'Collective Bargaining Structure and its Determinants: An Empirical Analysis with British and German Establishment Data', *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 12(2): 165–88
- Sinclair, D. M (1995) 'The Importance of Sex for the Propensity to Unionize' *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 33(2):173–90

- Snape, E and Bamber, G (1989) 'Managerial and Professional Employees: Conceptualising Union Strategies and Structures', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 27(1): 93–110
- Sullivan, R (2010) 'Labour market or labour movement? The union density bias as barrier to labour renewal', *Work, Employment and Society*, Volume 24(1): 145–56
- Simms, M and Holgate, J (2010) 'Organising for what? Where is the debate on the politics of organising?', *Work, Employment and Society*, Volume 24 (1): 157–68
- Taylor, P. and P. Bain (2003) 'Call Centre Organising in Adversity: From Excell to Vertex', in G. Gall (ed.), *Union Organising: Campaigning for Trade Union Recognition* (London, Routledge) pp. 153–72
- Vernon, G (2006) Does Density Matter? The Significance of Comparative Historical Variation in Unionization, *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 12(2): 189–209
- Williams, S., Abbott, B and Heery, E (2011) 'Non-union worker representation through civil society organisations: evidence from the United Kingdom', *Industrial Relations*, 41(1): 69–85
- Walters, D (2004) Worker representation and health and safety in small enterprises in Europe, *Industrial Relations Journal*, 35(2): 169–86