

Business Faculty Graduate Students' Attitudes toward Collective Representation

Taraneh Foroutan Yazdian

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of

Master
of
Business Administration

Eastern Mediterranean University
September 2012
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Prof. Dr. Elvan Yılmaz
Director

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

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Tumer
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. A. Tarik Timur
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Prof. Dr. Cem Tanova

2. Assoc. Prof. Dr. A. Tarik Timur

3. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Turhan Kaymak

ABSTRACT

Collective representation is not a not a new phenomenon. Its definition and different forms have been subject to research for more than a century. Traditionally, unions have been the most common form of collective employee representation. But changes in the economy and labor market resulted in a sharp decline in union membership numbers. However, this does not mean that employees have lost their interest in representation. Quite the contrary, the literature started focusing on the ‘representation gap’, which refers to the fact that employees in nonunion workplaces would prefer to be represented either by a union or some other form of representative entity (Freeman and Rogers, 1993). Absence of such a mechanism would result in widening representation gap. Many researchers reported that although union membership numbers are on the decline, more employees are willing to have representation in the workplace. Such a demand indicates that employees are not satisfied with such human resource management practices as participation programs and they do not view employee involvement programs as a satisfactory substitute for representation (Freeman and Rogers, 1993, Kaufman and Taras, 2000). Accordingly, in the few past decades there has been a growing of interest in employee representation as a way for employees to express their voice, opinions, and complaints to managers. Partnerships established through a representation mechanism in the workplace, is seen as a liberal way of contribution of employees which lead to higher levels of democracy in the workplace (Upchurch et al, 2006).

The main purpose of this study was to measure attitudes of graduate students enrolled in EMU's Faculty of Business and Economic, toward collective representation. It also focused on measuring their attitudes towards two forms of collective representation: union and nonunion representation.

The results of the study indicated that Business Faculty graduate students have positive attitudes toward collective employee representation. Between the two forms of collective representation (union or nonunion) they have more positive attitudes toward nonunion form of representation. The findings also showed that such demographic variables as nationality, undergraduate degree, union experience and having a union member in the family have an influence on attitudes toward collective representation and its different forms.

Keywords: collective representation, union, nonunion representation

ÖZ

Toplu temsiliyet yeni bir olgu değildir. Tanımı ve değişik formları bir yüzyıldan fazla süredir çalışılmıştır.

Geleneksel olarak en çok kullanılan örgütlü temsiliyet formu sendikalardır. Fakat ekonomide ve işgücü piyasasında meydana gelen değişiklikler sendika üye sayılarında büyük düşüslere yol açmıştır. Fakat bu, çalışanların temsiliyete karşı olan ilgilerini kaybettikleri anlamına gelmemektedir. Tam tersine, literatür de ‘temsiliyet uçurumu’ denen olgu üzerine yoğunlaşmaya başlamıştır. ‘Temsiliyet uçurumu’ sendikasız işyerlerinde çalışan ve sendika veya sendika dışı bir temsiliyet sisteminin parçası olmak isteyen çalışanların durumunu anlatmaktadır (Freeman ve Rogers, 1993). Böyle bir sistemin olmaması temsiliyet uçurumunu daha da büyütecektir. Birçok araştırmacı da, sendika üye sayılarında azalma olmasına rağmen, daha fazla çalışanın işyerinde temsiliyet talep ettiğini belirtmiştir. Böyle bir talep de çalışanların katılım mekanizmaları gibi insan kaynakları yönetimi uygulamalarından tatmin olmadıklarını ve uygulanan programların örgütlü temsiliyetin yerini alabileceğine inanmadıklarını göstermektedir (Freeman ve Rogers, 1993, Kaufman ve Taras, 2000). Buna bağlı olarak da, çalışanların şikayet, istek ve fikirlerini yöneticilere iletmek için kullanabilecekleri yöntem olarak toplu temsiliyet sistemlerine olan ilgi yeniden artmıştır. Bir toplu temsiliyet mekanizması aracılığıyla işyerinde kurulacak ortaklık, çalışanların özgürce katkıda bulunabileceği ve işyerinde demokrasinin gelişmesini sağlayacak yöntem olarak görülmüştür (Upchurch ve diğerleri, 2006).

Bu çalışmanın ana amacı İşletme Fakültesindeki yüksek lisans öğrencilerinin toplu temsiliyete karşı olan tutumlarını ölçmektir. Ayrıca, toplu temsiliyetin iki yöntemi olan sendika ve sendika dışı temsiliyet yöntemlerine karşı olan tutumlar da ölçülmüştür.

Çalışma katılımcıları Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi yüksek lisans programı öğrencileridir. Çalışma sonuçlarına göre İşletme Fakültesi yüksek lisans öğrencileri toplu temsiliyete karşı olumlu tutuma sahiptir. Toplu temsiliyetin iki şekli arasında (sendika ve sendika dışı) sendika dışı toplu temsiliyet sistemlerine karşı daha olumlu tutuma sahiptirler. Yine araştırmanın bulgularına göre milliyet, mezun olunan lisans programı, sendika tecrübesine sahip olma ve ailede sendika üyesinin bulunması gibi değişkenler de toplu temsiliyete karşı tutumlar üzerinde etkili olmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: toplu temsiliyet, sendika, sendika dışı temsiliyet

This study is dedicated to my
beloved father, sister and mother,
for their endless love, kindness and support.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I cannot find words to express my gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Dr. A. Tarik Timur for his long-term provision and guidance in the preparation of this study. Without his kindness, precious supervision and vast reserve of patience and knowledge all my efforts could have been short-sighted.

I also owe my deepest appreciation to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Selcan Timur, who generously helped me with various issues during the research.

I am indebted to all my friends, especially Gelareh Dashti, Gülsen Dökmecioğlu and Osman Ergin who had always been around to support me morally and emotionally.

Finally I am enormously grateful for the compassionate supports of my father Ataollah Foroutan, my mother Mino Habibi and my sister Sayeh Foroutan. I would like to dedicate this study to them as an indication of their significance in this study as well as in my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZ.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xii
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Rationale of the Study.....	1
1.2 Aim of the Study.....	5
1.3 Scope of the Study	6
1.4 Outline of the Study	6
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	8
2.1 Employee Representation in General.....	8
2.2 Union Representation.....	11
2.2.1 Reasons for Unionization.....	12
2.3 Nonunion Representation.....	14
2.3.1 Work Councils	16
2.3.2 Transition to Nonunion	16
2.3.3 Nonunion Representation as HR Strategies	19
2.3.4 Transition to Unionization Again	19
2.4 Attitudes toward Collective Representation	20
2.5 General Understanding	25
2.6 The Proposed Relationships and Hypotheses	26

3 METHODOLOGY	28
3.1 Introduction.....	28
3.2 Research Methodology	28
3.3 Survey	28
3.3.1 Questionnaire Design.....	29
3.3.2 Survey Instrument	30
3.3.3 Research Sample	30
4 DATA ANALYSIS.....	32
4.1 Descriptive Statistics.....	32
4.2 Analysis of Respondent’s Attitudes toward Employee Representation	38
4.2.1 Differences toward Union Representation	39
4.2.2 Differences toward Nonunion Representation	45
4.2.3 Differences toward Collective Representation	52
4.3 Analysis of Demographic Characteristics’ Effects on Representation Attitudes ..	62
4.4 Correlation Analysis	75
5 DISCUSSION	79
6 CONCLUSION	87
6.1 Implications for E.M.U.....	88
6.2 Limitations of the Study.....	89
6.3 Areas for Futures Studies.....	89
REFERENCES	91
APPENDIX.....	98
Appendix A: English Questionnaire Survey.....	99

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Frequency by age	32
Table 2: Frequency by nationality	33
Table 3: Frequency by undergraduate degree	34
Table 4: Frequency by monthly family income	35
Table 5: Frequency by job experience	35
Table 6: Frequency by previous union membership experience.....	36
Table 7: Frequency by having been a part of representation mechanism before.....	37
Table 8: Frequency by having any union members in the family.....	37
Table 9: Frequency by political view.....	38
Table 10: Mean analysis for Union related questions.....	39
Table 11: Mean comparison test for different age groups, nationalities and undergraduate faculties and union attitudes.....	40
Table 12: Mean comparison test for different groups of family income, job experience and political view and union attitudes	42
Table 13: Mean comparison test for union membership experience, representation mechanism experience and any union member in family and union attitudes	43
Table 14: Mean analysis of Nonunion related questions	45
Table 15: Mean comparison test for different age groups, nationalities and undergraduate faculties and nonunion attitudes.....	46
Table 16: Mean comparison test for different groups of family income, job experience and political view and nonunion attitudes	48

Table 17: Mean comparison test for union membership experience, representation mechanism experience and any union member in family and nonunion attitudes	50
Table 18: Mean analysis for Collective representation related questions.....	53
Table 19: Mean comparison test for different age groups, nationalities and undergraduate faculties and collective representation attitudes.....	55
Table 20: Mean comparison test for different groups of family income, job experience and political view and collective representation attitudes	57
Table 21: Mean comparison test for union membership experience, representation mechanism experience and any union member in family and collective representation attitudes	59
Table 22: One way ANOVA for nationalities and attitudes toward representation	62
Table 23: Tukey HSD Comparison for Union representation attitudes and Nationality .	63
Table 24: Tukey HSD Comparison for Collective representation attitudes and Nationality.....	64
Table 25: Mean comparison between political views and representation attitudes.....	65
Table 26: Paired T-test for faculty of undergraduate degree and relationship with union, nonunion and collective attitudes.....	66
Table 27: Paired T-test for having been a union member before and relationship with union, nonunion and collective attitudes	68
Table 28: Paired T-test for having been a part of representation mechanism before and relationship with union, nonunion and collective attitudes	70
Table 29: Paired T-test for having a union member in the family and relationship with union, nonunion and collective attitudes	73
Table 30: Correlation results.....	78

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Rationale of the Study

Collective representation, unlike individual representation, requires the establishment of a representational body. That entity could be a union, which is the traditional and most common form of representation. But unions are not the only form of representation. Companies can establish a formal nonunion employee representation system. This could be part of company's human resource management strategy or an attempt to prevent unionization. Regardless of objectives, these systems provide somewhat a voice mechanism for employees.

As stated earlier, unions are the most common form of representation. But due to the changes in the economy and labor market, many countries witnessed a sharp decline in union membership numbers. Underlining the long-term decline in organized labor, Kaufman and Taras (2000) drew attention to the widening gap between employees that want representation and those that actually are a part of such representation mechanisms (Freeman and Rogers, 1993). The infamous 'representation gap' refers to the fact that employees in nonunion workplaces would prefer to be represented either by a union or some other form of representative entity (Freeman and Rogers, 1993).

Many researchers (e.g., Timur et al, 2012; Timur, 2005; Kaufman and Taras, 2000; Lipset and Meltz, 2000) reported that although union membership numbers are on the decline, more employees are willing to have representation in the workplace. Such a demand indicates that employees are not satisfied with such human resource management practices as participation programs and they do not view employee involvement programs as a satisfactory substitute for representation (Freeman and Rogers, 1993, Kaufman and Taras, 2000). Accordingly, in the few past decades there has been a growing interest in employee representation as a way for employees to express their voice, opinions and complaints to managers. Partnership established through a representation mechanism in the workplace is seen as a liberal way of contribution of employees which lead to higher levels of democracy in the workplace (Upchurch et al, 2006).

Nowadays, employees sense the strong need for the contribution in decision making process in the organizations which can affect them and their co-workers directly or indirectly. It is not only necessary for union members and non-members but also for employers to recognize the perception of employees about collective bargaining and unionism in the organization (Sarkar, 2009). Employers understand that by providing a system of representation and letting employees to participate in decisions and to express their grievances they will help employees to be more satisfied, motivated, and eventually, more productive. At employer's side putting employee's inputs into the organizational process in these circumstances will lead to a higher level of performance for the firm.

There are two primary goals for partnership in employer's viewpoint. The main one is that by using some practices of employee representation, employee's level of commitment and eventually motivation will be increased. The other aim is that by employing partnership employers will offer employee circumstances where they can express their voice and disagreements in a way that management's decency will not suffer (Upchurch et al., 2006).

Additionally, Addison et al. (1993) presented reasons as to why a collective voice is considered as superior to individual voice in the workplace: First of all, in case of absence of collective voice employees might be reluctant to voice their concerns and opinion due to fear of management retaliation. Secondly, employees may feel that a collective voice can be more helpful to solve workplace problems. Thirdly, a collective voice can help employees to gain satisfactory employment contracts.

Regarding collective employee representation, there are two forms which organizations can employ; union and nonunion employee representation (NER). In either union or nonunion representation, employees will be represented by representatives whom they have chosen in an election. In both forms of representation, representatives can discuss and concentrate on any problem concerning employees (Cotton et al., 1988). The difference between these two is that trade unions are initiated by employees whereas nonunion representation is initiated by employers.

In organizations employing unionization program, employees work together to achieve their common goals and mutual interest. Union representatives negotiate wage, labor

contracts, employment policies and other work related issues with managers on behalf of employees. Previous research on trade unions memberships generally focused on two circumstances: first, was when unionism was the result of unemployment and, second, was when union membership was voluntary (Sarkar, 2009). One of the reasons that may cause employees to join trade unions can be result of dissatisfaction of work conditions (i.g., wage and pension conditions) and seeking job security.

