

Public Attitudes Towards Unions

Juliet .E. Ikhide

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master
of
Business Administration

Eastern Mediterranean University
September 2017
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali Hakan Ulusay
Acting Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Business Administration.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şule Aker
Chair, Department of Business Administration

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Business Administration.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tarik Timur
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Prof. Dr. Selcan Timur

2. Assoc. Prof. Dr. İlhan Dalci

3. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tarik Timur

ABSTRACT

In a general context, understanding the attitudes of the Public toward unions is paramount in having an insight into the level of support for organized labour. Workers and non-workers alike have some beliefs about unions, and these beliefs, together with the individual's socio economic and demographic factors are what influence their decision to join or not join a union. The growth, development or decline of union movement rests on the perception of unions by the public.

This study is aimed at exploring the general attitudes of the public towards unions and to analyse if the different union attitudinal pattern of employees has any significant influence on union behaviour in Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC).

The research used a quantitative research method and 585 questionnaires were distributed to respondents in five (5) regions of TRNC. The collected data was analysed using IBM SPSS software, the reliability of the variables were significant, and results from the main analyses indicated a strong positive relationship between union instrumentality and the decision to join a union; a weak negative relationship was found between labour image and the decision to join a union; and finally, the result showed that a person's demographics have a very little influence in their decision to join a union.

Keywords: Union attitudes, labour instrumentality, labour image

ÖZ

Genel anlamda kamuoyunun sendikalara karşı olan tutumunu anlamak işgücünün örgütlenmesine olan desteğin anlaşılması açısından önemlidir. İş sahibi olanların veya işsiz olanların sendikalar hakkında bazı görüş ve inanışları vardır ve bunlar demografik özellikleriyle birlikte sendikaya katılma veya katılmama kararlarını etkiler. Sendika hareketinin büyümesi, gelişmesi veya düşüşe geçmesi kamuoyunun sendikalar hakkında sahip olduğu algılamaya da bağlıdır.

Bu çalışmanın amacı Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta kamuoyunun sendikalara karşı tutumunu ortaya koymak ve sendikalara karşı çalışanlar tarafından geliştirilen değişik tavırların sendikaya katılma kararına olan etkilerini incelemektir.

Araştırmada nicel araştırma tekniği kullanılmış ve Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta 5 bölgede 585 tane anket dağıtılmıştır. Toplanan veriler IBM SPSS programı ile analiz edilmiştir ve yüksek güvenilirlik derecesi elde edilmiştir. Sonuçlar sendika enstrümentalliği ile sendikaya katılma kararı arasında güçlü fakat sendika imajı sendikaya katılma kararı arasında zayıf ve ters yönde bir ilişki göstermiştir. Ayrıca bireylerin demografik özelliklerinin sendikaya katılma kararı üzerinde çok az bir etkisi olduğu bulunmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sendikalara karşı tutum, sendika enstrümentalliği, sendika imajı

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my parent, Mr & Mrs Joy, John. A. Ikhide.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I like to start by thanking the Almighty God; the truss for successful completion, the strength for today and bright hope for tomorrow. I thank my immediate family: my parent and siblings for their unwavering support.

My unreserved gratitude goes to my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tarik Timur, for his support, patience and help throughout the working process of the study; who also accords me the privilege to learn and develop my research ability. Your effort is deeply appreciated Sir.

I thank all my colleagues at the Business Department, especially Steve. I appreciate my friends; Tobi, Emilie, Toyin, the Eluwoles, and every member of the Huios Community Network; you're the best, God bless you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZ.....	iv
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Aim of the Study.....	4
1.2 Significance of the Study.....	5
1.3 Research Questions.....	5
1.4 Outline of the Study.....	6
2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	7
2.1 Trade Unions in General.....	7
2.1.1 Webbs Theory of Union Origin.....	9
2.1.2 What unions do.....	10
2.1.3 Union Membership Decline.....	12
2.2 Union Attitude.....	13
2.3 Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA).....	15
2.4 General Union Attitude Variables.....	16
2.4.1 Union Instrumentality.....	17
2.4.2 Union Image/big labor index.....	19
2.4.3 General Union Beliefs And Union Behavior.....	22
2.5 Attitudinal Variation towards Unions.....	22
2.5.1 Union Members and Non-Members.....	23

2.5.2 Family and Area of Residence.....	24
2.5.3 Female and Male Employees.....	25
2.5.4 Age-Older and Younger Employees.....	26
2.5.5 Employment Type	27
3 METHODOLOGY	28
3.1 Overview	28
3.2 Research Design.....	28
3.2.1 Questionnaire Design.....	28
3.3 Sampling Design	29
3.4 Data Collection.....	30
3.5 Data Analysis	30
4 DATA ANALYSIS.....	31
4.1 Descriptive Statistics	31
4.2 Reliability Measures.....	36
4.3 Exploring Relationship among the variables	37
4.3.1 Correlation analysis	37
4.3.2 Multiple regression analysis	38
4.4 Exploring Differences between groups	41
4.4.1 Independent sample T-test.....	41
5 FINDINGS, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	44
5.1 Findings and Theoretical Contribution	44
5.2 Implications for manager and union Leaders	46
5.3 Limitation of the study	46
5.4 Suggestions for further Research	47
REFERENCES	48

APPENDIX.....	55
Appendix A: Public attitudes towards unions	56

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Frequency distribution of Gender	31
Table 2: Frequency distribution of Marital Status	32
Table 3: Frequency distribution of Age	32
Table 4: Frequency distribution for TRNC Citizenship	33
Table 5: Frequency distribution for recent degree type	33
Table 6: Frequency distribution for Employment status.....	34
Table 7: Frequency distribution for employment duration in present working place	34
Table 8: Frequency distribution for employment sector	35
Table 9: Frequency distribution for employment sector	35
Table 10: Frequency distribution for belonging to a union if one exists in the respondent's work place	36
Table 11: Reliability Analysis.....	37
Table 12: Correlations Analysis.....	38
Table 13: Regression Analysis tables	38
Table 14: Anova Table.....	39
Table 15: Coefficients Table.....	39
Table 16: Extended Variables	40
Table 17: T- test analysis for Gender and union attitude factors	41
Table 18: T- test analysis for union membership status and union attitude factors...	42
Table 19: T- test analysis for family union membership status and union attitude factors.....	43

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The attitude of the public towards trade union has for long been an area of concern for researchers in the social science field. In 1988, Campbell described attitudes as “deposits of experience or attained behavioural dispositions”. General Attitudes towards union stems from the question “what do unions do?” Answering this question has posed an age long debate. Researchers, management of firms, the government and all seem to have an answer or an opinion on this question. In general, unions are said to protect shared interest of its members at any cost, even to the detriment of the larger society, union members cling to the positive benefits unions’ offers, managers complain about union activities disrupting work operations etc. The perception of unions by the management, union members, the government and the general public has an implication on overall union attitudes.

In 1970 Professor Dunlop and his colleague Derek Bok at Harvard posed the question “Are Unions worth having?” in their work titled Labour and the American Community, written at a time when organized labour in the United States was under severe criticism and the unionized portion of the American labour force was in steady decline. Their answer went thus; “unions may not have direct and strong control over the real income of their members, but their presence helps in setting a generally acceptable pay rate and working conditions that prevail in the unorganized plants as well”. “Without the union or an opportunity to join such unions people

would not be able to tell whether they are working under fair conditions.” (Lichtenstein & Harris, 1993). The major challenge for researchers is getting a total understanding of people’s attitude towards trade unions and the cause they stand for.

An extensive review done by Riley (1997) on a vast literature pertaining to determinants of union membership, highlighted that people's attitude to unions are hinged on structural determinism and individual level variables . Some of the factors, that were hypothesised on the individual levels to have a significant effect on people's process to join a union, were grouped into industry-specific factors, company-specific factors, respondent specific and attitudinal factors. This study would be focussing on respondent specific variables , which includes demographic factors and attitudinal factors-- union instrumentality and union image effect on union behavior. Research has shown that union behavior varies along employees demographic attributes. Employees attitude towards organized labor to a large extent can be explained by their personal attributes like age, sex, employment cadre, the area of residence, family background etc.

Drawing from Rhoades & Eisenberger (2002) theory of perceived organizational support, the union can be personified, and a favourable or an unfavourable attitude from the public (union members and non-union members) , would be based on the general beliefs that Unions play an instrumental role in meeting individual concerns, as well as valuing their individual needs and well-being. For many workers, the union is a platform through which pay rate and working conditions can be enhanced (Kochan, 1979; Schriesheim, 1978).The instrumental opinion of union is significant in the unionization process. Thomas & Daryl (2012) used a survey carried out in

fifteen European countries to show that 72 percent of workers agree that trade unions were instrumental in protecting their pay and improving working condition, while only 13 percent disagreed ,and 15 percent were undecided. However, negative instrumentality is very obtainable as both union and non-union members still perceive the presence of union as harmful to the employment situation, and also holding other opposing ideologies against unions (Newton & Shore, 1992).