As stated earlier, trade union form of employee representation experienced a decline during the 1970s and the 1980s as employees started to lose their confidence in trade unions' efficiencies and seek for another substitute way (i.e., NER) to convey their voice to managers. As Roy (1980), Guest and Hoque (1994) and Mcloughlin and Gourlay (1994) found out, most of the companies have come up with different approaches for avoiding unions and keeping authority for managers (Upchurch et al., 2006). Medoff and Freeman (1984) believed that a trade union is the best alternative for representing employees and the reason is that representing employees in order to be effective, it should be incorporated and autonomous. Other researchers also raised some questions on the subject of whether nonunion way of representations is as effective as the union one concerning voice of employee (Upchurch et al, 2006). Many other studies debates and emphasizes on assessment of nonunion employee representation (NER). As Gollan (2005) talked about examination of their capability to find out whether they can compete or even surpass trade unions potentiality to convey employee's voice. Gollan (2000), Lloyd (2001), and Terry (2003) pointed out that most concerned area for referees about NER as a way to represent employees is its negotiating ability (Upchurch, Richardson, Tailby, Danford, & Stewart, 2006).

1.2 Aim of the Study

Even with the fact that both union and nonunion representation systems have their own supporters, advantages and disadvantages, there is a need to understand attitudes toward collective representation and its different forms. The graduate students in a business faculty in that sense provides with a rich source of information as these students are the future managers of organizations and what they think and feel about employee representation can be quite influential on representation practices in a workplace. Despite its importance, this topic has not been studied extensively in the literature. Accordingly, the main objectives of this research are:

- To measure the Business Faculty graduate students' attitudes toward collective representation;
- To measure the Business Faculty graduate students' attitudes toward nonunion representation as a form of collective representation;
- To measure the Business Faculty graduate students' attitudes toward union representation as a form of collective representation
- To identify specific demographic features that can affect student's attitudes toward employee representation

More specifically, the questions that this study will try to answer are:

- What is the attitude of business graduate students as future managers toward collective employee representation?

- Is there a difference between Business Faculty graduate students' attitudes according to their background?

1.3 Scope of the Study

This study discusses definition and theories of collective representation and its different forms, with an emphasis on attitudes toward collective representation. It also presents a comprehensive review of former studies about the subject and discusses and explains attitudes toward different forms of employee representation and participation. Furthermore, with an emphasis on demographic variables (i.e. age, nationality, family background and political view) the study focuses on the attitudes of Business Faculty graduate students at Eastern Mediterranean University (E.M.U). Based on the findings of the study and previous research results are analyzed and conclusions are drawn.

1.4 Outline of the Study

The thesis is comprised of six chapters. Chapter One presents background and context about the subject, aims and objectives of the study rationale and the reason about why the study is conducted, and also the research questions. Chapter Two presents a review of the relevant literature. It discusses collective representation in general, different ways of employee representation (union and nonunion forms of representation). It also presents findings of previous research about different attitudes toward employee representation. Chapter Three (methodology chapter) provides information about how the research is conducted, including data collection process, research and sampling methods which researcher used for the analysis. Chapter Four (data analysis) presents findings and results. It also presents detailed report about respondent's attitudes toward employee representations. Chapter Five (findings and discussion) discusses and

interprets the findings of the study. Finally, Chapter Six (conclusion) presents a summary of the findings. It also includes limitations of the present research and suggestions for future research.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Employee Representation in General

Employee representation mechanism in general is a way which enables employees to express their grievances, opinions, and, in broader perspective their voice to managers. According to Ponak (2002) representation is having “an internal or external agent, committee, or organization acting on behalf of employees with respect to procedures and outcomes relevant to terms and conditions of employment.” (p. 14). Ponak also presents the characteristics of representation: employees have discretion in choosing their representatives; some degree of independence from management; range of issues covered can vary from narrow to unrestricted; and power of the representatives can vary from advisory to shared authority. Thus, a group of selected employees as representatives on behalf of all employees negotiate about their concerns, interests and in general any issues regarding employee’s desires such as wage and work conditions (Kaufman and Tarras, 2000). Cregan (2005) stated: “More recently, membership has been presented as the culmination of process of individual commitment to the union.” (P. 283)

Employees feel more contented when they are getting represented by a group of legislative bodies, which are trying to voice their concerns to the employers, and to solve their problems. This would be completely opposite of individual representation and

participation, which in employees themselves should stand for their issues, and they will face the consequences alone. On the other hand, employers have been more pro collective employee representation in the recent years, due to the fact that this kind of representation mechanism will lead to higher level of satisfaction and motivation and eventually higher level of productivity and performance for the whole organization (Spencer, 1986).

Focusing on the benefits of representation from the standpoint of organizations, Kemp (2009) stated that representation mechanism is a way to serve some purposes of those managers concerning about performance at a higher level and employees pursuing their rights. A representation mechanism in a workplace is concerned about decisions of how to run the work place, what is needed to be done and by whom. Putting all of these together the result would be that the effect of representations on organization related aspects is approximately high (Cotton et al., 1988).

There are reasons for organizations to utilize an employee representation program. Employee representation is a factor that positively affects the productivity of employees in the workplace and it ultimately leads to higher performance for the whole institute (Wilkinson *et al*, 2004). Freeman (1976) claims that employee's societies which have been getting stronger by employee voice program, will cause the whole system to be more efficient. Related to benefits of engaging in employee representation programs Spencer's (1986) noted that employees' turnover will decline due to the argument that recognition of employee voice and representation programs may lead to a higher level of employee's satisfaction and better work and employment circumstances. However, it

should be noted that organizational performance is highly related to the degree that managers are willing to commit themselves to employee participation and representation (Freeman and Medoff, 1984). In addition to that, competency of organization and productivity of employees in the workplace is a function of the level that employees can influence firm's strategies and also management's behavior toward employee's voice program (Bryson *et al.*, 2006, cited in Addison, 2004).

A description by McCabe and Lewin (1992) indicates that a representation mechanism consists of two basic structures. One is regarding the contribution of employees in process of decision making and the other one is regarding employees expressing their objections and viewpoints to the managers, both would be a channel which connects employees and team of management together.

The competency of organization and productivity of employees in the workplace is a function of the level that employees can influence firm's strategies and also management's behavior toward employee's voice program (Bryson *et al.*, 2006, cited in Addison, 2004). Additionally, assessment of employee representation programs in the workplace can be evaluated based on consequences created by employee contribution in the act of decision making through their representatives, which may result in a decline in level of conflict in the workplace and improvement of democracy in the organization, (Cotton *et al.*, 1988)

A general characteristic of collective representation is the formation of an entity to fulfill representational duties and responsibilities. Regarding forms of representing employees,

two basic systems of employee representation exist: union representation and nonunion representation. Some basic differences have been identified between the two approaches (Kaufman and Taras, 2000). The next two sections will focus on union and nonunion forms of employee representation.

2.2 Union Representation

A union is well-defined as institutions of collective bargaining in work environments (Freeman, 1976). Trade unions are generally depicted as an organization that exists to protect employee's well-being in a workplace (Ramutloa, 2007).

It was around mid-1930s and after the Great Depression that the need for some organizations which were responsible for protecting employee's right felt by employees. They were concerned about such issues as job security, wage, and institutional rights. Positive attitudes toward trade unions continued till 1970s and after that during mid-1970s and 1980s there was a downward trend in acceptance of unions as a representation mechanism (Kaufman and Taras, 2000).

Ponak and Fraser (1979) found in their research that a majority of employees, for the sake of work efficiency and quality will choose joint union representation. Besides there is a viewpoint which argued that the best way for improving quality of workplace, decreasing economic unfairness and having more job security is to employ union representation (Benson, 2000).

Union executives, who are elected by their co-workers in a workplace, have different responsibilities toward employees whom they are representing. According to Ramutloa

(2007) one of the most important roles of unions is to stand up for employees and try to solve their issues when they demand such a service. Their other responsibility would be reporting to authorities employer's failings to comply with rules and regulatory. They are also accountable for observing employers to check the conformity of their behaviors with collective agreements and regulations set by labor relations legislation. On the other hand, employers and also employees have some responsibilities toward trade union representatives as well. Although managers are not allowed to reveal any information that may hurt employer or employees in the process of problems solving, they are obliged to provide trade union members with necessary information and details to facilitate the procedure. They should monitor and check related laws and consensus with work conditions and issues (Ramutloa, 2007).

2.2.1 Reasons for Unionization

Decline in employee's autonomy is one of the most important reasons for emergence of trade unions. As Jenson (1950) argued that higher level of membership in unions will appear with the decline in the employee's sovereignty which in some cases is resulted by sudden technological changes (Hills, 1985). There are several other reasons for joining unions like, wages conditions, the sense of separation that employees feel about the work conditions, sovereignty and self-independency they want in their jobs and ultimately job security that they seek in their workplaces.

Ponak and Taras (2005) listed some of the reasons which cause employees to join unions: economic motivations, seeking justice and equity in the firm, increasing and protecting wages, benefits and job security, improving working conditions, finding solution in case of conflicts and getting a voice in the workplace which enables them to

access the decisions which are made in the organization . Employees who are seeking higher wages usually see unions as a vehicle which can get them what they want. A union's negotiation power can be effective in improving employee's wage conditions and their overall economic circumstances. Moreover, one of the reasons which can be influential on making employees to join unions, is the idea of inequity in the workplace (Adams, 1966). Employees think that what employers get as profit is because of their inputs into the work process and it should be fairly shared among them as well. In the employee's mind, by getting unionized, they can create more fairness within the firm with regard to its pay system or its contracts. One of the most attractive features of unions which makes employees join unions is that unions enables employees to share their voice, opinions, grievances and dissatisfactions (Ponak and Taras, 2005). Freeman and Medoff (1984) described unions as a vehicle for employees to express their voice to managers. By enabling employees to solve their work related problems, increasing employee's productivity and decreasing their turnover rate, this voice sharing eventually help both employees and employers (Freeman, 1980). As Hurad (2002) noted "the role of the unions is to help employees find collective solutions to their work related concerns"

Scholars like Gomez, Gunderson and Meltz (2002) studied the the effect of age on individuals propensity to join unions. Based on their findings the amount of youths who expressed their willingness to join unions were more than adults.

As an additional reason, individuals who have a union member in their family have more pro union attitudes. They are much more likely to get unionized when some people in the family had union membership (Gomez and Gunderson, and Meltz, 2002).

2.3 Nonunion Representation

In the past decades, there has been a decline in interest of employees and employers toward trade unions. According to Lipset (1986), the reason for separation of employees and union in the last 30 years is the decline of general public's compassion about membership in unions. In-depth examination of union representation has shown the growing of interest toward nonunion form of representation in recent years among management and also employees (Upchurch et al., 2006). As Terry (1999) stated "Legislative developments and some renewal of managerial interest are drawing attention to systems of employee representation in the nonunion sector" (p.16). Although union representation is still the dominant form of representation, there is a growing of interest in the functioning and effects of nonunion employee representation (Berg and Grift, 2011)

In case of no existence of a union in the workplace or ineffectiveness of trade unions, employees may find the need for solving their problem through another form of employee representation which is called nonunion representation. Nonunion employee representation mechanisms are initiated, formed, financed and operated by employers. In this form of representation, a team of representatives from employees are elected by employees and these legislative bodies will be the channel through which employees can convey their voice, opinions and complaints to managers. These representatives may

negotiate some work issues like wage conditions, hours of jobs and other problems concerning their workplace (Kaufman and Tarras, 2000).

After the 1970s and 1980s, union prevention strategies could be seen in most of the workplaces. The belief was that nonunion representatives are more concerned about employee's issues and they use their negotiating power in the best interest of employees (Terry, 2003; Gollan 2000; Lloyd, 2001). On the other hand some 'unionizable' companies which are just not capable of coming up with individual ways of representation may employ collective approach which some aspects of it would be related to employee representation in forms of union, but this time without any real union. These 'Pseudo Unions' are generally under control of employers. What is obvious is that these union free firms are also trying to avoid unionization one way or another (Terry, 1999). In this case, companies use employer-controlled unions to create the illusion that there is some form of employee representation in their workplaces.

There are some types of nonunion representation with different representational groups and structures. Some like quality circles are limited to representing only employees in specific department or division and others like nonunion committees are able to represent employees in larger scales like in the whole organization (Kaufman and Tarras, 2000). The most common form of nonunion employee representation is work councils, which will be examined in the following section.

2.3.1 Work Councils

Although informal participation in decision making usually through the relationships between employees and managers can be seen in organizations, a formal representation process cannot be found in all nonunion workplaces (Cotton et al., 1988).

Cotton *et al.*, (1988) found some positive attitudes among the work council committee. Moreover, studying effects of work councils on performance level of organization, improvement in employee's production and efficiency, and reduction in employee's turnover have been found (Addison and Schnabel, and Wagner, 2004).

Van den Berg *et al.* (2011) studied the advantages of employing work councils (WC) as a representation mechanism and identified three distinguished benefit for using WC. The first advantage is that enhanced communication between managers and representatives create the sense of commitment and trust among employees and employers. Low turnover rate of employees is the second advantage of providing employees with WCs. The final benefit of WC is related to the concept of problem solving. Work councils give employees the right to participate in making decisions so their new ideas and suggestion may be helpful for managers in dealing with difficult issues.

2.3.2 Transition to Nonunion

Nonunion representation became more popular among employees and managers since people believed in the inefficiency of union representation. In the last two decades, due to this reason and also the decline in the interest of people in unions, there has been a shift from unionism to non-unionism (Timur et al., 2012). The shift from union representation to nonunion ones concerned not only employees but also managers and

employers as directors of the organizations. After the 1970s and 1980s union prevention strategies could be seen in most of the workplaces. The belief is that nonunion representatives are more concerned about employee's issues and they use their negotiating power in the best interest of employees (Terry, 2003; Gollan 2000; Lloyd, 2001).

A review of the literature reveals many reasons for the development of nonunion representations in recent years. Findings of Hughes and Brinkley (1979) indicated that the strongest reason for employees not to join unions is the perceived ineffectiveness of trade unions. This is related to the belief that union's values and principles are not well-matched with their own values so there is no benefit and reason for union membership. Furthermore, one of the other reasons for the emergence of NER is about the changes in work environments' conditions and employee's needs and demands and other aspects of union's failure. Nonunion representation became more popular among employees and managers since people believed in the inefficiency of union representation (Terry, 2003; Gollan 2000; Lloyd, 2001). Hughes and Brinkley (1979) in their study in addition to ineffectiveness of trade unions highlighted some other reasons for not joining a union: being politically powerful, not being suitable for individuals with liberated mind, being unrelated to job's types and troubles that they can cause by their regular strikes.

Additionally, among reasons which caused an increase in nonunion employee representation in past three decades, globalization has a crucial role. With globalization taking place in business world, the circumstances with laws and regulation which are employed in different workplaces in different environments are getting more

complicated. The reason is that same rules cannot be used in all countries and accordingly, it would be impossible for unions to follow the same legislations in different countries (Lloyd, 2001).

Based on most of the research which is about firms employing nonunion way of representation (e.g., McLoughlin and Gourlay, 1994 and Guest and Hoque, 1994) two alternative approaches to NER can be found. The first approach views them as HRM policies and the second one as a way to use them to prevent unionization in their workplace (Terry, 1999).

Anti-union employers who were not caring enough for employee's satisfaction were trying to find a substitute system designed for union since they wanted to keep union out of their territory. That substitution did not mean any support for nonunion representation though. They had chosen NER just for the sake of having a system of representation in their organizations just to convince employees that they are willing to hear their voices. The other half caring about employees' satisfaction were trying to provide their employees with a system through which they can express themselves. The complementary and sometimes substitute system that they have chosen to communicate with employees was through their human resource management (HRM) strategies. Consequently, they designed their HR policies and procedures in a way that it could be the voice mechanism connecting employees to employers (Timur et al., 2012).

2.3.3 Nonunion Representation as HR Strategies

The appearance of HRM concept was followed by some basic changes in organizations system of managing like the participation of employees in decision making process and higher level of information sharing between managers and employees (Benson, 2000).

Terry (1999) stated that companies are using nonunion approach either as a cosmetic device which is unnecessary in the viewpoint of managers and employees or as a way to establish a system for those employees whose voice could not be heard before. In either case, it is stated that any failure in their success would result in emergence of unionism all over again. He argued that although European companies are more concerned about legal matters regarding their HR policies, they may start applying their own way of employee representation before legal enforcement. On the other hand, he found that some unrelated reasons to regulations may be found which conveys the conclusion that these innovations are useful for either advancing HR policies or circumvention of union improvement or even de-collectivization approaches for employee representation.

2.3.4 Transition to Unionization Again

Kidger's work (1992) explains that when nonunion employee representation is not effective enough, losing its allegiance and dedication would be inevitable and sooner or later it will be vanished completely. Moreover, there are strong debates about nonunion representative's ineptitude. This may result in an increasing numbers of unsatisfied employees represented by nonunion systems and also managers believing in their ineffectiveness, which may eventually lead to retreating back to unionism (Findlay, 1993).

One of the basic characteristics of collective bargaining as a way of representation between employees and management can be identified as its untainted collaboration and neat discussions. These features specifically in times of difficulty can make the whole system to be insubstantial and abortive (Terry, 1999). Furthermore in his study Terry (1999) argued that one of the factors which are causing employees resort to unionism is the fact that number of employees who could not reach a fair and well-functioning representation system was increasing sharply. By practicing de-collectivization and moving from collective way of representation toward nonunion ways, these employees are left without having their views and thoughts shared, complaints around wages conditions, received information about organization aspects and finally influencing the circumstances of the workplace environment. Terry (1999) argued about incompetency of nonunion members to put pressure on managers on behalf of employees and their lack of knowledge, expertise and ability to perform their responsibilities. Comparing to their union equivalents, they have more anxiety while executing their duties and eventually that may lead to low authorization which is why managers cannot take them seriously. All of these factors may motivate employees to re-consider union representation as an option to resolve conflict in their workplaces.

2.4 Attitudes toward Collective Representation

Examination of representation has shown the growing interest toward nonunion form of representation in recent years among management and also employees (Upchurch et al., 2006). Hills (1985), on the other hand, stated that existence of workplaces with insecure and corrupt work environment results in growing of interest of employees for unionization.

During past decades scholars conducted vast amount of studies regarding the indicators of attitudes of employees, managers and even public toward employee representation. Researchers like Sarkar (2009), Guestand and Hoque (1994), Dewe (1988) and Klandermans (1986) indicated that weighing the cost and benefits of unions as one of most influential factors affecting attitudes of people toward representation ways for employees. In addition, personal characteristics are stated to impact attitudes of people (Booth 1986; Hernandez 1995). Furthermore, Smith and Hopkins (1978) stated the effect of organization's size, educational level of employees and their negative evaluation of life on their attitudes toward representation.

Attitudes of employees toward representation approaches vary among different industries (e.g., insurance and banking) due to their different characteristics. For instance, attitudes which nonunion employees have toward union representation, is different from union employees. In the public sector there are more people who are supporting trade unions compared to private sectors and other service or manufacturing industries (Hills, 1985).

Among some of the indicators of attitudes toward representation Sarkar (2009) listed employee's satisfaction or dissatisfaction about work conditions, their family background and their evaluation of advantages and disadvantages of joining unions as three factors that can create different attitudes toward union membership.

Work related factors are much stronger indicators of employee's attitudes toward unions. Comparing differences between reactions of white-collar and blue-collar

employees toward unionism, researchers found that educational and the expertise level of an employee has direct effect on their behaviors. These findings have shown that the lower the status of employees the more positive attitudes they have for joining union. Employees' negative evaluation of life is another factor which leads to positive behavior toward union membership. Another influential factor affecting employees to be more pro-union is the frustration of their work. Firm's size and organization involvement are further indicators of an employee's attitude. This means the lower levels of involvement and larger firm size can affect attitudes toward unions in a positive way (Smith and Hopkins, 1978).

Individual decisions about whether to join unions or not can be highly influenced by the status and position of employee in the organization. The effect of personal awareness and familiarity with trade unions can be significant on their attitudes and even their decisions about joining unions (Kochan, 1979). According to Hughes and Brinkley (1979) wage and work condition, connection with other employees and having faith in union's basics are some of the reasons for employees to join trade unions

Generally the level of part time employee's participation in unions is much lower compared to that of full time employees. They frequently work in industries which do not employ unions, but their participation levels cannot be fully explained by this factor since there are situations in which part time employees are a part of organized firms with the implication of unionism but even in these cases their membership in trade unions is lower than full time employees (Sinclair, 1995).

Based on the findings of Walters (2002), a majority of part time female employees seems to have positive attitudes toward unionism. In her study, she discussed the effect of media, their past experience about unionism, union's efficiency and the belief that existence of unions is needed and beneficial for protecting their rights on their unions attitudes. Related to the subject studies of Hill (1985) revealed that attitude of male union member employees and non-members employees are intensely different from one another due to the group they belong and industry that they are working in.

According to Cregan (2005), the effect of employee's personal goals has been found in examinations of many scholars like Fullagar and Barling (1989), Klandermans (1989) Van der Veen and Klanderman (1995). At the same time attitudes of people toward unionism can be originated from personal and social relationships (Ellisa et al., 1992) on the other hand examining nonunion working environments shows the favorable attitudes of black employees for joining unions (Hills, 1985).

Individual's demographic characteristics including sex and family background and employee's attitudes toward unionism are two factors affecting the membership of employees in unions (Walters, 2002; Booth, 1986; Hernandez, 1995). Regarding individual characteristics even though there have been findings and proofs about the impact of personal characteristics and culture on union membership, some academics underline the effect of exit-voice theory, which contradicts former findings. Despite that exit-voice theory is one of the most applicable indicators for explaining employee's union related attitudes, scholars still have diverse perspectives about it (Sarkar, 2009).

Individuals directly or indirectly can get influenced and unconsciously shape their attitudes toward unions by their parents' behaviors. Their awareness, beliefs and attitudes about trade union are directly subject to their parent's perceptions and reaction toward unionization. Furthermore participation level of parents in unions is another factor which has a significant role in affecting individuals' union attitudes (Barling and Kelloway, and Bremermann, 1991). Kelloway, Barling and Agarc (1996) in their study found that the socialization background of parents and their union experience are influential factors determining individual's perceptions and at the same time attitudes about trade unions.

Another factor influencing attitudes toward representation as Hills (1985) said is the length of existence of unions in the industry. Attitudes, loyalty and commitment of the members to the unions are also dependent to that factor (Hills, 1985).

Some studies on the subject showed that even some psychological approaches can define people's attitude toward unionization. In the area of social psychology three distinguished factors have been found to have a direct impact on people's perception about union participation. Evaluation of cost and benefits of union membership, values and principles of trade unions and displeasure of individual's job are indicators of one's engagements in unions (Klandermans, 1986). Extensive study of the subject of the representation mechanism brought this conclusion that the way that individual evaluate cost and benefits of participation in unions can be a solid indicator of them joining unions or not. The social context of individuals have been found as one of the factors which can influence their attitudes toward unionization (Guest and Dewe, 1988).

Practically half of union members are not committed enough to their unions due to lack of security they feel in their job and high insecurity conditions of work environment. The other half doesn't have any solid opinion about participation, pros and cons of membership in unions and even choices about whether to stay or leave the union (Kochan, 1979).

In one of the few studies that focused on attitudes of students toward unionizations, Lowe and Ration (2000) examined high school and university student's attitude toward union representation and discussed that more than half of their sample have neutral feelings toward representation and among the remained number of students with favorable union attitudes was larger than number of students with antiunion attitudes. Generally student's especially female students and also those who have union members in their families have stronger attitudes toward unionization (Bramel & Ortiz, 1987). Although, by studying students' attitudes toward representation, Morand (1998) argued that personality is one the most significant factors which shape their attitudes toward employee representation, Bramel and Ortiz (1987) noted that business education, has a positive impact on students' attitudes toward employee representation in general.

2.5 General Understanding

What is obvious is regardless of the growing of people's interest toward either union or nonunion representation, related to the environment of the work which in they are employed each has its own benefits and shortcomings. For trade union to be more effective members should recognize the fact that working closely with employers and management team will be beneficial for both employees and themselves as union members.

An increased numbers of studies, due to the growing of interest in nonunion representation, have shown two possible reasons as to why nonunion members are more satisfied with their jobs and also why nonunion representatives tend to be more successful in recent years. The first reason is related to employee's concerns of whether managers are willing to hear their voice or not. Being represented through nonunion representation system makes employees feel that their expressions and shared views will be taken into consideration. The other reason is linked with the psychological state of human mind in sense of commitment and obligation to the group which they belong and at the same time feeling of distrusting other groups. In case of trade union employees who are in charge for representation would observe themselves separated from managers and that would eventually lead to situations which in employees and employers do not trust each other.

2.6 The Proposed Relationships and Hypotheses

The aim of this inquiry is to identify the effect of specific demographic differences on attitudes of business graduate students toward employee representation. Hence, the proposed hypotheses are as follows: H1: a) Having union membership experience will make a difference in business graduate students' attitudes toward collective representation, b) Having union membership experience will make a difference in business graduate students' attitudes toward nonunion representation, c) Having union membership experience will make a difference in business graduate students' attitudes toward union representation. H2: a) Having been part of a representation mechanism before will make a difference in business graduate students' attitudes toward collective representation, b) Having been part of a representation mechanism before will make a difference in business graduate students' attitudes toward nonunion representation, c)

Having been part of a representation mechanism before will make a difference in business graduate students' attitudes toward union representation. H3: a) Having a family member in a union will make a difference in business graduate students' attitudes toward collective representation, b) Having a family member in a union will make a difference in business graduate students' attitudes toward nonunion representation, c) Having a family member in a union will make a difference in business graduate students' attitudes toward union representation. H4: a) Business Faculty Graduate students' nationalities will influence their attitudes toward collective representation, b) Business Faculty Graduate students' nationalities will influence their attitudes toward nonunion representation, c) Business Faculty Graduate students' nationalities will influence their attitudes toward union representation. H5: Business Faculty graduate students with business undergraduate degree have more favorable attitudes toward unionizations. H6: a) Attitudes toward collective representation influence attitudes toward union representation, b) Attitudes toward collective representation influence attitudes toward nonunion representation, c) There is a relationship between attitudes toward union representation and nonunion representation.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the research method, research design and the research sample. The respective sections will give information about the type of research method that was employed in this study, the kind of data that was collected, and which sources were used. It will also present information about the survey instrument used in the study.

3.2 Research Methodology

The present study aims to measure Business Faculty graduate students' attitudes toward collective representation as well as their attitudes toward two forms of representation; union and nonunion employee representations. The inquiry also aims to investigate whether there will be any differences among attitudes according to demographic variables. Accordingly, the researcher used a questionnaire to collect data and used quantitative approach to analyze the results.

3.3 Survey

A questionnaire is a research instrument consisting of a series of questions aiming to gather information from participants in a study. A questionnaire was chosen as the data collection tool for this study because of the size of the sample. Using a questionnaire made data collection, data entry, and analysis easy for such a relatively large sample.

Additionally, questionnaires are familiar to most people, which make participation in the study relatively easier.