In concurrence with Kochan (1979) survey results, that portrays union as an extremely powerful and effective institution, which exercises a lot of influence in not only the workplace, or their industry of operation, but in the society as well. That may just be a puffed up image of unions (Chacko & Greer, 1982). It can be seen from reviewed literature that the major position of the public towards union is one of more association with the level of perceived instrumentality of unions than its image (Summers, Betton, & Decotiis, 1986). Both positions are a huge determinant of union joining behaviour.

Workers' perceptions of unions are crucial elements in the development, growth, internal structures, and rules of the trade union movement (Poole, 1984). This argument was further highlighted by Jarley & Kuruvilla (1994), The manner in which employers deal with the unions, union members loyalty and union activity can be greatly impeded or enhanced by the assertion of public opinions. public opinion represents a vital force affecting labor relations processes and the actions of a labor organization. Changes in the pattern of unions act as only a simple pointer of such phenomena.

Taking on another angle, after looking at the general perceived union attitude as important determinants in the process of becoming a union member, another theme widely considered is the presence of a union. Individual preference for union membership and the presence of a union in the workplace are responsible for an employee's decision to become a member of a trade union (Hartley & Stephenson, 1992).

In conclusion, it is necessary to understand how the general public views union as this helps explain the level of support employees are likely to give unions. Therefore, a study on union directed towards explaining the attitude of the public is required, to further understand the pattern of union development, growth, union joining process and the formulation of trade union policies

1.1 Aim of the Study

The fluctuating statistics in trade union membership has led to a quest in exploring factors that may be responsible for union decline or union growth and development. Understanding the changing support and attitude towards organized labour is necessary to predict union behaviour. This study mainly seeks to examine the general attitude of the public towards unions and also to analyse if the different union attitudinal pattern of employees has any significant influence on union behaviour. It would be building on prior literature while making an effort to add to already existing studies, and findings would give industrial relations actors some insight into the public's view on unions, and also aid in formulating practical policies in the industrial relation environment

1.2 Significance of the Study

In spite of the level of interest in organized labour, there still exist some shortcomings in the study of Union Attitude. There has been some level of interest to know the different perceptions of trade unions, reasons for joining and attitude toward unions. The aforementioned terms are predictors of union joining behaviour which ultimately translates to either union growth or decline. But theoretically, the vastly available literatures are timeworn, dating back to 1970s and 80s, mainly carried out in the America and Britain to a lesser extent.

Previous research highlights instrumentality, socio-demographic variables, individual attitude, and awareness as well as other structural features as predictors of union behaviours and participation, yet positive disposition by a person to any of the mentioned variables does not essentially translate into actual membership to a trade union.

This thesis, specifically focusing on the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus-TRNC attempts to investigate the general public's attitude towards unionization on a much wider scope, not limiting the study to just a a sector of the economy. The findings from this research will give a comparative insight into the reasons employees (Union and non-union members) join or avoid unions, a comprehensive understanding of Cypriots' perception of unions, how government policies can be developed to make the industrial relations environment more favourable.

1.3 Research Questions

Varying views exists when it comes to Union and their affairs. Depending on what aspect is questioned about unions, an individual's disposition may be favourable or unfavourable. (Furnham, 1984) . The focal concern of this thesis is to understand and

have a comprehensive insight into the perception of the general public towards unions and union joining behavior , to do that, some research questions have been prepared centred on some factors—general perception of unions, union instrumental and union image view , in a bid to explain the public’s attitude toward unions.

1. What key variables affect union attitudes?
2. In the decision to join a union, what union belief prevail the most amongst employees?
3. How well do union beliefs predict the decision to join a trade union?
4. Are there any differences in union attitudes along demographics line?

1.4 Outline of the Study

The thesis work will be divided into five chapters. The first chapter highlights an introduction to the researcher’s interest in the study and the end result of the research. This is projected in a short background of the public attitude towards union, the aim, significance of the study and research questions. A comprehensive review of existing literature on the topic would be captured in chapter two. Chapter three will deal with detailed information on the methodology and data analysis while chapter four and five would present a report on findings, discussions and detailed explanation of the results generated.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter, I will be presenting a review of the related and relevant literature.

The literature reveals theories and conceptualizations of union attitudes, union behaviours, union membership, and union perception and areas pertinent to unionism in general. Although the basic question, “Why do employees join a union?” dominates several studies. Attitude towards unions is the basic proposition upon which this literature review is built on. The area of trade union is the first body of literature to be reviewed. In this section, trade unions were discussed in general, which is then followed by historical insight into the construct definition, a theoretical framework that further explains the construct, and operationalization of related variables that explains attitudes towards union along employees demographic, union membership status and employment status. The purpose of the review is to present a model of union attitude, while incorporating prior empirical and hypothetical knowledge from both areas (i.e. attitudes and unions), that would enable me to focus on the research questions.

2.1 Trade Unions in General

Understanding how trade unions operate is necessary for anyone who is part of a workplace, either as an employer or an employee. A union represents the employees in all dealings with management or employer. It is an organized association of workers, (either belonging to same craft, industry or a general category) formed to

protect members' right, advocate work related issues and to deal with members' grievances, all of which is done through collective bargaining and daily interactions between union officers and managers. Trade Union Act of 1926 referred to a trade union as "any combination, whether short-term or long-lasting, formed mainly for the purpose of regulating the relations between workers and employers, or for imposing restrictive conditions on the condition of any trade or business and includes the federation of two or more unions. Various definitions of trade union also exists from industrial relations scholars. Sydney and Beatrice Webb (1894) Defined it as a "Continuous associations of wage-earners for the purpose of maintaining or improving the conditions of their employment". A broader definition by (Opara, 2014) goes thus, "an association of employees formed to protect members work related interest, improve employees pay, working conditions and negotiate labour contracts while acting as a socio economical change agent in the society."

According to Commons (1909) the earliest form of employees association was the craft guild that began in Europe in the 14th century. Members of these guilds were self-employed craftsmen, who worked from home or from a workshop in their home community. The guilds offered some form of unemployment benefits to members, who were incapable of working due to an ill health or injury. The funds for such schemes were gotten from members' regular fee payment made to the guild. The guilds also facilitated the sharing of idea, skills, and knowledge amongst practitioners of the similar craft.

The massive shift in technology that came with the industrial revolution era of the 18th century revolutionized the workplace and work structure (McQuarrie, 2002).

Production scale increased and spanned international frontiers and the little workshop gave way to factories in urbanized areas. Business was now owned by employers who employed thousands of people including children. Business owners controlled work processes, work rates and pay. This gave rise to terrible working conditions, as the factories were expected to work uninterruptedly in a bid to meet increased demands and mass production targets. Production costs of the factories were kept at the lowest point, to increase price competitiveness and hence little or no attention was given to workers satisfaction or their health and safety issues. It was reported that in a clothing manufacturing factory in Britain, cloth weavers were paid as low as 5 shillings per week and they previously earned 25 shillings every week as independent craftsmen (Thompson,1963)

2.1.1 Webbs Theory of Union Origin

The earliest modern trade unions were formed to address the effect of the adverse working conditions of factory workers. In a research conducted by Webbs, (1894) to inquire into the origin of organized labour, they called for a restructuring of factory workers working conditions, which they argued, reflected more than just workplace challenges but an indicator of wider societal challenges.

The Webbs concluded that, the sole aim of union members was to simply improve their working life and protect themselves against the exploitation of business owners (capitalists), who provided capital and controlled how labour was used in production. While the business owners tried to minimize cost (wages) and maximize profits. According to Webb's, unions main objective was to provide protection for own concerns against their employers, and also to represent their member's interest more than would be on an individual level. The approaches employed by unions to shield their interest were collective bargaining, financial aid to (laid off, ill, or injured)

union members and legal enactments –ensuring that the government establishes labor laws that secure favourable working standards for all workers.

2.1.2 What Unions Do

Dunlop's (1958) systems theory is no doubt one of the most concise frameworks that summarizes the working of the industrial relations system. He tried to use a system process-input, process and output to explain the operations of a union on an internal level-within the organisation, on the external level –with other organisations and also the interrelations between both . Without going into the details of systems theory, Dunlop recognises the trade union as one of the players/actors in the industrial relations system, the government and the organisation's management are the other two. These three players usually have conflicting ideologies over fundamental issues and the trade union stands to represent employees.