3.3.1 Questionnaire Design

This survey was designed to provide information about Business Faculty graduate students' attitudes toward collective representation as well as to provide information about differences among the participants' attitudes. The 5 point Likert scale used for this study is as follows:

1. Strongly disagree
2. disagree
3. neutral
4. agree
5. strongly agree

Self-administered questionnaires were given to respondents with assurance that data will only be used for this thesis research and not for any other purpose. The items of the survey instrument were prepared in English. There was a pilot study of 15 students who were given questionnaires to complete, so that the researcher could confirm if the questionnaire was well understood by the respondents. After confirming the questions were understood, the researcher handed out the questionnaires to graduate students in the Business Faculty. The researcher was present at the scene, when respondents were filling the questionnaires, to answer their questions and explain technical terms for them in case of facing any difficulties. The questionnaires were voluntarily completed and returned to the researcher without respondent identification, and analyzed using Windows SPSS 20.0.

3.3.2 Survey Instrument

The survey instrument (Appendix 1) contained six demographic questions consisting of age, nationality, undergraduate degree, monthly family income, job experience, political views and three general representation related questions.

The questionnaire containing 3 main parts, for which participants were asked whether they agree or disagree with attitudinal statements:

- 1) Union related attitudes were measured with 7 questions. This section was adapted from Uphoff and Dunnette (1956) union attitudes survey.
- 2) Nonunion related attitudes were measured with 7 questions, which were adapted from Timur (2005) and Timur et al. (2012).
- 3) Collective representation related attitudes were measured with 11 questions. This section was adapted from Freeman and Rogers (1999) and Timur et al. (2012).

3.3.3 Research Sample

The questionnaire used in the study was filled out by the Business Faculty graduate students at E. M. U. in North Cyprus. In the current study, purposive sampling method – which is a sampling method in which elements are chosen based on purpose of the study – was used, as the researcher aimed to focus on graduate students to gather specific information (attitudes toward collective representation) for the research. For this study, questionnaires were distributed to graduate students in the classrooms, on-campus cafeterias, and the school library. A total of 350 questionnaires were handed out among

Business Faculty's graduate students and 214 were returned by respondents, which meant a response rate of 61.14%.

Chapter 4

DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

350 questionnaires were distributed among graduate students of Faculty of Business and Economics of Eastern Mediterranean University. 214 questionnaires were completed and returned which resulted in 61.14% response rate. The survey included demographic questions about respondents' age, nationality, undergraduate degree, family income, job experience and political view. Respondents were also asked about their union membership experience, former participation in representation mechanism and their family members participating in unions. Moreover, regarding employee representation respondents were asked to answer 34 different questions about employee representation.

Table 1: Frequency by age

Age	Number of Respondents	Total Percentage (%)
20-24	59	27.6
25-29	116	54.2
30-34	36	16.8
34+	3	1.4
Total	214	100.0

The age of fifty nine respondents (27.6%) were between 20 and 24 years old, one hundred and sixteen respondents' age was ranged from 24 to 29, thirty six respondents were aged between 30 and 34 (16.8%), and finally three respondent's age were above the age of 34 (1.4%).

Table 2: Frequency by nationality

Nationality	Number of Respondents	Total Percentage (%)
Iranian	88	41.1
African	60	28.0
Turkish and Turkish Cypriot	35	16.4
Other Nationalities	31	14.5
Total	214	100.0

Respondents were asked about their nationality with an open ended question. Subsequently nationalities of respondents were clustered into 4 different groups: Iranian, African (Nigerian, Cameroonian, Eritrean, Guinean, Kenyan, Libyan, Senegalese and Sudanese), Turkish and Cypriot, and, finally a group labeled “Other Nationalities”. Other nationalities group includes Tajik, Azerbaijanis, Uzbekistanis, Kazakhstanis, Palestinians, Jordanians, Iraqis, Russians and Slovenians. Eighty eight (41.1%) of the respondents were from Iran, sixty (28%) from African countries, thirty five from Turkey and North Cyprus (16.4%) and the rest, thirty one (14.5%) from other nationalities (see Table 2).

Table 3: Frequency by undergraduate degree

Undergraduate Degree	Number of Respondents	Total Percentage (%)
Faculty of Business	110	55.3
Faculty of Engineering	50	25.1
Others Faculties	39	19.6
Total	199	100.0
Missing	15	
Total	214	

Respondents' undergraduate background degrees were also asked from them. Due to the wide variety of responses, 3 groups are created. One hundred ten respondents had Faculty of Business and Economics (55.3%) degree, fifty (25.1%) had Faculty of Engineering degree, thirty nine (19.6%) had degree from other faculties. Other faculty group had seventeen students (8.5%) with degree from Faculty of Art & Sciences, seven students from Tourism Faculty (3.5%), three students from Architecture Faculty (1.5%), two students (1.00%) from Faculty of Education, four students from Faculty of Communication (2.00%), two students (1.00%) from Faculty of Law and three students (1.5%) from Faculty of Health Science.

Table 4: Frequency by monthly family income

Monthly Family Income	Number of Respondents	Total Percentage (%)
\$0-1000	27	12.7
\$1001-2000	45	21.1
\$2001-3000	53	24.9
\$3001-4000	31	14.6
\$4000+	57	26.8
Total	213	100.0
Missing	1	
Total	214	

Regarding respondent's family income (Table 4), 27 (12.7%) respondents' family income is less than \$1000 per month. 45 respondents (21.1%) indicated their monthly family income in the range of \$1001-2000 and 53 students (24.9%) in the range of \$2001-3000. Among 31 (14.6%) respondents' family income is between \$ 3001-4000 and finally 57 (26.8%) respondents' family income is more than \$4000 per month.

Table 5: Frequency by job experience

Job Experience	Number of Respondents	Total Percentage (%)
None	20	9.5
Less than 1 year	40	19.0
1-2	59	28.0
3	35	16.6
4	21	10.0
5	6	2.8
5+	30	14.2
Total	211	100.0
Missing	3	
Total	214	

The frequency distribution of respondents' years of job experience is presented in Table 5. Majority of respondents (28%) has a job experience between 1 and 2 years. On the other hand job experience of 40 respondents (19%) was less than 1 year. 35 respondents (16.6%) stated that they have 3 years of job experience, 30 respondents (14.2%) reported having more than 5 years of job experience, 21 students (10%) reported to have 4 years of job experience and only 20 respondents (9.5%) have no any job experience.

Table 6: Frequency by previous union membership experience

Any Union Membership before	Number of Respondents	Total Percentage (%)
Yes	72	33.6
No	142	66.4
Total	214	100.0

Respondents were asked whether they had experienced any union membership before. Table 6 shows that 142 (66.4%) respondents do not have any former experience in union membership and remaining 72 (33.6%) students indicated that they had experienced membership in unions.

Table 7: Frequency by having been a part of representation mechanism before

Having Been a Part of Representation Mechanism Before	Number of Respondents	Total Percentage (%)
Yes	75	36.1
No	133	63.9
Total	208	100.0
Missing	6	
Total	214	

Respondents were also asked to indicate whether they have ever been a part of a representation mechanism. While the majority of respondents (63.9%) stated that they had never been part of representation mechanism. 36.1% of students indicated that they have been a part of mechanism for representation.

Table 8: Frequency by having any union members in the family

Any Union Member in Family	Number of Respondents	Total Percentage (%)
Yes	101	47.2
No	113	52.8
Total	214	100.0

Graduate students were also asked if they had any union member in their family. One hundred and one respondents (47.2%) stated that they have a family member participating in a union representation mechanism and the rest 113 (52.8%) indicated that they do not have any union members in their family.

Table 9: Frequency by political view

Political View	Number of Respondents	Total Percentage (%)
Conservative	18	8.5
Liberal	52	24.6
Social Democrat	66	31.3
Socialist	11	5.2
None of the above	64	30.3
Total	211	100
Missing	3	
Total	214	

Finally graduate students' political views were also questioned. Results showed that 18 (8.5%) students have conservative view, 52 respondents (24.5%) have liberal view, 66 respondents follow social democrats (31.3%), 11 students (5.2%) follow socialists, and political view of 64 respondents (30.3%) was not any of these views.

4.2 Analysis of Respondent's Attitudes toward Employee

Representation

In the questionnaire three different set of questions are included by researcher. First set consist of 7 questions which are related to respondents' attitudes and perceptions about union representation. Second set contains 7 questions which are measuring business graduate student's nonunion attitude and finally, the last set of questions, evaluate attitudes about collective representation in general.

In order to learn more about the perceptions of business graduate students toward each set of representation, the researcher carried out a mean analysis.

4.2.1 Differences toward Union Representation

In order to better analyze business graduate students' responses to 7 union questions mean analyses and ANOVA tests are used.

Table 10: Mean analysis for Union related questions

	Mean	Std. Deviation
In an election to decide whether employee should be represented by a union I would vote for a union	3.71	1.021
In my workplace, I would prefer an organization run by employee to represent me	3.59	1.003
if an organization run by employees, I would be willing to volunteer two or three hours a month to discuss workplace issues with my company's management	3.67	.951
Unions obtain more benefits for employees	3.60	.966
A union would be more effective to solve problems which an individual would be unable to solve them on his/her own	3.91	.871
Union representation would result in hostile relationship between employees and management	3.25	1.039
Collective bargaining carried out by an independent union is an effective form of representation	3.58	.877

Table 10 shows the means of 7 questions that are asked to measure respondents' attitudes toward unions. The results indicate that the strongest mean (3.91) is for "effectiveness of union in solving workplace problem when individuals are unable to

solve them” and the weakest mean (3.25) is for “hostility that unions will cause in the workplace” (see Table 10).

Table 11: Mean comparison test for different age groups, nationalities and undergraduate faculties and union attitudes

	Age Sig.	Nationality Sig.	Undergraduate faculty Sig.
In an election to decide whether employee should be represented by a union I would vote for a union	.155	.006	.636
In my workplace, I would prefer an organization run by employee to represent me	.528	.122	.070
if an organization run by employees, I would be willing to volunteer two or three hours a month to discuss workplace issues with my company's management	.370	.030	.137
Unions obtain more benefits for employees	.623	.155	.026
A union would be more effective to solve problems which an individual would be unable to solve them on his/her own	.375	.000	.816
Union representation would result in hostile relationship between employees and management	.844	.103	.029
Collective bargaining carried out by an independent union is an effective form of representation	.762	.002	.364

According to Table 11, there is no significant difference between different age groups and their union attitudes. However, it should be noted that the highest mean of 4.21 belongs to 20-24 age group, for the item of “effectiveness of union in solving workplace problem when individuals are unable to solve them” and the lowest mean of 3.21

belongs to 20-24 age group but for the item of “hostility that unions will cause in the workplace”.

Results of Table 11 indicate that due to respondent’s nationality their attitudes toward 4 union items are significantly different. These items are “voting in an election for union form of representation” (at significance level of 0.01), “spending 2, 3 hours in a company which is running by employees voluntarily” (at significance level of 0.05), “effectiveness of unions in solving employee’s problems when individuals are unable to solve them” (at significance level of 0.000), and finally “union representation is an effective way of collective bargaining” at significance level of 0.01. African students had stronger attitudes ($m=4.31$) toward the item of “effectiveness of union in solving workplace problem when individuals are unable to solve them”. The Iranian students had the weakest attitudes ($m=3.10$) toward “union representation is an effective way of collective bargaining”.

Additionally Table 11 indicates that there are significant differences (at significance level of 0.05) between graduate students’ undergraduate degree and their attitudes toward 2 of questions about “benefits of union representation” and “hostility that unions will cause in the workplace”. Graduate students with undergraduate background in other faculties not only had strongest attitudes ($m=4.00$) toward the item of “effectiveness of unions in solving employee’s problems when individuals are unable to solve them”, and but also the weakest attitudes (2.92) toward the question about “hostility that unions will cause in the workplace”.

Table 12: Mean comparison test for different groups of family income, job experience and political view and union attitudes

	Family income Sig.	Job experience Sig.	Political view Sig.
In an election to decide whether employee should be represented by a union I would vote for a union	.663	.574	.861
In my workplace, I would prefer an organization run by employee to represent me	.320	.524	.268
if an organization run by employees, I would be willing to volunteer two or three hours a month to discuss workplace issues with my company's management	.316	.040	.425
Unions obtain more benefits for employees	.974	.383	.698
A union would be more effective to solve problems which an individual would be unable to solve them on his/her own	.664	.802	.451
Union representation would result in hostile relationship between employees and management	.093	.794	.336
Collective bargaining carried out by an independent union is an effective form of representation	.769	.904	.149

Respondents with different level of job experience have significantly different perception (significance level of 0.05) about the question of “spending 2, 3 hours in a company which is running by employees voluntarily to solve work issues, if the organization runs by employees” (see Table 12). Students with 5 years of job experience (mean=4.50) has the strongest attitudes toward the item of “spending 2, 3 hours in a company which is running by employees voluntarily to solve work issues, if the organization runs by employees”.

Based on family income and political view, respondents did not have any significant difference toward the set of union representation questions.

Table 13: Mean comparison test for union membership experience, representation mechanism experience and any union member in family and union attitudes

	Union membership Sig.	Representation mechanism Sig.	Union family member Sig.
In an election to decide whether employee should be represented by a union I would vote for a union	.017	.015	.040
In my workplace, I would prefer an organization run by employee to represent me	.933	.392	.486
if an organization run by employees, I would be willing to volunteer two or three hours a month to discuss workplace issues with my company's management	.787	.277	.844
Unions obtain more benefits for employees	.418	.704	.532
A union would be more effective to solve problems which an individual would be unable to solve them on his/her own	.524	.348	.167
Union representation would result in hostile relationship between employees and management	.001	.001	.063
Collective bargaining carried out by an independent union is an effective form of representation	.166	.229	.672

Table 13 consists of the result of analyzing three demographic differences between the respondents due to the fact that whether they have been union member before, whether they have been a part of representation mechanism before and whether they have any

family member who is a union member. These results indicate that regarding the subject of any former union membership there is a significant difference between attitudes of respondents in 2 union related items of “voting in an election for union form of representation” at significance level of 0.05, and “hostility that unions will cause in the workplace” at significance level of 0.01, and their former experience of unions.