The question “what do unions do?” has been an age long debate. Researches and the other actors in the industrial relations system seem to have an answer for or an opinion on this question. In general, unions are said to protect shared interest of its members at any cost, even to the detriment of the larger society, while others cling to their positive benefits. The perception of unions by the management, union members, the government and the general public has a consequence on unions.

The common idea of what a union does is to advance union members interests, but what they do transcends just using negotiation means to protect members right in an occupation. They also improve their member's living standards, seek to alter class structure in the society, gain power for their members (Hoxie, 1919), grant them a voice in their workplace and educate or train them when necessary (Bakke, 1945).

According to the insightful and timely study of Freeman and Medoff (1984) who analysed a substantial amount of data, were able to pinpoint the actual role of unions in the larger society. Through the study they found two outlooks of unions. The first face, which outweighs the other, has a desirable effect on the larger society, which they termed “collective voice/institutional face” while the second has a contrary side, which they called “monopoly face”. The latter face linked unions with having monopolistic control over wages, which, in the long run, is detrimental to the economy in the form of reduced employment level and firms productivity. This face puts the interest of union’s members ahead of non-unionized employees, the organization or the larger society’s interest, which all bear the consequences of ensuring that those interests are met. The first outlook of unions as proposed by Freeman and Medoff (1984), suggests that unions provide a collective platform through which members can voice their grievances, communicate them to management, ensure that the grievance is addressed, and the process results in the well-being of every employee. According to them, unions make a difference and have an impact within the union, in the organization (all employees) and in the larger society in the following categorical areas: reduction in employees’ turnover rate, standard labour relations policies, productivity improvement in the firm, alteration in power distribution and remuneration packages (seniority based rewards), improvements in employee well-beings, and better employee—management communication etc.

For over thirty years, the arguments presented by Freeman and Medoff (1984) held up pretty well, but not without controversy. Other researchers have countered the standpoint of Freeman and Medoff (1984) on what unions do, but no doubt their

work provided great insight into unions, union roles and collective bargaining process on a large scope. On the issue of unions improving productivity and economic performance, Hirsch (2004) in his research presented different findings . He found that unions have had a generally low effect on the economy, productivity varies in different context and unionized firms or sectors are not always more productive than nonunionized ones (Hirsch, 2004).

2.1.3 Union Membership Decline

The attitude among workers towards union is one of great significance, as the survival of unions rests in the hands of these employees. Since 1900s researchers started questioning the trend that unions would take in the coming years. The pioneer of such researchers was John Commons, who tried to study unionization growth and decline patterns, because union membership is a key component when it comes to measuring the union's power base and capacity for a collective bargain (Korpi, 1983; Balasubramanian, 2015).The most readily accessible indicator for measuring the strength of any union in a country or industry is union membership rate, or otherwise called union density—the proportion of the labour force that is unionized in a country. In many studies, union density has been substituted for union power and using these terms interchangeably has been generally accepted (Addison, Bailey, & Stanley, 2007; Bain & Price, 1980) , but in practice , measuring union strength or weakness in relation to union membership base is not so optimal as the affairs of unions are also influence by political stability in an environment or country , public policies and the regime form, the unions own organizational scope (union constituents) or even some charismatic leaders or political parties (Valenzuela, 1994).

The patterns of unionization have been on the rise and decline, but by and large, more on the declining side. Since the 1980s, there has been a widespread decline of unions and many scholars in industrial relations fields asserted this fact (Checchi & Visser, 2005; Visser, 2003; Western, 1995). The review of literatures revealed factors responsible for waning union popularity as economic factors, socio-political factors, cyclical factors, structural factors (Balasubramanian, 2015), opposition from management (Freeman & Medoff, 1984), occupational and personal factors- like attitude, age, family background and work type-- white and blue collar jobs (Schnabel & Wagner, 2007), and labour passivity (Western, 1995). When studying factors influential on union density, many of the researchers placed emphasis on macro socioeconomic variables (Riley, 1997) and failed to really consider union attitude as a determinant of union joining behavior, which raised the concern with respect to the topic under discussion.

2.2 Union Attitude

In understanding unions and its future role, the attitudes of employees towards union membership plays key role, while considering the prevalent decline in union attractiveness (Deery & Walsh, 1999). The support of employees for unionization is just one of the several ways by which unions can be revived.

For centuries, the construct “attitude” has been one of the most studied in varying contexts in the social sciences. Defining and explaining the term has been an area of contention amongst scholars. Different scholars in different studies presented different definitions for the term. The earliest definition was “mental and neural state of readiness in response to an external stimulus that influences behaviour and cognition “and since then the term has passed through series of incarnations (Allport,

1935). Allport's view sets the foundation for all study of attitudes, regardless of the slightly different perspectives of contemporary scholars. Wood and Fabrigar (2012) summarized that contemporary researchers denote attitude to mean a valence evaluation of an attitude object, which could either be an object, a person, an event, or an action, to mention but a few. It's also noteworthy to state that the same authors, after an in-depth study of the term considers attitude to be enduring, usually stable over time, unlike moods or feelings. While an in-depth detail may be useful in understanding the evolution and nature of discussions that have ensued on human psychological development and processes, a thorough review spanning a reasonable period of time is beyond the scope of this thesis. Instead, the focus would be more on examining union attitude in conjunction with understanding the unionization process in industrial relation realm.

Amongst other points held in Allport's definition of attitude, one point still relevant today and to this study is 'behaviour'. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) theorized a useful methodology to analyse the relationship between attitude and behaviour. Much of the earliest research carried out on the uncertainty relationship between attitude and behaviour was perfected and a conclusion was arrived at by them. In their work, they were able to show that attitudes are formed by the beliefs (positive or negative) an individual has about an object, and in turn, reflects that individual's intention to behave relative to that object. So from beliefs to attitudes to actual behaviour performed. This prototype can be said to have a direct effect on employee behaviour towards union. If an employee holds a negative belief toward unions, such belief manifests itself in a negative attitude and therefore a negative intention to perform (disapproving behaviour) those behaviors favourable to unions. This model can also

be applied on a larger scale- i.e. the general public. This stresses the necessity of studying the public's attitude towards Union, as a better understanding of the union attitudes, which can help predict union joining behaviours in this time of decreasing union membership. The extent to which union related behaviour can be explained by union attitudes (attitudes of union and non-union members') has been a major area of interest for industrial relation researchers. Considerable attention was given to the study of union attitude between 1948 and 1953 (see- Spinrad, 1960; Strauss, 1977)

In general, union attitudes can be viewed as the general disposition of workers towards unions. It could be deduced as “a valence evaluation—i.e. a negative or positive mental assessment assigned by a person to an attitude object (in this case trade Union) based on its attractiveness to this person influencing his/her behaviour”. In essence, employees can have a positive or negative valence towards unions.

2.3 Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA)

In this study, the Theory of Reasoned Action which was developed by Icek Ajzen and Martin Fishbein in 1967 will be employed to understand attitudes towards unions. This theory takes into account the link between attitude and behaviour (an intention to perform an actual performance). As stated earlier, they postulated that rational human beings form their attitudes from beliefs or a combination of new information with existing beliefs. According to this theory, an intention to execute certain behaviour (behavioural intention) regularly comes before the actual behaviour, and this behavioural intention follows the expectation that the actual performance leads to a specific outcome. According to the model, this behavioural intention is determined by a person's attitude and his subjective norm towards the

behaviour, which was defined by, Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) as ‘ a person’s perceived social pressure to perform or not to perform the behavior in question ’.

Fishbein and Ajzen(1975) identified descriptive belief, inferential and informative beliefs as the foundation upon which beliefs are formed, and attitudes developed towards union stems from these beliefs. Beliefs formed as a result of direct experience with the union is called descriptive belief, while those formed on the base of descriptive belief or past inference about the union is termed inferential beliefs and finally informative beliefs are developed by accepting the information made available by a referent other or an outside source -like the media. In summary, a person’s attitude toward the unions is formed by the sum of the person’s beliefs (descriptive, inferential and informative) about the union together with subjective norms, leading to behaviour. For the sake of this study, union attitude would be conceptualized as flowing from Descriptive, inferential and informational beliefs.

Relating the above aspects of Fishbein & Ajzen theory with information from other research would aid the development of an all-inclusive study of union attitude. below, some variables-two to be precise, is largely associated with the study of attitudes towards unions and areas in which attitudes towards union varies would be presented and discussed also.

2.4 General Union Attitude Variables

It's no news that when it comes to measuring union attitudes, questionnaire items have been used typically to solicit a response from respondents, but the dimension of the constructs employed by researchers are often inconsistent and needs validation (McShane, 1986). Consistent with earlier research, Union Instrumentality and Union

Image are the two common measures of general Union attitudes (Kochan T. A., 1979; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Deshpande & Fiorito (1989) suggests that Union instrumentality, when compared with Union image, is a more precise construct as it visibly measures a belief properly than an attitude.

The extent to which the public, union members inclusive are knowledgeable about Unions, Union activities, and all that unions do on their behalf (like ensuring that fair labor practices ensue in the economy) would no doubt have a positive impact on their Union attitudes. After all, Chew (1991) rightly concluded that whatever benefits negotiated by the trade unions with management, same is received and enjoyed by both union and nonunion members.

2.4.1 Union Instrumentality

A lot has already been said about the determinants of union attitude: individual disposition, structural factors, demographics, family history as well as union instrumentality are all very important factors. Union instrumentality is seen as the union's capability to help members impact and gain favourable traditional work conditions (e.g. wages, benefits) (Hammer, Bayazit, & Wazeter, 2009) and non-traditional work conditions (e.g. job satisfaction) (Gordon., Tetrick, & Barling, 1995) pertinent to their employment relations through collective bargain. Shan, Hu, Zhi, Zhang, & Zhang (2016) further portrays Union instrumentality as the dominant use of union movements to gain outcomes that are favorable to both the individual employees and the organization.

some scholars view union instrumentality as the most important antecedent to unionization while others have disagreed to their relative importance. However,

predominately in the U.S, the supremacy of the instrumental role of Unions lords its ideological role (Kochan, Katz, & McKersie, 1986), others, contemplate both roles as predictors that can take different paths as circumstances dim fit (Barling, Fullagar, & Kelloway, 1992; Bamberger, Kluge, & Suchard, 1999) . But Missing in the discussion about the relative position of Union ideology and union instrumentality is the failure to recognize that unions differ with respect to occupational characteristics of their members, the legal structure of states they operate in, member's demographics, history, and ties with political parties. A very strong ideological commitment to trade unionism as a social, political or educational movement may be what prevails in some unions and others less—i.e. tilting more to the economic view aspect (Hammer, Bayazit, & Wazeter, 2009).

Kochan T. A. (1979) and Farber & Saks (1980) are amongst the notable researchers in the area of individual decision to join a join, they all came out with similar results showing that there was a direct relationship between unionization and job satisfaction, with perceived union instrumentality having a vital mediating effect. Therefore dissatisfaction leads individuals to join unions and it also causes them to believe in union instrumentality, leading to unionization as well.

Premack & Hunter (1988) established that satisfied employees were less likely to perceive union instrumentality, while those employees who were dissatisfied with certain features of their jobs were involved with unions, turning to them for protection (Visser, 2002; Dhammika, Fias, & Sam,2012). Nevertheless, other researchers show that and employees' dissatisfaction with his job or an aspect of it was not enough to result in unionization (Premack & Hunter, 1988). In essence,

employees would only join unions if they perceive that they could help reduce or remove the cause of their dissatisfaction and improve their working condition (Charlwood, 2002).

2.4.2 Union Image/big labor index

In previous researches, it's constant to see somewhat various measures of union beliefs, perceived Union image is a constant measure used in measuring union beliefs, In contrast to the positive belief outlook accorded to union instrumentality, the "big union|labor image" usually gets a more negative perspective in relation to beliefs about Unions. Union image is usually measured by items describing union as too strong, corrupt or not even necessary at all as it interferes with political and economic stability (Chacko & Greer, 1982). Consistent with Kochan T. A.(1979) article, it is widely held amongst employees that unions are big and powerful institutions wielding lots of influence in the society.

Craft & Abboushi (1983) Supports that it is commonly admitted by the public that trade unions have a negative public image and its discussed in five aspects, three of those aspects would be considered here in buttressing union image.

Union leadership, this aspect deals with the public's perception of the temperament and character of persons filling leadership positions in unions. The projected image of unions is significantly affected by its leader's personality (Snyder, 1973); union leaders are perceived as being too powerful, authoritative, seeking self-interest rather than members' benefits (Kochan T. A., 1979), but union members disagreed with this view. Fiorito & Hendricks (1987) emphasizes that several research suggests that a variance exists between the desired outcomes of union members and union leaders, and most often than not bargain results reflects the leaders choice.

Another aspect is that of Outside influence, this point to the idea that unions are alleged to have some level of influence at a national level, having some control over organizations in the larger economy. They do so by employing subtle compulsion (Craft & Abboushi, 1983). Issues usually discussed at this point involves: unions impact on the running of the economy, what bills are passed into laws and enacted in the economy, strong ties that exists between unions and those in the executive arm of government, unions say on those who run and get elected into public offices as well as the strong perceived influence of unions over employers. In the argument of Jarley & Kuruvilla (1994), unions are perceived as a part of the challenges an economy faces, the ripple effect of their affairs(costly actions e.g strike, collective bargaining process) can be felt in areas of persistent price rise, manipulating lawmakers plan and even electoral activities in the economy. On the flip side, some other employees do not mind this aspect of labor union, they would vote for a union or even join one if they perceive its ability to influence national policies (Fiorito,1987)

The third aspect to be considered in In-house governance amongst union members, this aspect deals with unions in-house management, which comprises of the quality and level of fairness obtainable in all unions internal affairs and its oligarchy power structure. Many anticipate that unions like other economic, social or political institution in the society are highly democratic in nature, but the reverse is the case, as they are now characterized as being autocratic in their in-house administrations, very low or absent participation of members in decision-making process (Sultan, 1963)

As earlier stated these three out of Craft & Abboushi five dimensions of labor image displays and gives a good understanding of labor image as it concerns this study. There may be a faint discrepancy in the overall view of labor image by a person or a group of persons depending on the dimension stressed but the presented dimensions appear to encompass the ideas from available literature.

The manner in which an employee perceives a union: in the sense that, they recognise and hold a favourable belief of union instrumentality or they are dissatisfied with their employment conditions, labour image construct is hypothesised as having a veto influence on union voting intention (Youngblood, DeNisi, Molleston, & Mobley, 1984). In other words, an employee may not consider voting for a union despite dissatisfaction with terms of employment and perceived favorable union instrumentality belief, because of the negative union image. On the reverse side, an employee must hold a positive image of unions in general to express a pro-union attitude. In Youngblood et al (1984) experimental model of unionisation, where they assessed an individual's intent to vote for or against a union, concluded that an employee would only vote in favour of a trade union if there was a triggering effect in term of high job dissatisfaction, an augmenting effect in terms of perceived union instrumentality and finally a positive image of unions (Riley, 1997).

In conclusion, those having a negative outlook of unions as regarding big labor image, along the three dimensions chosen for this study -be it assertions that union leaders are too authoritative and seeking self-interest, or unions exerts too much influence over the running of the political and legislative affairs in the society, or that

unions engage in too many costly actions disrupting the smooth operation of businesses and the economy or that unions are undemocratic institutions, maintaining an autocratic style of operation and denying rank and file members their full freedom to participate in decision making. Such negative belief of unions only echoes a preconceived and widespread stereotype which affects workers attitudes to unionize or vote for a union (Kochan T. A., 1979).

2.4.3 General Union Beliefs And Union Behavior

Union instrumentality and union image belief may encourage or weaken the desire of an employee to display union joining behavior. Kochan T. A.(1979) best described the relationship between these beliefs as not mutually exclusive, in the sense that employees can maintain favorable or unfavorable attitude towards both beliefs simultaneously. The inclination of an individual to support a union increases when he subscribes to perceived union instrumentality belief, likewise, a belief that a union would only make the work environment worse off reduces the likelihood of supporting a union by the same margin.

In practical term, the judgment passed by people about unions, and their actual union behavior is more influenced by the personal benefits that accrue (what unions do for their members/benefits of union membership) to them individually, than by the general image of organized labor in the society.

So far, all references cited in this research have found a very robust connection between both beliefs of unions and employees union behavior.

2.5 Attitudinal Variation towards Unions

Outside perceived union instrumentality and union image, some other demographical variables have been associated with employees' attitudes towards unionization and their union behaviours. The shifting demographic, geographical and work structure

characteristics of the workplace poses some challenge to the future of unions. The following section throws some light on what differences exists in union attitudes along some demographic lines.

2.5.1 Union Members and Non-Members

Union and non-union member in general both hold similar beliefs about organized labour in relation to perceived instrumentality. They believe in the capability of unions in minimizing the areas of dissatisfaction they feel within their work context, and also in improving their terms and condition of work (Kochan T. A., 1979; Charlwood, 2002). Furthermore, non-union members are more predisposed to unionize when they are unfulfilled with the economic aspects of their job, relying on the union's influence to reduce the un-satisfaction and further improve the same aspect and vice versa, but members and satisfied non-members unionize for the sake of further improving their work conditions and terms. This favourable disposition of the public in relation to union instrumentality usually precedes other union characteristics, and it is a more salient feature than its negative side 'union image' which has been seen in most research to distort unionisation process (kuruvilla , Gallagher, & Wetzel, 1993).