The researcher conducted further examination to find out whether there are significant differences between respondents attitudes toward unions and their former collaboration in representation mechanism. Table 13 show that for two items of “voting for unions in election” at significance level of 0.05, and “hostility that union cause among managers and employees” at significance level of 0.01, respondents have significantly different attitudes. The weakest attitude related to all of above three demographic questions, is calculated for those students who have never been a union member (3.07), neither have ever been a part of representation mechanism (3.06) and do not have any union member in their family (3.12) all toward the item of and “hostility that union cause among managers and employees”.

Furthermore, having a family member who is a union member causes respondents to have significant different (at significance level of 0.05) attitudes for only one item which is “voting for union in case of election”.

This indicates that students who have no experience of union membership or representation mechanism before do not think that unions cause hostile relationship in the workplace between managers and employees.

4.2.2 Differences toward Nonunion Representation

Among 7 questions that are asked to evaluate nonunion attitudes, the highest mean is for “effectiveness of regular meeting between managers and employees” with 3.85, and the lowest (3.22) is for “effectiveness of nonunion presentation to solve problems”.

Table 14: Mean analysis of Nonunion related questions

	Mean	Std. Deviation
I feel more comfortable raising workplace problems through an employee association, rather than an individual.	3.72	1.072
When I have a workplace problem, I would feel more comfortable if a group of my fellow employees help me deal with management.	3.75	1.097
In my workplace, I would prefer an organization run jointly by management and employees to represent me.	3.60	.891
If an organization runs jointly by employees and management, I would be willing to volunteer two or three hours a month to discuss workplace issues with my company's management.	3.67	.982
A nonunion representation mechanism would be more effective to solve problems which an individual would be unable to solve on his/her own.	3.22	1.072
Regular meetings between employees and their supervisors are an effective form of representation.	3.85	.893
Joint consultations committees are an effective form of representation	3.66	.825

Table 15: Mean comparison test for different age groups, nationalities and undergraduate faculties and nonunion attitudes

	Age Sig.	Nationality Sig.	Under graduate faculty Sig.
I feel more comfortable raising workplace problems through an employee association, rather than an individual.	.107	.221	.711
When I have a workplace problem, I would feel more comfortable if a group of my fellow employees help me deal with management.	.008	.565	.179
In my workplace, I would prefer an organization run jointly by management and employees to represent me.	.712	.278	.679
If an organization runs jointly by employees and management, I would be willing to volunteer two or three hours a month to discuss workplace issues with my company's management.	.899	.045	.623
A nonunion representation mechanism would be more effective to solve problems which an individual would be unable to solve on his/her own.	.394	.564	.549
Regular meetings between employees and their supervisors are an effective form of representation.	.339	.090	.917
Joint consultations committees are an effective form of representation.	.301	.126	.396

Results indicate that based on age, there statistically is significant difference (at significance level of 0.01) between respondents' attitude to only one item which is "being more comfortable when a group of employees represent them in workplace". Results also show that students have significantly different opinion (at significance level of 0.05) about "willingness to spend 2 or 3 hours voluntarily for discussing work issues

in existence of nonunion representation” based on their nationality. African students have stronger attitudes ($m=4.02$) regarding this question “effectiveness of regular meeting between managers and employees”. Graduate students with the age above 34 had the strongest attitude ($m=4.67$) toward 2 items of “being more comfortable to raise workplace’s issues by employee association rather than individuals” and “being more comfortable when a group of employees represent them in workplace” and on the other hand the weakest attitudes ($m=3.00$) toward the question of “to prefer that organization run jointly by management and employees”

According to the Table 15, there is no difference in the opinions of respondents with different background in their undergraduate degree and any of 7 nonunion related questions.

Table 16: Mean comparison test for different groups of family income, job experience and political view and nonunion attitudes

	Family income Sig.	Job experience Sig.	Political view Sig.
I feel more comfortable raising workplace problems through an employee association, rather than an individual.	.292	.205	.484
When I have a workplace problem, I would feel more comfortable if a group of my fellow employees help me deal with management.	.624	.037	.554
In my workplace, I would prefer an organization run jointly by management and employees to represent me.	.163	.846	.937
If an organization runs jointly by employees and management, I would be willing to volunteer two or three hours a month to discuss workplace issues with my company's management.	.393	.745	.937
A nonunion representation mechanism would be more effective to solve problems which an individual would be unable to solve on his/her own.	.484	.090	.069
Regular meetings between employees and their supervisors are an effective form of representation.	.084	.229	.909
Joint consultations committees are an effective form of representation.	.667	.287	.010

Results which are presented in Table 16 are indicating that there is no difference between respondent's attitudes toward any of nonunion related question based on their monthly family income.

According to Table 16 student's years of job experience cause respondents to have significantly different attitude toward the question of "being more comfortable when a

group of employees represent them in workplace” with significance level of 0.05. Among means comparison of nonunion related question and year of job experience, the lowest mean (2.17) belongs to the group which has 1-2 years of job experience for the item of “effectiveness of nonunion presentation to solve problems”. This indicates that business graduate students with limited job experience have weaker attitudes toward this nonunion related item.

Further examination of results shown in Table 16 indicates that respondents have significant different opinions for the item of “effectiveness of joint consultation committees as a representation way” (at significance level of 0.05) based on their political view. Accordingly, based on the results, with the lowest mean (2.92) which is for Social democrats for the item of “effectiveness of nonunion presentation to solve problems” it is concluded that social democrat viewed students compared to other students have a weaker attitudes toward this item of nonunion representation.

Table 17: Mean comparison test for union membership experience, representation mechanism experience and any union member in family and nonunion attitudes

	Union membership Sig.	Representation mechanism Sig.	Union family member Sig.
I feel more comfortable raising workplace problems through an employee association, rather than an individual.	.690	.969	.633
When I have a workplace problem, I would feel more comfortable if a group of my fellow employees help me deal with management.	.343	.336	.927
In my workplace, I would prefer an organization run jointly by management and employees to represent me.	.052	.239	.013
If an organization runs jointly by employees and management, I would be willing to volunteer two or three hours a month to discuss workplace issues with my company's management.	.000	.004	.000
A nonunion representation mechanism would be more effective to solve problems which an individual would be unable to solve on his/her own.	.799	.967	.971
Regular meetings between employees and their supervisors are an effective form of representation.	.142	.039	.064
Joint consultations committees are an effective form of representation.	.011	.387	.041

Table 17 presents the results of mean comparison for three questions of having been a union member before, having been a part of representation mechanism before and having any union member in their family.

Results indicate that former experiences of union membership of students cause them to have significantly different attitudes toward 2 nonunion attitudes items of “willingness

to spend 2 or 3 hours voluntarily for discussing work issues in existence of nonunion representation” at the significance level of 0.00 and “effectiveness of joint consultation committees as representation way” at significance level of 0.05. Comparing means of nonunion questions and any former union membership shows that the highest mean of 4.00 is for the item of “willingness to spend 2 or 3 hours voluntarily for discussing work issues in existence of nonunion representation” for the respondents who have been a union member before, this means that students who have been a union member before have stronger opinions about these items.

Getting influence by their former experience of being a part of representation mechanism, results show that students (at significance level of 0.01) have significant difference in their opinion about of “willingness to spend 2 or 3 hours voluntarily for discussing work issues in existence of nonunion representation” and “effectiveness of regular meeting between managers and employees” at significance level of 0.05. The lowest mean of 3.22 is for those students who have not been a part of representation mechanism before for question about “effectiveness of nonunion presentation to solve problems”, explains that graduate students with no background in representation mechanism have weaker attitudes toward this item.

On the other hand, having any union member in their family cause respondents to have significantly different attitudes toward 3 nonunion related questions of “preferring organization run jointly by employees and managers” at significance level of 0.05, “willingness to spend 2 or 3 hours voluntarily for discussing work issues in existence of

nonunion representation” at significance level of 0.00, and “effectiveness of joint consultation committees as representation way” at significance level of 0.05.

Students who have a union member in their family have the stronger attitudes ($m=3.97$) toward the question about “effectiveness of regular meeting between managers and employees” and those students who do not have any union member in their family have the weaker attitudes ($m=3.22$) toward the question about “effectiveness of nonunion representation to solve problems which an individual cannot”. This indicates that students, who have union members in their family, have stronger attitudes toward nonunion representation mechanism.

4.2.3 Differences toward Collective Representation

In order to further analyze graduate students’ responses to 11 collective representation questions, mean analyses and ANOVA tests are run.

Table 18: Mean analysis for Collective representation related questions

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Employee should have a say in decisions affecting them.	3.92	.987
Employment relationship in workplace would be more positive if there is a representation mechanism in place.	3.66	.926
Employees participating in decision making processes would impose restrictions on employers/ managers.	3.38	.964
Employee representation mechanism would strengthen industrial democracy.	3.67	.960
Employee representation mechanism would give more control to employees in a workplace.	3.59	.933
Employee representation mechanism can be instrumental in resolving conflicts between employees and management.	3.71	.960
Employee representation mechanism would increase employee input in formulating policies.	3.56	.968
Employee representation mechanism improves communication among employees.	3.87	.972
Employee representation mechanism improve communication among employees and management	3.85	.963
Employee representation mechanism would decrease discrimination in a workplace	3.63	1.102
Employee representation mechanism would increase your opportunity to participate in decisions that affect your job.	3.84	1.049

Of all the collective representation items, the highest means and they are ranged from highest mean of 3.92 belongs to “having a say for employees in decisions affecting

them” and lowest mean of 3.38 belongs to “participation of employees in decision making processes impose restrictions on employers/ managers” (see Table 18).

Table 19: Mean comparison test for different age groups, nationalities and undergraduate faculties and collective representation attitudes

	Age Sig.	Nationality Sig.	Undergraduate faculty Sig.
Employee should have a say in decisions affecting them.	.311	.003	.738
Employment relationship in workplace would be more positive if there is a representation mechanism in place.	.499	.162	.536
Employees participating in decision making processes would impose restrictions on employers/ managers.	.141	.838	.507
Employee representation mechanism would strengthen industrial democracy.	.016	.367	.643
Employee representation mechanism would give more control to employees in a workplace.	.701	.414	.206
Employee representation mechanism can be instrumental in resolving conflicts between employees and management.	.921	.013	.571
Employee representation mechanism would increase employee input in formulating policies.	.343	.043	.449
Employee representation mechanism improves communication among employees.	.647	.580	.363
Employee representation mechanism improve communication among employees and management	.845	.107	.065
Employee representation mechanism would decrease discrimination in a workplace	.394	.034	.676
Employee representation mechanism would increase your opportunity to participate in decisions that affect your job.	.771	.578	.022

Based on age, there is a significant difference toward the item of “employee representation mechanism will strengthen industrial democracy” at significance level of 0.05 (see Table 19). Students who are older than 34 years old have stronger attitudes ($m=4.67$) toward the items of “having a say for employees in decisions affecting them”, “participation of employees in decision making processes impose restrictions on employers/ managers” and “employee representation mechanism will strengthen industrial democracy”.

Results show that based on nationality, respondents have shown significant different attitudes toward 4 collective representation items of “having a say for employees in decisions affecting them” at significance level of 0.001, “employee representation mechanism can be helpful in resolving conflicts”, “employee’s input in formulating policies is increased by employee representation mechanism” and “employee representation mechanism decreases discrimination in a workplace” (each at significance level of 0.05). Turkish and Turkish Cypriot students have strongest belief about effectiveness of collective representation (with the mean of 4.36).

Finally according to results of Table 19, respondents’ attitudes toward the item “increasing of opportunity to participate in decisions that affect job by employee representation mechanism” is significantly different based on their different background in their undergraduate degree (at significance level of 0.05). Students with business undergraduate degrees have less favorable attitudes toward collective representation ($m=3.32$).

Table 20: Mean comparison test for different groups of family income, job experience and political view and collective representation attitudes

	Family income Sig.	Job experience Sig.	Political view Sig.
Employee should have a say in decisions affecting them.	.860	.145	.094
Employment relationship in workplace would be more positive if there is a representation mechanism in place.	.397	.509	.196
Employees participating in decision making processes would impose restrictions on employers/ managers.	.862	.039	.728
Employee representation mechanism would strengthen industrial democracy.	.157	.122	.386
Employee representation mechanism would give more control to employees in a workplace.	.579	.004	.577
Employee representation mechanism can be instrumental in resolving conflicts between employees and management.	.163	.097	.959
Employee representation mechanism would increase employee input in formulating policies.	.077	.840	.998
Employee representation mechanism improves communication among employees.	.171	.818	.111
Employee representation mechanism improve communication among employees and management	.219	.451	.514
Employee representation mechanism would decrease discrimination in a workplace	.445	.262	.506
Employee representation mechanism would increase your opportunity to participate in decisions that affect your job.	.057	.629	.155

Regarding monthly family income and political view, there are no differences in respondents' opinion about any of collective representation related items (see Table 20).

On the other hand, years of respondents' job experience caused graduate students to show significantly different attitudes toward "participation of employees in decision making processes impose restrictions on employers/ managers" at significance level of 0.05, and "more control that employee representation mechanism gives to employees" at significance level of 0.001. Students with 5 years of job experience have stronger attitudes for the question about "having a say for employees in decisions affecting them" ($m=4.67$). This shows that more years of job experience may cause students to have more favorable attitudes toward having a say on the organization.