Union members do not buy into the corrupt and tarnished image which outsiders have branded union with. Regardless of the public's perceived low image of union which has gained more ground through the media (Craft & Abboushi, 1983), many experts in the field disregard such image but not totally (Freeman & Medoff, 1984) as they believe that every social institution has some level of corruption. Surveys amongst union members have shown that most union members are satisfied with union internal operation, union democracy, and union leadership and the level of

responsiveness they get in relation to their needs (Chacko & Greer, 1982). Unions are generally democratic, contrary to critics stand point.

Having established the stands of union and non-union members have a favourable attitude towards unions in terms of perceived union instrumentality belief, it is not far-fetched to say that unions can push the limits in a bid to meet and keep maintaining their economic objectives (Jarley & Kuruvilla, 1994), and in so doing may engage in tactics that tarnish and further adds to their image challenge. Members may be comfortable with whatever tactics (e.g. strikes, lockouts, protests, resource consuming negotiations) unions employ to further its course, as it is seen as a means to an end, but the public gets dissatisfied in the long run.

In general, Union members are twice more likely to maintain a favourable attitude towards unions than non-union members. Krahn & Lowe (1984) presented the reason to be that: a pro-union attitude displayed by union members is formed over time just by being union members i.e. just belonging to a union creates a disposition that naturally supports unions and also for the fact that they were initially predisposed to unionism.

2.5.2 Family and Area of Residence

A person's attitude towards work and unionisation decision may be influenced by the disposition of their family, community, and class towards unions, raising the informative belief aspect of Fishbein & Ajzen Theory of Reasoned Action as a backdrop. Blanden & Machin (2003) offers firm evidence that backs the idea that a decision to join a union or not stems from the role of socialization within the family. They found that the chance of a young person whose father belonged to a union is

twice more likely to unionize than those with a non-union member father. To tie the ends of the preceding line, on an individual level, a personal perception of unions and their willingness to join a union relies on their perception of a referent other towards Union.

Accordingly, an employee in a traditionally union-dominated area is bound and should be more predisposed towards joining a union than one in an area lightly unionized. This would be as a result of the influence of information from family and friends with direct experience (descriptive belief) of trade unionism. A research was done by Charlwood (2002) in Britain, using data from a representative sample of the non-union member to assess the level of support of non-union members for union membership, shows that people who lived in an affluent neighbourhood in England were less likely to unionize than everyone else. In the same light, a respondent who was residing in a manufacturing, mining or industrial area were twice as likely to unionize as a resident of an affluent neighbourhood, as opposed to expectations; both relationships were not mediated and influenced by perceived union instrumentality ideology.

2.5.3 Female and Male Employees

The participation of women in trade unions runs congruently with the influx of women into the labour force. Women membership and participation rate in union activities still lag far behind their male counterpart; this can be ascribed to their late arrival into the labour force, home responsibility, engagement in precarious jobs, relatively shorter tenure in the world of works (as temporary or part time employees) and female marginalization (Andibo, 2012).

For a long time now, unions are being perceived as patriarchal in nature, but the influx of women into the world of work is changing the game, and research shows that females are even more receptive of the union (Donald & Tribbey, 2011). Despite low union membership rate of women in unions, evidence can be seen from the works of Kochan T. A. (1979); Krahn & Lowe (1984) that counters the stereotype that portrays women as incapable of functioning and being supportive of the unionization process. All the assumption's concerning women and their attitudes towards unionisation is open to research.

2.5.4 Age-Older and Younger Employees

Same chances exist for both a younger and an older employee to unionize if their work situation permits it (Kochan T. A., 1979). But potential union membership chances are higher for younger employees than older employees. older workers, are close to leaving the workforce and may be seeking protection from union for reasons peculiar to their age (e.g. securing retirement benefits and waning efficiency) , in contrast to younger employees , who are more militant , vibrant , earn lower salaries and less dedicated to an employer (Waddington & Whitston, 1997)

The reason for the low membership rate of young people in unions is not because they perceive the presence of unions casually or unimportant, but because of the following reasons: they hold more non-standardized work arrangement (temporary or part time jobs , self-employment and maybe contract staff) than older workers and also because they find employment in relatively newer industries (non-union sectors e.g. telecommunication and service industries) than older workers who are predominantly employed in organized sectors(e.g. manufacturing and construction and)of the economy (Freeman & Medoff, 1984)

2.5.5 Employment Type

An Employees occupational cadre and type is another variable that research has found to have an effect on unionization decision. In employment relationship, like self-employment, sole proprietorship and entrepreneurship, with very small ratio of employer to employee, the need for unions or their services is seen to be low in such structures (Deery & Cieri,1991).

It has also been found that based on occupational status , white collar employees are less likely to unionise than blue collar employees (Kochan T. A., 1979). Amongst other adjectives, Deshpande & Fiorito (1989) described unions as an organisation for manual workers only , which poses a threat to the individual autonomy of white collar employees. other reserachers suggests that blue collar employees tends to vote more for unions because they usually receive lower pay , have less security and freedom on the job , and rely heavily on voice approach to obtain preferred working terms ,unlike white collar employers who contrast those characteristics and can easily exit a firm if the working terms are not favourable (Freeman & Medoff, 1984)

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Overview

The aim of this research is to find out if the different union attitudinal pattern of employees has any significant influence on union behaviour and to examine the general attitude of the public towards organized labour. This chapter provides information about the research methodology of this study, which includes all the details of how the study was conducted, the research design, and population, sampling methods, data collection methods and finally data analysis.

3.2 Research Design

The study made use of quantitative research method with the aid of questionnaires for data collection. The choice of research instrument (questionnaire) was chosen because it is the most standardized method of collecting data (Converse & Presser, 1986) and most respondents are familiar with this method, also the population was large and using this method reduced the complication of data entry and analysis. In addition, this method reduces bias in respondents' responses to questions

3.2.1 Questionnaire Design

For this study, a combination of items from two different sources which were similar and related to this study was used. The questionnaire was prepared to measure the general attitudes of the public towards unions. The survey instrument was designed containing demographic section and the other section contains scales measuring attitudes towards unions.

The items were taken from Krahn & Lowe (1984) and Morand (1998) paper, but originally, they were developed by Uphoff & Dunnette in 1956. A set of 15 likert style statement measuring the general attitudes of the public towards unions, union instrumentality, union image in relation to the power they hold, and union influence in the larger society were administered to respondents. Respondents were required to answer extent to which they agree or disagree to the statement on a 5 point likert (strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree) response scale.

Few word changes were made to the original Uphoff & Dunnette (1956) union attitudinal scales to make it more suitable for the present population, but asides that nothing else was done to the scales. It is noteworthy to know that the scale is the most extensively used measure when it comes to examining union attitudes. Other researchers has reported the good reliability and validity of the scale also (krahn & Lowe, 1984; Morand, 1998).

3.3 Sampling Design

Webster (1985) described a sample as a set of people (respondents), who were drawn from the whole population for the purpose of studying them to gain information about the whole. For this study, the sample size was 999 respondents from all over TRNC.

Purposive sampling method was used in this study, because it allows the researcher focus on certain characteristics of the respondents which is relevant in answering the research questions of this research. Questionnaires were distributed to randomly selected respondent since this research is measuring the attitudes of the public towards unions.

3.4 Data Collection

The Questionnaire used in the study was designed and distributed in five (5) cities (Iskele, lefkosa, Girne, gazimagusa, and Guzelyurt lefke) of TRNC. The number of questionnaire was given out to respondents in each city in proportion to the population of people in that city. A total of 1000 questionnaires were distributed and collected. One questionnaire was discarded due to missing data.

3.5 Data Analysis

Data analysis for this study was done with the use of IBM SPSS software. Correlation and regression analysis were used in exploring the relationship that existed among the variables while providing answers to the first three research question of this study; and independent sample T-test was used in exploring differences between the different groups and provided answer to the forth research question.

Chapter 4

DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

1000 questionnaires were distributed among different respondents in five (5) major cities of TRNC. A total of 598 were left after all the questionnaires were completed, received and cleaned on Statistical Package for Social Sciences SPSS. The survey included demographic questions about respondent gender, marital status, age, TRNC citizenship, and educational level. Respondents were also asked about their employment duration, present employment status, sector of employment, union membership status, union membership intention for non-union members and union membership status of family members. Furthermore, respondents were asked to answer 19 different questions pertaining to general union attitudes on a five likert scale.

The final sample was composed of 308 (52.6%) male respondents and 277 (47.4%) female respondents. This result clearly indicates that male respondent had a higher response rate.

Table 1: Frequency distribution of Gender

	Frequency	Per cent
Male	308	52.6
Female	277	47.4
Total	585	100.0

As shown in table 2, 404 of the respondents were married, making (69.1%) of the sample while 181 (30.9%) respondents were single.

Table 2: Frequency distribution of Marital Status

	Frequency	Per cent
Married	404	69.1
Single	181	30.9
Total	585	100.0

As shown in Table 3 below, the respondents whole ages were between 18 and 25 years made up 15.2% of the sample, while 35.7% of the sample comprised of respondents aged between 26 and 36 years, while those between 36 and 45 years made up 30.6%, 16.1% were between 46 and 55 years and 2.4% of the sample was between 56 and 65 years.

Table 3: Frequency distribution of Age

	Frequency	Per cent
18-25	89	15.2
26-35	209	35.7
36-45	179	30.6
46-55	94	16.1
56-65	14	2.4
Total	585	100.0

The forth table displays the number of respondent who are citizens of TRNC and those who are not. TRNC citizens make up 88.2% of the sample while 11.8% were nationals from other countries.

Table 4: Frequency distribution for TRNC Citizenship

	Frequency	Per cent
No	69	11.8
Yes	516	88.2
Total	585	100.0

The frequency distribution of the respondent's recent degree type presented in Table 5 shows that 62 (10.6%) of the total sample had a junior high qualification; 220 (37.6%) of them had a high school qualification; 59 (10.21%) of the respondent had a two (2) year program certification; 194 (33.2%) of them were undergraduates; 39 (6.7%) had a master's degree and 11 (1.9%) of the total number of respondents had a Ph.D. degree.

Table 5: Frequency distribution for recent degree type

	Frequency	Per cent
Junior High	62	10.6
High School	220	37.6
2 Year Program	59	10.1
Undergraduate	194	33.2
Masters	39	6.7
Ph.D.	11	1.9
Total	585	100.0

A frequency distribution table for the respondents' employment status at the time of the survey shows that 575 (98.3%) of the respondent had a job while 4 (.7%) of them were unemployed and 6 (1.0%) of them were retired.

Table 6: Frequency distribution for Employment status

	Frequency	Per cent
I have a job	575	98.3
I do not have a job	4	.7
I am retired	6	1.0
Total	585	100.0

At the time of the survey, table 7 below shows that 279 (47.7%) of the sample has been working with their present employer for between 1-5 years; 141 (24.1%) of them between 6-10 years, while 79 (13.5%) of them has been with their present employer for between 11-15 years and 86 (14.7%) of the respondents for 16 years and above.

Table 7: Frequency distribution for employment duration in present working place

	Frequency	Per cent
1-5	279	47.7
6-10	141	24.1
11-15	79	13.5
16 - Above	86	14.7
Total	585	100.0

Table 8 shows the sectors in which the respondents work at the time of the survey. It can be seen from the table that 68 (11.6%) of the respondents were self-employed while 263 (44.8%) of them works in the public sector (state, municipal and Banking) and 254 (43.5%) of them works in the private sector (services, manufacturing, construction, transportation, banking and others)

Table 8: Frequency distribution for employment sector

	Frequency	Per cent
Self Employed		
Yes	68	11.6
Public Sector		
State	189	32.2
Municipal	54	9.2
Banking	20	3.4
Private Sector		
Services(hospital ,consulting)	114	19.5
Manufacturing(factory , workshop)	35	6.0
Construction	22	3.8
Transportation	13	2.2
Banking	32	5.5
Other	38	6.5

Table 9 below presents the frequency distribution for the union membership status of respondents and union membership status of the respondents' family members. The table shows that 387 (66.2%) of the respondents are non-union members while 198 (33.8%) of them are union members. 293 (50.1%) of the total respondent had no family member who belonged to a union while 292 (49.9%) of them had someone in their family who belong to a union.

Table 9: Frequency distribution for employment sector

	Frequency	Per cent
Are you a member of a union		
No	387	66.2
Yes	198	33.8
Total	585	100.0

	Frequency	Per cent
Is anyone in your family a union member		
No	293	50.1
Yes	292	49.9
Total	585	100.0

The frequency distribution table below shows that 204 (34.1%) of the respondents would not join a union if one existed in their place of work, while 394 (65.9%) of them would join a union if one existed in their place of work.

Table 10: Frequency distribution for belonging to a union if one exists in the respondent's work place

	Frequency	Per cent
Valid No	198	33.8
yes	387	66.2
Total	585	100.0

4.2 Reliability Measures

A reliability test was ran to ascertain the internal consistency of the scales. According to Uphoff and Dunnette (1956) and McShane (1986) labour instrumentality scale and labour Image Scale has very good internal consistency. The cronbach alpha coefficient for these two scales in this study is .73 and .80 accordingly.

For a third scale- decision to join union, which had just two (2) items, the cronbach alpha coefficient was a low .50. As recommended by Briggs and Cheek (1986), the mean inter item correlation score for the scale should be between .2 and .4. The mean inter item score for this study is .36.

Table 11: Reliability Analysis

Scale	Cronbach's	
	Alpha	N of Items
labour	.726	5
Instrumentality		
Labour Image	.798	8
Inter total statistics; Decision to join		
	Mean	N of Items
Inter-Item Correlations	.336	2

4.3 Exploring Relationship among the variables

4.3.1 Correlation analysis

Table 12 below shows the descriptive statistics and Pearson product-moment correlation. The correlation table shows the relationship between selected variables. Amongst the variables are employees' union membership status, intention to join a union and three union factors- labour image, labour instrumentality and the decision to join a union, which was averaged from a number of items on in the questionnaire. The data showed that there was a positive correlation between labour union instrumentality and the decision to join a union, the relationship was statistically significant at ($r = 0.76$, $n = 585$, $p = 0.000$); a weak negative relationship exists between the labour image and the decision to join a union at ($r = -0.17$, $n = 585$, $p = 0.000$); and finally, another negative relationship between union instrumentality and labour Union image ($r = -0.28$, $n = 585$, $p = 0.00$).

Table 12: Correlations Analysis

	labour image	labour instrumentality	Decision to join
labour image	1	-.279**	-.172**
labour instrumentality		1	.760**
Decision to join			1

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

4.3.2 Multiple regression analysis

Assumption of normality of data → the data were assumed to be normally distributed based on the respective Skewness, coefficients of the study variables which were within the accepted range of [-2:2] (Pallant , 2011)

Table 13: Regression Analysis tables

Model	Model Summary								
	R	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.042 ^a	.002	1.07239	.002	.341	3	581	.796	
2	.765 ^b	.585	.69270	.583	406.746	2	579	.000	

a. Predictors: (Constant), Are you a union Member , Gender , Age

b. Predictors: (Constant), Are you a union Member , Gender , Age , Labour instrumentality, Labour image

Table 14: Anova Table

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.176	3	.392	.341	.796 ^a
	Residual	668.156	581	1.150		
	Total	669.332	584			
2	Regression	391.512	5	78.302	163.189	.000 ^b
	Residual	277.820	579	.480		
	Total	669.332	584			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Are you a union Member , Gender , Age

b. Predictors: (Constant), Are you a union Member , Gender , Age , Labour instrumentality, Labour image

c. Dependent Variable: Decision_to_join

Table 15: Coefficients Table

Model		Unstandardized		Standardized		Sig.
		Coefficients		Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	
1	(Constant)	3.303	.213		15.511	.000
	Gender	-.007	.090	-.003	-.076	.939
	Age	-.023	.045	-.021	-.504	.615
	Are you a union Member	.091	.095	.040	.953	.341
2	(Constant)	.455	.233		-1.954	.001
	Gender	.110	.058	.051	1.891	.059
	Age	-.045	.030	-.042	-1.483	.139
	Are you a union Member	-.067	.064	-.029	-1.037	.300
	Labour image	.060	.038	.047	27.579	.115
	Labour instrumentality	1.024	.037	.781	31.825	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Decision to join

Table 16: Extended Variables

Model						Collinearity
		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Statistics Tolerance
1	Labour image	-.178 ^a	-4.101	.000	-.168	.889
	Labour instrumentality	.769 ^a	28.441	.000	.763	.983

a. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Are you a union Member , Gender , Age

b. Dependent Variable: Decision to join

Multiple regressions was used to measure the capability of two Union beliefs (labour union instrumentality and labour image) to estimate the decision to join a union, after controlling for the influence of union membership status, gender and age. Preliminary analyses which are not presented in this work due to congestions were carried to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, homoscedasticity linearity and multicollinearity.