Table 21: Mean comparison test for union membership experience, representation mechanism experience and any union member in family and collective representation attitudes

	Union membership Sig.	Representation mechanism Sig.	Union family member Sig.
Employee should have a say in decisions affecting them.	.507	.446	.824
Employment relationship in workplace would be more positive if there is a representation mechanism in place.	.996	.877	.716
Employees participating in decision making processes would impose restrictions on employers/ managers.	.021	.036	.480
Employee representation mechanism would strengthen industrial democracy.	.613	.550	.794
Employee representation mechanism would give more control to employees in a workplace.	.577	.839	.038
Employee representation mechanism can be instrumental in resolving conflicts between employees and management.	.212	.083	.295
Employee representation mechanism would increase employee input in formulating policies.	.018	.120	.017
Employee representation mechanism improves communication among employees.	.023	.003	.137
Employee representation mechanism improve communication among employees and management	.290	.089	.028
Employee representation mechanism would decrease discrimination in a workplace	.212	.279	.068
Employee representation mechanism would increase your opportunity to participate in decisions that affect your job.	.015	.074	.053

To further examine whether there are significant differences between respondents and their attitude toward collective representation, more analyses are run. Table 21 shows the results about effect of former union membership on collective representation attitudes, which are indicating that respondents have significantly different attitudes toward 4 collective representation related items; “participation of employees in decision making processes imposes restrictions on employers/ managers” “employee’s input in formulating policies is increased by employee representation mechanism”, “employee representation mechanism improves communication among employees” and ”increasing of opportunity to participate in decisions that affect job by employee representation mechanism” all of them at significance level of 0.05. Students who have not been a union member before, have less favorable attitudes ($m=3.27$) toward the collective representation item of “participation of employees in decision making processes imposes restrictions on employers/ managers”.

Furthermore, results show that for 11 items for evaluation of collective representation attitude, based on having been a part of representation mechanism before, there is no significant difference in respondent’s attitudes except for two, “participation of employees in decision making processes impose restrictions on employers/ managers” at significance level of 0.05, “employee representation mechanism improves communication among employees” at significance level of 0.01. Moreover, lowest mean (3.28) which is calculated for those students who have not been a part of representation mechanism before and their attitudes toward the item of “participation of employees in decision making processes imposes restrictions on employers/ managers”,

indicates that student without any former participation in representation mechanism have weaker attitudes toward collective representation features.

On the subject of having any family member who is a union member, results indicate significantly different attitude of respondents (all at significance level of 0.05) to the items of “more control that employee representation mechanism gives to employees”, “employee’s input in formulating policies is increased by employee representation mechanism” and “employee representation mechanism improves communication among employees and managers”.

Students who have a union member in their family more favorable attitudes toward this collective representation item: “employee representation mechanism improves communication among employees”.

4.3 Analysis of Demographic Characteristics' Effects on Representation Attitudes

Table 22 presents ANOVA analysis for different nationalities and representation attitudes.

Table 22: One way ANOVA for nationalities and attitudes toward representation

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Union representation	Between Groups	5.711	3	1.904	6.568	.000
	Within Groups	59.420	205	.290		
	Total	65.132	208			
Nonunion representation	Between Groups	1.248	3	.416	1.151	.330
	Within Groups	75.219	208	.362		
	Total	76.468	211			
Collective representation	Between Groups	3.177	3	1.059	2.653	.050
	Within Groups	81.043	203	.399		
	Total	84.220	206			

A one-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of nationality on business graduate students' attitudes toward union, nonunion and collective representation, in Iranian, African, Turkish and Turkish Cypriot, and other nationalities conditions. There is a significant effect of nationality on attitudes toward union representation at the $p < .000$ level for the four conditions [$F(3, 205) = 6.568, p = 0.000$]. Moreover, there is a significant effect of nationality on attitudes toward collective representation at the $p < .05$ level for the four conditions [$F(3, 203) = 2.653, p = 0.050$].

Table 23: Tukey HSD Comparison for Union representation attitudes and Nationality

		Mean	Std. Deviation	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Union Representation	Iranian	3.5156	.50104	3.4069	3.6243	1.86	4.80
	African	3.8279	.57872	3.6784	3.9774	1.57	5.00
	Turkish and Turkish Cypriots	3.7094	.60801	3.4972	3.9215	2.43	4.71
	Other Nationalities	3.3702	.46991	3.1978	3.5426	2.33	4.00
	Total	3.6152	.55958	3.5389	3.6915	1.57	5.00

Table 23 represents the result of Post hoc analysis between the different nationalities. Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test, indicated that the mean score being an Iranian ($M = 3.5156$, $SD = 0.50104$) did not significantly differ from the being an African ($M = 3.8279$, $SD = 0.57872$), Turkish and Turkish Cypriot ($M = 3.7094$, $SD = 0.60801$), and, Other Nationalities ($M = 3.3702$, $SD = 0.46991$). Taken together, these results suggest that business graduate students' nationalities do have an effect on their union attitudes. Specifically, our results suggest African students have the strongest attitudes toward union representation ($m = 3.82$).

Table 24: Tukey HSD Comparison for Collective representation attitudes and Nationality

	Mean	Std. Deviation	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Collective Representation	Iranian	3.5669	.56981	3.4425	3.6914	2.00	4.70
	African	3.7946	.74907	3.6011	3.9881	1.00	5.00
	Turkish and Turkish Cypriots	3.8549	.58081	3.6489	4.0608	1.90	5.00
	Other Nationalities	3.5787	.59213	3.3615	3.7959	1.60	4.60
	Total	3.6806	.63940	3.5930	3.7682	1.00	5.00

Regarding attitudes of business graduate students toward collective representation, results of Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test which are shown in Table 24, indicated that the mean score being an Iranian ($M = 3.5669$, $SD = 0.56981$) did not significantly differ from the being an African ($M = 3.7946$, $SD = 0.74907$), Turkish and Turkish Cypriot ($M = 3.8549$, $SD = 0.58081$), and, Other Nationalities ($M = 3.5787$, $SD = 0.59213$). Taken together, these results suggest that business graduate students' nationalities affect their collective representation attitudes. Specifically, our results suggest that Turkish and Turkish Cypriot group have the strongest attitudes toward collective representation ($m = 3.85$).

Table 25: Mean comparison between political views and representation attitudes

	Union Representation		Nonunion Representation		Collective Representation	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
Conservative	3.5905	.46968	3.7101	.50069	3.7549	.54608
Liberal	3.6707	.55570	3.7572	.54071	3.6435	.51669
Social Democrat	3.7046	.56218	3.6196	.57460	3.7405	.62039
Socialist	3.4675	.35623	3.5732	.59294	3.7919	.54716
None of the above	3.5079	.61108	3.6576	.71113	3.5996	.79563

Table 25 presents the result of mean comparison among respondents' different political views and their attitudes toward employee representation. According to the results graduate students with social democrat political view with the highest mean of 3.70 have strongest positive attitudes toward union representation. On the other hand student with liberal political view have stronger attitudes toward nonunion representation and finally socialist students are more concerned about collective representation in general.

Table 26: Paired T-test for faculty of undergraduate degree and relationship with union, nonunion and collective attitudes

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Union Representation	Faculty of Business and Economics	109	3.6103	.53431	-40.713	194	.000
	Other Faculties	86	3.6266	.60156			
	Total	195	3.6175	.56351			
Nonunion Representation	Faculty of Business and Economics	110	3.6497	.61631	-41.033	197	.000
	Other Faculties	88	3.7087	.59366			
	Total	198	3.6759	.60553			
Collective Representation	Faculty of Business and Economics	108	3.6421	.65546	-39.612	192	.000
	Other Faculties	85	3.7192	.61290			
	Total	193	3.6761	.63659			

In order to analyze whether undergraduate degree of respondents influence their attitudes toward union representation, nonunion representation and collective representation, respondents were grouped into 2 clusters: faculty of business and economics and other faculties.

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare attitudes of business graduate students toward union, nonunion, and, collective representation with undergraduate background from Faculty of Business and Other Faculties conditions, which is shown in Table 26. Regarding business students' attitudes toward unions, there was a significant difference in the scores for business education background ($M = 3.6103$, $SD = 0.53431$) and background from other faculties education ($M = 3.6266$, $SD = 0.60156$) conditions; $t(194) = -40.713$, $p = 0.000$. These results suggest that business graduate students' business undergraduate backgrounds really do have an effect on their attitudes toward union representation. Specifically, the results suggest that compared to students who have other backgrounds in their undergraduate degrees, respondents with the undergraduate background of business related majors, have weaker attitudes toward union representation.

Additionally, related to business students' attitudes toward nonunion representation, there was a significant difference in the scores for business undergraduate background ($M = 3.6497$, $SD = 0.61631$) and no other faculties undergraduate background ($M = 3.7087$, $SD = 0.59366$) conditions; $t(197) = -41.033$, $p = 0.000$. These results suggest that students' business undergraduate backgrounds have an impact on their attitudes toward nonunion representation. The results indicate that those students with business undergraduate degrees compared to those, whose undergraduate degrees are from other faculties, have weaker attitudes toward nonunion representation,

Moreover, regarding their attitudes toward collective representation, there was a significant difference in the scores for business faculty background ($M = 3.6421$, $SD =$

0.65546) and background of other faculties ($M = 3.7192$, $SD = 0.61290$) conditions; $t(192) = -39.612$, $p = 0.000$. Results suggest that business graduate students' undergraduate backgrounds influence their attitudes toward collective representation. Based on the results, students with the undergraduate degrees from other faculties, have stronger attitudes toward collective representation.

Table 27: Paired T-test for having been a union member before and relationship with union, nonunion and collective attitudes

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Union Representation	No	137	3.5623	.53656	-47.87	208	.000
	Yes	72	3.716	.59175			
	Total	209	3.6152	.55958			
Nonunion Representation	No	140	3.6032	.59806	-48.163	211	.000
	Yes	72	3.8046	.59129			
	Total	212	3.6716	.60200			
Collective Representation	No	136	3.6175	.65676	-45.268	206	.000
	Yes	71	3.8014	.59054			
	Total	207	3.6806	.63940			

Table 27 represents results of paired-samples t-test which was conducted to compare attitudes of business graduate students toward union, nonunion, and, collective representation with having been a union member before and not having been a union member before conditions. According to results, regarding business graduate students'

attitudes toward unions, there was a significant difference in the scores for not any former union membership ($M = 3.5623$, $SD = 0.53656$) and former union membership ($M = 3.716$, $SD = 0.59175$) conditions; $t(208) = -47.87$, $p = 0.000$. These results suggest that having been a union member before, affect business graduate students' attitudes toward union representation. Consequently, results are indicating that students who have been union member before have stronger attitudes toward union representation.

Furthermore, based on Paired-sample t-test, regarding students' attitudes toward nonunion representation, there was a significant difference in the scores for not any former union membership ($M = 3.6032$, $SD = 0.59806$) and former union membership ($M = 3.8046$, $SD = 0.59129$) conditions; $t(211) = -48.163$, $p = 0.000$. These results suggest that experience of former union membership influences business graduate students' attitudes toward nonunion representation. Accordingly, results are shown that students, who haven't been a union member before, have weaker attitudes toward nonunion representation.

In addition, based on Paired-sample t-test, regarding students' attitudes toward collective representation, there was a significant difference in the scores for not any former union membership ($M = 3.6175$, $SD = 0.65676$) and former union membership ($M = 3.8014$, $SD = 0.59054$) conditions; $t(206) = -45.268$, $p = 0.000$. These results suggest that former experience of union membership has an impact on business graduate students' attitudes toward collective representation. Additionally, results indicate that students, who have been a union member before, have stronger attitudes toward collective representation.

Moreover, based on Table 27, the lowest mean is for union representation (3.67160), followed by collective representation (3.8014) and nonunion representation (3.8046). On the other hand, among students who haven't been a union member in the past, the highest mean belongs to collective representation with the mean of 3.6175 which means these students have more favorable value toward collective representation in general.

Table 28: Paired T-test for having been a part of representation mechanism before and relationship with union, nonunion and collective attitudes

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Union Representation	No	128	3.5485	.52018	-47.292	202	.000
	Yes	75	3.7401	.61003			
	Total	203	3.6193	.56128			
Nonunion Representation	No	130	3.6157	.61445	-45.434	205	.000
	Yes	76	3.7745	.58967			
	Total	206	3.6743	.60884			
Collective Representation	No	128	3.6152	.64571	-43.711	200	.000
	Yes	73	3.7977	.63529			
	Total	201	3.6815	.64637			

A paired-sample t-test was conducted to compare attitudes of business graduate students toward union, nonunion, and, collective representation with having been part of representation mechanism before and not having been a part of representation mechanism before conditions. Based on results of Table 28, concerning business

graduate students' attitudes toward unions, there was a significant difference in the scores for no former experience of representation mechanism ($M = 3.5485$, $SD = 0.52018$) and former experience of representation mechanism ($M = 3.7401$, $SD = 0.61003$) conditions; $t(202) = -47.292$, $p = 0.000$. These results suggest that having been a part of representation mechanism before has an impact on business graduate students' attitudes toward union representation. Subsequently, results indicate that those students, who have been a part of representation mechanism before, have more favorable attitudes toward union representation.

Results are indicating that related to business graduate students' attitudes toward nonunion representation, there was a significant difference in the scores for no former experience of representation mechanism ($M = 3.6157$, $SD = 0.61445$) and former experience of representation mechanism ($M = 3.7745$, $SD = 0.58967$) conditions; $t(205) = -45.434$, $p = 0.000$. These results suggest that having been a part of representation mechanism before influences business graduate students' attitudes toward nonunion representation. Moreover, results show that students who have been a part of representation mechanism before have stronger attitudes toward nonunion representation.