In the first model, union membership status, gender and age explained less than 1% of the decision to join a union (dependent variable). After the two union beliefs scale (labour union instrumentality and labour image) were added to the model (referred to as b or 2) the overall variance explained by the model was 58.5%, $F(5, 579) = 163.189$, $p = .000$. 58% of the variance in the decision to join a union is explained by union belief scales after controlling for the influence of union membership status, gender and age. This can be seen in R^2 change = .58, F change $(5, 579) = 406.746$, $p = .000$.

Table 16 (extended variables) table, shows the influence of the two independent variables (labour union instrumentality and labour image) on the dependent variable (Decision to join), when they are alone. Beta labour image = -.178, $t = -4.10$, $p = .000$ and Beta labour instrumentality = .768, $t = 28.44$, $p = .000$. This shows that

individually, 17% of the decision to join a union is explained by labour image belief and the relationship is negative as expected: and also 77% of the decision to join a union is explained by labour instrumentality with a significant positive relationship between both variables.

4.4 Exploring Differences between groups

4.4.1 Independent sample T-test

In exploring the difference between different groups based on the respondents' demographics and the survey's factors, an independent-samples t-test was carried out to compare the different union attitude factors (labour image, labour instrumentality and the decision to join a union) scores between males and females in the first table for this section (Table 17). There was no statistically significant difference in the three factors between the groups.

Table 17: T- test analysis for Gender and union attitude factors

Factor	Demographics	Group	N	M	SD	df	T	Sig
Labour image		Male	308	2.76	.82		-.22	.826
		Female	277	2.77	.83			
Labour instrumentality	Gender	Male	308	3.65	.83	583	-1.67	.094
		Female	277	3.54	.78			
Decision to join		Male	308	3.35	1.09		-.042	.967
		Female	277	3.35	1.04			

The independent sample t-test analysis in table 18 below compares union membership status and the three union attitude factors. There is a statistically

significant difference in the mean scores for lab or image and labour instrumentality variables between the groups (union members and non-union members), and no significant different among the groups for the decision to join a union variable.

Mean labour image score for non-union members ($M = 2.90$, $SD = .84$) and union members ($M = 2.50$, $SD = .71$), $t(460.2) = 6.11$, $p = .000$; Mean labour instrumentality score for non-union members ($M = 3.54$, $SD = .83$) and union members ($M = 3.72$, $SD = .77$), $t(583) = -2.52$, $p = .012$;

Table 18: T- test analysis for union membership status and union attitude factors

Factor	Demographics	Group	N	M	SD	df	T	Sig																							
Labour image		No	387	2.90	.84	460.196	6.11	.000																							
		Yes	198	2.50	.71				Labour instrumentality	Are you a union member	No	387	3.54	.83	583	-	.012	Yes	198	3.72	.77	2.52	Decision to join		No	387	3.32	1.10	438.922	-	.363
Labour instrumentality	Are you a union member	No	387	3.54	.83	583	-	.012																							
		Yes	198	3.72	.77				2.52	Decision to join		No	387	3.32	1.10	438.922	-	.363	Yes	198	3.41	.99	.911								
Decision to join		No	387	3.32	1.10	438.922	-	.363																							
		Yes	198	3.41	.99				.911																						

The independent sample t-test analysis in table 19 below compares the mean scores of those respondents who have a family member who is a union member and those who don't have any family member who belongs to a union and the three union attitude factors. There is a statistically significant difference in the mean scores for

labour image and labour instrumentality variables between the groups (a family member belongs to a union and no family member belong to a union), and no significant different among the groups for the decision to join a union variable.

Mean labour image score for no one in my family belong to a union ($M = 2.94$, $SD = .80$) and someone in my family belongs to a union ($M = 2.59$, $SD = .81$), $t(583) = 5.31$, $p = .000$; Mean labour instrumentality score for no one in my family belong to a union ($M = 3.55$, $SD = .83$) and someone in my family is a union member ($M = 3.66$, $SD = .78$), $t(583) = -2.01$, $p = .045$.

Table 19: T- test analysis for family union membership status and union attitude factors

Factor	Demographics	Group	N	M	SD	df	T	Sig
Labour image		No	293	2.94	.80	583	5.31	.000
		Yes	292	2.59	.81			
Labour instrumentality	Is anyone in your family a union member	No	293	3.53	.83	583	-2.01	.045
		Yes	292	3.66	.78			
Decision to join		No	293	3.37	1.11	583	.372	.710
		Yes	292	3.34	1.02			

Chapter 5

FINDINGS, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Findings and Theoretical Contribution

The overall findings on the attitudes of the public towards unions in TRNC are not so different from what was obtained in major researches in other countries. Results from the survey of 585 questionnaires filled out by different respondents in five (5) different regions of TRNC.

The union attitude scales (labour image, labour instrumentality and the decision to join a union) have good reliability, with cronbach alphas of .79 and .72 for the two (2) union belief scales and .36 mean inter item score (Briggs & Cheek, 1986) for the decision to join a union. Pearson product-moment correlation was used to measure the inter relationship among the union attitudes variables. Similar to other research results (see Kochan, 1979; Krahn & Lowe, 1984) on public attitudes, labour image, otherwise termed “big labour” usually have a negative or an unfavourable perception from respondents. This belief views unions as excessively powerful, having great influence over employers, the external environment and needs strong government control. In this research as well, labour image belief recorded a significant negative correlation with the decision to join a union and with labour instrumentality as well ($r = -.17$, $r = -.27$). Conversely, labour instrumentality showed a strong positive relationship with the decision to join a union, with ($r = .76$).

This reasonable correlation among the different union attitudes variables settles the research. It is clear that labour instrumentality is a more powerful determinant in the decision to join a union than labour image.

The overall observations was made from my dataset when standard multiple regression analysis. Some demographical variables (gender, age and union membership status) were introduced into the regression analysis. The result showed that an individual's demographic were not quite significant in the decision to join a union as were e two union beliefs (labour image and labour instrumentality). Individual characteristics has no reliably predictive power over union membership decision, this finding is in sync with that of Riley (1997) work and in controversy with others that propose otherwise .So in providing answers to the research, in the decision to unionize, employees demographic has no reliable influence and labour instrumentality has a greater predictive power that labour image.

From the comparison of the differences between groups, it was found that both male and female had same outlook about union beliefs (labour image and labour instrumentality) and also in their decision to unionize. Both genders did not differ significantly in their union attitudes. Not unpredictably, the perception of union members and non-union members, and respondents who had a family member who belonged to a union and one who don't varied. Non-union members and those who didn't have anyone who belonged to a union in their family held more to labour image view while union members and those who respondents who had a family member who belonged to a union held on to union instrumentality belief of union.

In conclusion, and at par with previous researches, this research was able to show that labour instrumentality belief is the strongest attitudinal variable influencing more than half of the decision to unionize and remain in a union (for union members) and labour image belief kept non-union members from unionizing. Union attitudes are the major determinant that accounts for the variation in the unionization process, as demographic variables had no reliable influence when controlled for in the analysis.

5.2 Implications for manager and union Leaders

The results of this research have highlighted that non-union (387 people) members holds more to the labour image belief, which has a negative relationship with unionization and union members (198 people) held more to the instrumentality beliefs of union. Extrapolating these sample results would imply that managers of unionized organization would do well to implement and maintain practices where industrial democracy thrives.

Also, the likely source of union growth is from non-unionized workers, union leaders would need to work on dealing with the negative image of union which is a more dominant belief of union attitude. If that is dealt with, the number of organized workers would more than double, giving unions a stronger voice.

5.3 Limitation of the study

Some limitations particular to this study is that first, it was conducted in Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) alone, secondly , generality cannot be claimed or made on the finding of the results of this research as it is limited to only a particular people with similar culture.

5.4 Suggestions for further Research

Public attitude towards union is a relevant aspect of employee relations and should be studied often. As earlier stated, the growth, development or decline of trade unions rests on the attitude of the public toward unions. Therefore, it would be good to regularly conduct research on union attitude as union attitude changes in response to various factors. Also, this study failed to find out the actual cause of negative labour image belief and positive labour instrumentality belief. Further research could be done to find out the reason for the negative relationship between labour image and the decision to join a union.

REFERENCES

- Addison, T. J., Bailey, W. R., & Stanley, S. (2007). The impact of deunionisation on earnings dispersion revisited. (pp. 337-363). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Allport, G. W. (1935). Attitudes. In C. Murchison, *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 798–844). Worcester, Massachusetts: Clark University Press.
- Andibo, A. E. (2012). Obstacles women face in participating Effectively in Trade Union membership and leadership. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 3(3), 317-322.
- Bain, S. G., & Price, R. (1980). *Profiles of Union Growth: A Comparative Statistical Portrait of Eight Countries*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bakke, E. W. (1945). Why Workers Join Union. *American Management Association*.
- Balasubramanian, G. (2015). Union decline: a geography based assessment. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 50(3), 373-386.
- Bamberger, A. P., Kluge, N. A., & Suchard, R. (1999). The antecedents and consequences of union commitment: A meta-analysis. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(3), 304–318.