Additionally, results indicate that related to business graduate students' attitudes toward collective representation, there was a significant difference in the scores for no former experience of representation mechanism ($M = 3.6152$, $SD = 0.64571$) and former experience of representation mechanism ($M = 3.7977$, $SD = 0.63529$) conditions; $t(200) = -43.711$, $p = 0.000$. These results suggest that having been a part of representation

mechanism before affects business graduate students' attitudes toward collective representation. Furthermore, results are indicating that students who have not been a part of representation mechanism before have weaker attitudes toward collective representation.

According to the results, students who have experienced representation mechanism before, have stronger attitudes toward union, nonunion and collective representation. In addition, the calculated lowest mean (3.7401) for respondents with past experience of representation mechanism is toward union representation and the highest mean (3.7977) is toward collective representation attitudes.

Table 29: Paired T-test for having a union member in the family and relationship with union, nonunion and collective attitudes

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Union Representation	No	111	3.5493	.48358	-44.19	208	.000
	Yes	98	3.6898	.62903			
	Total	209	3.6152	.55958			
Nonunion Representation	No	114	3.591	.57765	-44.394	211	.000
	Yes	98	3.7654	.61894			
	Total	212	3.6716	.60200			
Collective Representation	No	109	3.6091	.62655	-41.565	206	.000
	Yes	98	3.7601	.64733			
	Total	207	3.6806	.63940			

According to Table 29, a paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare attitudes of business graduate students toward union, nonunion, and, collective representation with having any union member in their family and not having any union member in their family conditions. Results indicate regarding business graduate students' union representation attitudes, there was a significant difference in the scores for not having any union member in their family ($M = 3.5493$, $SD = 0.48358$) and having a union member in their family ($M = 3.6898$, $SD = 0.62903$) conditions; $t(208) = -44.19$, $p = 0.000$. These results suggest that having a union member in their family, affects business graduate students' attitudes toward union representation. Additionally, results indicate

that students who have a union member in their family have stronger attitudes toward union representation.

Results suggest that concerning business graduate students' nonunion representation attitudes, there was a significant difference in the scores for not having any union member in their family ($M = 3.591$, $SD = 0.57765$) and having a union member in their family ($M = 3.7654$, $SD = 0.61894$) conditions; $t(211) = -44.394$, $p = 0.000$. These results show, having a union member in their family, has an impact on business graduate students' attitudes toward nonunion representation. Moreover, results indicate that those students, who have a union member in their family, have more favorable attitudes toward nonunion representation.

Furthermore related to business graduate students' attitudes toward collective representation, there was a significant difference in the scores for not having any union member in their family ($M = 3.6091$, $SD = 0.62655$) and having a union member in their family ($M = 3.7601$, $SD = 0.64733$) conditions; $t(206) = -41.565$, $p = 0.000$. These results indicate, having a union member in their family, influences business graduate students' attitudes toward collective representation. Moreover, results indicate that students who do not have any union member in their family have weaker attitudes toward collective representation.

According to findings, students who have a union member in their family have stronger value attitudes toward all three kinds of representations. Regarding having any union member in the family, the mean comparison for the students with positive response to

the question shows that lowest (3.6898) mean is for union representation and highest mean (3.7654) is for nonunion representation. On the other hand, the lowest mean calculated for the students who do not have any union member in their family is for union representation (3.5493) and highest mean is for collective representation (3.6091).

4.4 Correlation Analysis

Table 30 demonstrates that there are some significant relationships (both negative and positive) between demographics variables and respondent's general attitudes toward union, nonunion and collective representation.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess these relationships between the students' union, nonunion and collective representation attitudes and other demographic variables.

There was a positive weak correlation between the two variables of nationality and having former experience of union membership, $r = 0.156$, $n = 214$, $p = 0.022$. Similarly, results indicate that there is a weak positive correlation between nationality and having any family member in the family, $r = 0.156$, $n = 214$, $p = 0.023$.

On the subject of faculty of undergraduate degree, there is a weak negative correlation between faculty of undergraduate degree and having any union member in the family, $r = -0.148$, $n = 199$, $p = 0.038$.

Additionally the correlation between years of job experience and having been a part of representation mechanism is positive and moderately weak, $r = 0.217$, $n = 205$, $p =$

0.002, correlation between years of job experience and attitudes toward nonunion representation is positive and weak, $r = 0.176$, $n = 209$, $p = 0.011$.

The correlation between having been a union member before and having been a part of representation mechanism is moderately high and positive, $r = 0.429$, $n = 208$, $p = 0.000$. Moreover, there is a positive and moderately strong correlation between former union membership and having a union member in the family, $r = 0.529$, $n = 214$, $p = 0.000$. The correlation between former union membership and political view is weak and negative, $r = -0.211$, $n = 211$, $p = 0.002$, the correlation between former union membership and nonunion representation is weak and positive, $r = 0.159$, $n = 212$, $p = 0.021$, and with collective representation is weak and positive, $r = 0.137$, $n = 207$, $p = 0.049$.

Further analysis shows the weak and positive correlation between having been a part of representation mechanism and having a family member who has a union membership, $r = 0.294$, $n = 208$, $p = 0.000$, weak and negative correlation between having been a part of representation mechanism and political view, $r = -0.143$, $n = 205$, $p = 0.041$ and weak but positive correlation between former contribution in representation mechanism and union representation attitudes, $r = 0.165$, $n = 203$, $p = 0.019$.

In the situations which in respondents have union member in the family, results show the weak but positive correlation with their nonunion representation attitudes, $r = 0.145$, $n = 212$, $p = 0.035$.

On the other hand, the correlations between respondents' union representation attitudes and their attitudes toward nonunion representation is positive and strong, $r = 0.661$, $n = 209$, $p = 0.000$, and with collective representation is again positive and strong $r = 0.576$, $n = 207$, $p = 0.000$.

Correspondingly, is the correlation between respondent's attitudes toward nonunion representation and their attitudes toward collective representation which is strong and positive, $r = 0.603$, $n = 207$, $p = 0.000$.

Table 30: Correlation results

	A	N	F	J.E	U.M	R.M	F.M	U.R	N.R	C L
Age (A)	1									
Nationality (N)	-.305**	1								
Faculty of Undergraduate (F)	.041	-.052	1							
Family Income (F.I)	-.016	-.071	.068							
Job Experience	.532**	-.126	.025	1						
Former Union Membership (U.M)	.010	.156*	-.120	.037	1					
Former Representation Mechanism (R.M)	.082	.061	-.074	.217*	.429**	1				
Any Union Member in Family (F.M)	.012	.156*	-.148*	-.007	.529**	.294**	1			
Political View (P.V)	-.129	.069	.056	-.055	-.211**	-.143*	-.062			
Union Representation (U.R)	.074	-.029	.038	.076	.131	.165*	.126	1		
Nonunion Representation (N.R)	.118	-.031	.061	.176*	.159*	.126	.145*	.661*	1	
Collective Representation (C.R)	.063	.062	.070	.098	.137*	.136	.118	.576*	.603*	1

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

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

The main objective of this inquiry is to study Business Faculty graduate students' attitudes toward collective representation and its two main forms: unions and nonunion employee representation systems. In order to find any possible effects, the researcher employed ANOVA (analysis of variance), paired sample T-test, and correlation analysis. In this chapter significant results have been found based on the research hypotheses, will be presented and explained.

Extensive studies about individuals' representation attitudes have shown the growing interest toward nonunion representation among employers and employees in the past three decades (Berg and Grift, 2011; Upchurch et al., 2006; Lipset, 1986). Additionally, findings of this inquiry lead us to the main conclusion that business graduate students as future managers have stronger positive attitudes toward nonunion representation. Their ideas and beliefs toward employee representation have been shaped in a way that as managers their involvement in representation systems is necessary.

Individuals' attitudes toward employee representation are highly influenced by their demographic characteristics, their family background in unionization (Sarkar, 2009; Walters, 2002; Kelloway, 1996; Hernandez, 1995; Barling et al., 1991; Booth, 1986; and Kochan, 1979), their former experience of union membership or representation

mechanism and their culture (Walter, 2002 and Kochan, 1979), and their nationality and cultural background (Hills, 1995 and Sarkar, 1999).

Six hypotheses have been proposed in the study. In the following section, findings and discussions about these hypotheses will be presented.

H1:

a) Having union membership experience will make a difference in business graduate students' attitudes toward collective representation, b) Having union membership experience will make a difference in business graduate students' attitudes toward nonunion representation, c) Having union membership experience will make a difference in business graduate students' attitudes toward union representation.

The findings of the study accepted H1 and showed the influence of union membership experience on students' representation attitudes. Walter (2002), Kochan (1979) have debated the main roles of individual's experiences of and their level of involvement in unions on their attitudes toward union representation. The paired t-test analysis and the results showed that there is a statistically significant difference between business graduate students' attitudes toward different employee representation forms based on their earlier experience of union membership. These results revealed that graduate students who have been a union member before, have stronger attitudes toward collective employee representation, and both two kinds of employee representation mechanisms, i.e., union and nonunion. Students with the background of union membership tend to have more positive attitudes first of all toward nonunion

representation, followed by collective and union representation. According to the findings of the study, due to their earlier experiences with representation, students tend to be more supportive of having collective employee representation in general. The findings also indicated that union membership in the past not only influences students to have more pro-union attitudes but also it causes them to have more favorable attitudes toward having another kind of representation system (nonunion) which consists of both employee and management team.

H2:

a) Having been part of a representation mechanism before will make a difference in business graduate students' attitudes toward collective representation, b) Having been part of a representation mechanism before will make a difference in business graduate students' attitudes toward nonunion representation, c) Having been part of a representation mechanism before will make a difference in business graduate students' attitudes toward union representation.

Individuals' familiarity and knowledge about representation systems significantly affect their attitudes toward collective representation (Kochan, 1979; Walter 2002). Based on the results of current inquiry, which have been found by employing t-test mean analysis, there is statistically significant difference between attitudes of students toward union, nonunion and collective employee representation due to their experience in a representation mechanism. However, the findings of the study showed that having been a part of representation mechanism in the past does not necessarily mean that Business Faculty graduate students will have more positive attitudes toward unions. In fact the

highest obtained result is for collective representation and nonunion representation, which means first of all students with an experience of a representation mechanism have a desire for a representation system through which by they can express their voice in their workplaces. Moreover, they prefer that system to be a nonunion representation with the participation of both employee and management sides.

H3:

a) Having a family member in a union will make a difference in business graduate students' attitudes toward collective representation, b) Having a family member in a union will make a difference in business graduate students' attitudes toward nonunion representation c) Having a family member in a union will make a difference in business graduate students' attitudes toward union representation.

The impact of parental unionization experience on individuals' union attitudes is conspicuous (Kelloway et al., 1996). Likewise, Barling et al., (1991) noted that family's level of contribution in unions has a major significant role in determining one's attitudes toward unions. In this study, the researcher conducted extensive examinations to find out the possible effects of having any union member in the family on business graduate student's attitudes toward employee representation. The results suggest that students with a union member in their family have stronger attitudes toward collective representation. These students want to have a voice and a system of representation in the organization regardless of whether it is nonunion or even union form. On the other hand, between union and nonunion representation, students have more positive attitudes toward nonunion representation. This finding reveals those students who have a family

member who is a union member, tend to be more supportive of nonunion representation and to get unionized is something that they will choose in the situations which nonunion representation does not exist. Family's beliefs and backgrounds about unions, directly or indirectly shape individual's attitudes toward employee representation (Sarkar, 2009; Walters, 2002; Hernandez, 1995; Booth, 1986). According to Sarkar (2009) individuals' union opinions are greatly interrelated with their parents and relatives' perceptions and attitudes toward unionization.

H4:

a) Business Faculty Graduate students' nationalities will influence their attitudes toward collective representation, b) Business Faculty Graduate students' nationalities will influence their attitudes toward nonunion representation, c) Business Faculty Graduate students' nationalities will influence their attitudes toward union representation.

Supplementary analyses of the subject illustrate that there are statistically significant relationships between business graduate students' nationalities and their attitudes toward union, nonunion and collective representation. Hills (1995) in his study argued for stronger attitudes of black people toward unions. In addition, findings achieved during the study indicated that although among all nationality groups African students have strongest attitude toward union representation, they also have the strongest positive attitude toward nonunion representation among all other existing nationalities groups. This means that between 3 kinds of representation systems, African students want to have a voice in their workplace and they think getting unionized is the most effective way to convey their voice. On the other hand, Turkish and Turkish Cypriot students

have most favorable attitudes toward collective representation. They want to have a representation system in their organization but apparently they do not have a preference about the form of representation. Their only concern is to be represented and to express their voice and complaints through a representation mechanism. These differences of attitudes toward different representation systems are entrenched in students' cultural and social background. Sarkar (2009) discussed about the importance of individuals' characteristics and culture on their union attitudes. According to her, this could be the reason why some nationalities have more favorable attitudes toward a specific form of representation.

H5:

Business Faculty graduate students with business undergraduate degree have more favorable attitudes toward unionizations.