- Barling, J., Fullagar, C., & Kelloway, K. E. (1992). *The union and its members: A psychological approach*. New York : Oxford University Press.
- Briggs, S. R., & Cheek, J. M. (1986). The role of factor analysis in the development and evaluation of personality scales. *Journal of personality*, 54(1), 106-148.
- Chacko, T. I., & Greer, C. R. (1982). Perceptions of union power, service, and confidence in labor leaders: A study of member and nonmember differences. *Journal of Labor Research*, 3(2), 211-221.
- Charlwood, A. (2002). Why do non-union employees want to unionize? Evidence from Britain. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 40, 463-491.
- Commons, J. (1909). American Shoemakers, 1648-1895: a sketch of industrial evolution. *The Quartely Journal of Economics*(24).
- Converse, J. M., & Presser, S. (1986). Survey questions: Handcrafting the standardized questionnaire. 63.
- Craft, J. A., & Abboushi, S. (1983). The union image: Concept, programs and analysis. *Journal of Labor Research*, 4(4), 299-314.
- Deery, S., & Walsh, J. (1999). The decline of collectivism? A comparative study of white collar employees in Britain and Australia. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 37(2), 245-269.

Donald, C. G., & Tribbey, R. C. (2011). Representation And Leadership Roles: Women Officials In Local Unions. *Journal of Diversity Management*, 2(2), 35-50.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An introduction to Theory and Research*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Freeman, R. B., & Medoff, J. L. (1984). *What do unions do?* New york : Basic Books .

Furnham, A. (1984). The Protestant work ethic, voting behaviour and attitudes to the trade unions. *Political Studies*, 32(3), 420-436.

Gordon., E. M., Tetrick, E. L., & Barling, J. (1995). Some remaining challenges. In L. E. Tetrick, & J. Barling, *Changing employment relations: Behavioral and social perspectives* (pp. 349-366). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Hammer, H. T., Bayazit, M., & Wazeter, L. D. (2009). Union leadership and member attitudes: A multi-level analysis. . *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2.

Hartley, J. F., & Stephenson, G. E. (1992). *Hartley, J. F., & Stephenson, G. M. E. (1992). Employment relations: The psychology of influence and control at work. Blackwell Publishing. Blackwell Publishing.*

- Hirsch, B. T. (2004). What do unions do for economic performance? *Journal of Labor Research*, 25(3), 415-455.
- Jarley, P., & Kuruvilla, S. (1994). American trade unions and public approval: Can unions please all of the people all of the time?. *Journal of Labor Research*, 15(2), 97-116. *Journal of Labor Research*, 15(2), 97-116.
- Kochan, T. A. (1979). How American Workers View Labor Unions. *Monthly Labor Review* 102, 23-31.
- Kochan, A. T., Katz, C. H., & McKersie, B. R. (1986). *The transformation of American industrial relations*. New York : Cornell University Press.
- Korpi, W. (1983). *The Democratic Class Struggle*. London: Routledge.
- Krahn, H., & Lowe, G. S. (1984). Public attitudes towards unions: Some Canadian evidence. *Journal of Labor Research*, 5(2), 149-164.
- Kuruvilla, S., Gallagher, D. G., & Wetzel, K. (1993). The development of members' attitudes toward their unions: Sweden and Canada. *ILR Review*, 46(3), 499-514.
- Lichtenstein, N., & Harris, H. J. (1993). Industrial Democracy in America: The Ambiguous Promise. In R. W. Schatz, *From Commons to Dunlop* (p. 107). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- McQuarrie, F. A. (2002). *Industrial relations in canada*. Ontario: Wiley.
- McShane, L. S. (1986). General union attitude: A construct validation. *Journal of Labor Research*, 7(4), 403-417.
- Morand, D. A. (1998). Exploring the relationship between authoritarianism and attitudes toward unions. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 12(3), 343-353.
- Newton, L. A., & Shore, I. M. (1992). A model of union membership: Instrumentality, commitment, and opposition. *Academy of Management.the Academy of Management Review*, 17(2), 275., 17(2), 275-298.
- Opara, L. C. (2014). The Legal Frame Work of Trade Union Activism and the Role of National Industrial Court (NIC) in Handling Trade Disputes. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4(3).
- Pallant , J. (2011). *SPSS Survival Manual 4th edition: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS version 18: Maidenhead, Berkshire. Open University Press*. Maidenhead, Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Poole, M. (1984). *Theories of trade unionism: a sociology of industrial relations*. Routledge.
- Premack, S. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1988). Individual unionization decisions. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(2), 223-234.

- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 698–714.
- Riley, M. N. (1997). Determinants of union membership: a review. *Labour, 11*(2), 265-301.
- Schnabel, C., & Wagner, J. (2007). The persistent decline in unionization in western and eastern Germany, 1980-2004: What can we learn from a decomposition analysis? *The German Journal of Industrial Relations, 14*(2), 118-132.
- Snyder, C. D. (1973). *White-collar Workers and the UAW*. University of Illinois Press.
- Spinrad, W. (1960). Correlates of Trade Union Participation: A Summary of the literature. *American Sociological Review, 25*, 237-244.
- Strauss, G. (1977, may). Union Government in the U.S: Research Past and Future. *Industrial Relations, 16*(2), 215-242.
- Sultan, p. E. (1963). *The disenchanted unionist*. New York : Harper and Row.
- Summers, T. P., Betton, J. H., & Decotiis, T. A. (1986). Voting for and against unions: A decision model. *Academy of Management Review, 3*, 643-655.
- Waddington, J., & Whitston, C. (1997). Why do people join unions in a period of membership decline? *British Journal of Industrial Relations, 34*(5), 515-546.

Webb, S., & Webb, B. (1894). *The history of trade unionism*. New York : Longmans Green and Co.

Western, B. (1995). A comparative study of working-class disorganization: Union decline in eighteen advanced capitalist countries. . *American Sociological Review*, 60(2), 179-201.

Youngblood, S. A., DeNisi, A. S., Molleston, J. L., & Mobley , W. H. (1984). The Impact of Work Environment, Instrumentality Beliefs, Perceived Labor Union Image,and Subjective Norms on Union Voting Intentions. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 27(3), 576-590.

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Public attitudes towards unions

This study seeks mainly to examine the general attitude of the public towards unions, and to analyse if the different union attitudinal patterns of the employees have any significant influence on the decision to unionize. All responses will be kept confidential and individual participants will remain anonymous.

Thank you for your time and effort

Section 1: General Information

1. Gender: Male Female
2. Marital Status : Married Single
3. Age : 18-25 26-35 36-45 46-55
 56-65
4. Citizen of TRNC : Yes No
5. Region : lefkosia Girne Gazimagusa Guzelyurt
 lefke Iskele
6. What is your most recent degree? Junior High Undergraduate
 High School Masters
 2 Year Program Ph.D.
7. As of today: I have a job I do not have a job I am Retired
8. Which of the following sector do you work in?
 Self-Employed _____
 Public Sector State Municipal Banking
 Private Sector Services (Hospital, Accounting , Consultancy)
 Manufacturing (Factory, Workshop)
 Construction Transportation Banking Others
9. Are you a member of a union? Yes No
10. Is somebody in your family a union member? Yes No
11. If there is a union in your workplace, would you be a member? Yes No

Section 2: Items measuring union attitude

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

1	The high wage demands of unions contribute directly to inflation.	1	2	3	4	5
2	We need more laws to limit the power of unions.	1	2	3	4	5
3	Unions impose too many restrictions on employers.	1	2	3	4	5
4	Labour unions should be regulated to a greater extent by the government.	1	2	3	4	5
5	Employees of an organization have better wages and working conditions when all of them belong to a union.	1	2	3	4	5
6	The selfishness of employers can be fought only by strong unions.	1	2	3	4	5
7	If the majority of workers in a workplace vote to have a union, the others should be required to join.	1	2	3	4	5
8	Workers should have to join a union in order to hold a job.	1	2	3	4	5
9	The growth of unions has made our democracy stronger.	1	2	3	4	5
10	If it were not for unions, we'd have little protection against favouritism on the job.	1	2	3	4	5
11	Unions should have something to say about whom the employer hires.	1	2	3	4	5
12	Union rules often interfere with the efficient running of the employer's business.	1	2	3	4	5
13	Labour unions hold back progress.	1	2	3	4	5
14	The high wage demands of unions reduce chances for employment.	1	2	3	4	5
15	In a factory where there is a union, workers who are not members should be required to pay the regular union fees if they are getting union rates of pay.	1	2	3	4	5