Based on previous grouping of faculties of undergraduate degree (Faculty of Business, Faculty of Engineering and other Faculties) no significant differences between attitudes of students were found. For further analysis, the researcher regrouped participants' undergraduate Faculties into 2 groups: Faculty of Business and other Faculties. The findings of the further analysis merit discussion. Exploring students' attitudes according to their undergraduate Faculties indicated that students with the background of business majors, as opposed to what everyone may think, have less favorable attitudes toward union, nonunion and also collective representation. This shows the impact of their former educations on formulating their attitudes toward different representation systems. During their undergraduate studies, as business students, they have been taught how to

be a manager in the future. Evidently, as future managers and based on their previous studies, they became more anti-employee representation systems and more HRM supporters, which, in general, is based on individual representation. Benson, (2000) and Timur et al., (2012) argued that this is a substitute voice mechanism for union representation which establishes a communication channel between employees and employers working together, but with a higher level of information sharing and also participation on the managers' side. On the other hand, between union, nonunion and collective representation, graduate business students are more supportive of collective representation which is followed by nonunion and finally union representation. The conclusion based on these findings is that as future managers they support the idea that unionization is not the most appropriate representation system in the organization. In these cases they prefer to employ nonunion employee representation in which a management team has a crucial role. According to Terry (1999) using HRM policies as a channel through which employees can express themselves to managers is a way that most of managers employ to avoid unionization in their organizations.

H6:

a) Attitudes toward collective representation influence attitudes toward union representation, b) Attitudes toward collective representation influence attitudes toward nonunion representation, c) There is a relationship between attitudes toward union representation and nonunion representation.

Further analysis of the data revealed that the correlation between student's collective representation attitudes and their attitudes toward union representation is positive and

significantly strong, which means those students who have positive attitudes toward collective representation mostly have strong attitudes for unions as well. Additionally, collective representation attitudes have a strong correlation with nonunion attitudes which leads to this conclusion that business graduate students mostly concern about having a representation system in the workplace to share their voice and opinions and due to that reason they have positive attitudes toward both union and nonunion employee representation. The stronger relationship between student's collective representation and nonunion attitudes compared to their union attitudes demonstrates that while business graduate students have strong attitudes toward having a system which by they will be represented, they prefer that system to be nonunion representation but this does not necessarily mean that they do not want to be represented by union form at all.

Moreover, by investigating the relationship between union and nonunion attitudes, the results showed a strong positive correlation between students' union and nonunion attitudes. These outcomes expose the positive impact of union and nonunion attitudes on one another. Student's positive attitudes toward either union or nonunion will eventually lead to positive attitudes for the other one. This is important to know that students who prefer to work in unionized or nonunionized workplaces, as long as the existence of a system by which they can express themselves, do not mind to be represented by the other representation system.

Chapter 6

CONCLUSION

As stated earlier, nowadays one of the major concerns of employees and also employers is the concept of employee representation. Employees, who are concerned about having a voice in processes used to make decisions in the organizations, seek for the best alternative through which they can provide input into the process and express their grievances, complaints and opinions. Among the two forms of collective representation (union representation and nonunion representation) there has been a growing interest in the nonunion form in past decade or two due to the perceived ineffectiveness of unions in solving employees' problems and issues. Employees who were not satisfied by getting unionized in their organizations developed more positive attitudes toward a mechanism which consists of employees and manager representatives. This study is an effort to examine attitudes of business graduate students toward collective employee representation and specific demographic characteristics can that affect their attitudes.

The present study tried to answer two specific research questions:

- 1) What is the attitude of business graduate students as future managers toward employee representation?

- 2) Is there a difference between Business Faculty graduate students' attitudes according to their background?

Although the findings suggest that business graduate students either as employee or employer are positive about having a representation mechanism in their workplace, they have more favorable attitudes toward nonunion representation, which is followed by relatively stronger attitudes toward union representation as a collective representation form. These students, whether or not they have been a union member before and whether or not they have been a part of some kind of a representation mechanism before and whether or not they have a union member in their family, have stronger attitudes for nonunion representation. Further analyses showed that as future managers and based on what they have been taught by their studies about importance of managerial roles, business graduate students tend to more supportive of nonunion form where managers have a crucial role in its functioning. Interestingly enough, Business Faculty graduate students whose undergraduate major is Business do not have relatively more positive attitudes toward collective representation or any form of it. This could be, again, due to their training that focused on individual forms of representation as a human resource management practice that would benefit the organizations.

6.1 Implications for E.M.U

The findings of the study could be beneficial to managers of small or large organizations (i.e., E.M.U) to understand attitudes of employees with business education degrees as to whether they would like to have collective representation in their workplace and if so in what form. The researcher believes that understanding employees' perceptions and attitudes toward work related issues, exclusively regarding the concepts which are of

interest to them, expressing their voices and thoughts is very vital for every organization. Due to the fact that Business Faculty graduates soon will be either managers or white-collar professional employees, understanding their attitudes toward collective employee representation mechanism, can be beneficial for both E.M.U's management team and business faculty in terms of formulating the graduate programs to ensure sufficient training of students for their future careers.

6.2 Limitations of the Study

Although this study provides findings which are useful for understanding the perspectives of individuals with the background in business about employee representation concept, there are limitations to the study. A major limitation of the study is the limited job experience of the participants in the study. This is an important factor constraining the generalizability of the findings and taking a more realistic snapshot of the phenomenon in the study. More job experience would have increased the participants' familiarity with representation systems, helped them have a better idea about the pros and cons of representation systems and such an experience would have an influence on their attitudes.

Another limitation on the generalizability of the findings is the fact that the study was conducted at Faculty of Business at E.M.U due to budgetary and time constraints. A study using a larger sample would present more generalizable findings regarding attitudes of Business Faculty graduate students.

6.3 Areas for Futures Studies

Because the findings of this inquiry is specifically related to the Business Faculty graduate students at E.M.U, future studies related to the subject of this research can

investigate the attitudes of undergraduate students and also students from other faculties (especially engineering faculties due to large number of students with engineering background in business graduate majors) toward collective employee representation. Furthermore, future research can include the effect of other demographic differences; e.g., gender on students' attitudes toward representation mechanism. Although there have been valuable findings regarding students' nationalities, still the impact of culture on their attitudes is ambiguous; subsequently other researchers can concentrate on this issue and examine the impact of culture on either individuals or students attitudes toward collective employee representation. A final future investigation area would be measuring Business Faculty graduate students' attitudes two or three years after graduation to identify, if any, differences in their attitudes toward collective representation.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1966). Inequity In Social Exchange. In L. Berkowitz, *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (pp. 267-299). New York: Elsevier Inc.
- Addison, J. T., Schnabel, C., & Wagner, J. (2004). The Course of Research into the Economic Consequences of German Works Councils. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 255-281.
- Adrian Wilkinson, T. D. (2004). Changing Patterns of Employee Voice: Case Studies from the UK and Republic of Ireland. *The Journal of Industrial Relations*, 298-322.
- Barling, J., Kelloway, E. K., & Bremermann, E. (1991). Preemployment Predictors of Union Attitudes: The Role of Family Socialization and work beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 725-731.
- Benson, J. (2000). Employee Voice in Union and Non-union Australian Workplaces. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 453-459.
- Booth, A. (1986). Estimating the Probability of Trade Union Membership: A Study of Men and Women in Britain. *Economica*, 41-61.
- Bramel, D., & Ortiz, C. (1987). Tomorrow's Workers and Today's Unions: A Survey of High School Students. *Labor Studies Journal*, 28-43.

- Cotton, J. L., Vollrath, D. A., Froggatt, K. L., Lengnick Hall, M. L., & Jennings, K. R. (1988). Employee Participation: Diverse Forms and Different Outcomes. *Academy of Management Review*, 8-22.
- Cregan, C. (2005). Can Organizing Work? An Inductive Analysis of Individual Attitudes toward Union Membership. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 282-304.
- Edwards, P. K., & Bain, G. S. (1988). Why Are Trade Unions Becoming More Popular? Unions and Public Opinion in Britain. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 311-326.
- Ellisa, A. L., Guntoa, S. J., Weavera, C. L., & Kelsoa, K. A. (1992). The Effect of Contemplated Interpersonal Contact with Union Members on Attitudes toward Labor Unions. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 411-413.
- Findlay, P. (1993). Union Recognition and Non-Unionism: Shifting Fortunes in the Electronics Industry in Scotland. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 28-43.
- Freeman, R. B. (1976). Individual Mobility and Union Voice in the Labor Market. *The American Economic Review*, 361_368.
- Freeman, R. B. (1980). The Exit-Voice Tradeoff in the Labor Market: Unionism, Job Tenure, Quits. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 633-672.
- Freeman, R. B., & Medoff, J. L. (1984). What Do Unions Do? *Industrial and Labor Relations*, 244-248.

- Gollan, P. J. (2000). Non-union forms of Employee Representation in the United Kingdom and Australia. In B. E. Kaufman, & D. G. Taras, *Nonunion Employee Representation: History, Contemporary Practice and Policy* (pp. 410-449). New York: M. E. Sharpe, Inc.,
- Gollan, P. J. (2005). Silent Voices: Representation at the Eurotunnel Call Centre. *Personnel Review*, 423-450.
- Gomez, R., Gunderson, M., & Meltz, N. (2002). Comparing Youth and Adult Desire for Unionization in Canada. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 519-542.
- Guest, D. E., & Dewe, P. (1988). Why Do Workers Belong to a Trade Union? A Social Psychological Study in the UK Electronics Industry. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 178-192.
- Guest, D., & Hoque, K. (1994). The Good, the Bad and the Ugly: Employment Relations In New Non-Union Workplaces. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 1-14.
- Hernández, A. (1995). The Impact of Part-Time Employment on Union Density. *Journal of Labor Research*, 485-491.
- Hills, S. M. (1985). The Attitudes of Union and Nonunion Male Workers toward Union Representation. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 179-194.
- Hughes, J. J., & Brinkley, I. (1979). Attitudes and Expectations of Skill Center Trainees Towards Trade Unions and Trade Union Membership. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 64-69.

- Hurd, R. W. (2002). Contesting the Dinosaur Image — the U. S. Labour Movement's Search for a Future. *Society in Transition*, 227-240.
- Kaufman, B. E., & Tarras, D. G. (2000). *Nonunion Employee Representation: History, Contemporary, Practice, and Policy*. New York: M. E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Kellowaya, E. K., Barlingb, J., & Agarc, S. (1996). Preemployment Predictors of Children's Union Attitudes: The Moderating Role of Identification with Parents. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 413-415.
- Kemp, A. (2009, September 3). *SAMPLE 109: Papers 4 You*. Retrieved July 1, 2012, from Papers 4 You: <http://www.coursework4you.co.uk/essays-and-dissertations/sample109.php>
- Kidger, P. (1992). Employee Participation in Occupational Health and Safety: Should Union-Appointed or Elected Representatives Be the Model for the UK? *Human Resource Management Journal*, 21-35.
- Klandermans, B. (1986). Psychology and Trade Union Participation: Joining, Acting, Quitting. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 189-204.
- Kochan, T. A. (1979). How American Workers View Labor Unions. *Monthly Labor Review*, 23-31.
- Lipset, S. M. (1986). Labor Unions in the Public Mind. In S. M. Lipset, *Unions in Transition: Entering the Second Century* (pp. 287-321). San Francisco : Institute for Contemporary Studies.

- Lloyd, C. (2001). What Do Employee Councils Do? The Impact of Non-Union Forms of Representation on Trade Union Organisation. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 313-329.
- Lowe, G., & Rastin, S. (2000). Organizing the Next Generation: Influences on Young Workers' Willingness to Join Unions in Canada. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 203-222.
- Martin Upchurch, M. R. (2006). Employee representation and partnership in the non-union sector: a paradox of intention? *Human Resource Management Journal*, 393-410.
- McCabe, D. M., & Lewin, D. (1992). Employee Voice: A Human Resource Perspective. *California Management Review*, 112-123.
- McLoughlin, I., & Gourlay, S. (1994). *Enterprise without Unions: Industrial Relations in the Non-union Firm*. Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Morand, D. A. (1998). Exploring the Relationship Between Authoritarianism and Attitudes Toward Unions. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 343-353.
- Nurick, A. J. (1982). Participation in Organizational Change: A Longitudinal Field Study. *Human Relations*, 413-429.
- Obradovic, J. (1975). Workers' Participation: Who Participates? *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 32-44.
- Paul J. Gollan. (2005). Silent voices: representation at the Eurotunnel call centre. *Personnel Review*, 423-450.

- Ponak, A. M., & Fraser, C. R. (1979). Union Activists' Support for Joint Programs. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 197-209.
- Ramutloa, L. (2007, October 3). *Basic Guide to Trade Union Representatives: Labor Republic of South Africa*. Retrieved July 1, 2010, from Labor Republic of South Africa Web Site: <https://www.labour.gov.za/legislation/acts/basic-guides/basic-guide-to-trade-union-representatives/>
- Richard B. Freeman, J. L. (1984). What Do Unions Do. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* , 244-250.
- Sarkar, S. (2007). Individualism_collectivism as predictors of BPO employee attitudes toward union membership in India. *Springer Science + Business Media*, 93–118.
- Sarkar, S. (2009). Individualism–Collectivism as Predictors of BPO Employee Attitudes Toward Union Membership in India. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 93_118.
- Sinclair, D. M. (1995). The Importance of Sex for the Propensity to Unionize. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 173-190.
- Smith, R. L., & Hopkins, A. H. (1978). Public Employee Attitudes toward Unions. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* , 484-495.
- Spencer, D. G. (1986). Employee Voice and Employee Retention. *The Academy of Management Journal* , 488-502.
- Terry, M. (1999). Systems of Collective Employee Representation in Non-union Firms in the UK. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 16-30.

- Terry, M. (2003). Can 'Partnership' Reverse the Decline of British Trade Unions? *Work Employment & Society*, 459-473.
- Timur, A. T., Taras, D. G., & Ponak, A. (2012). 'Shopping for Voice': Do Pre-Existing Non-Union Representation Plans Matter When Employees Unionize? *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 214-238.
- Upchurch, M., Richardson, M., Tailby, S., Danford, A., & Stewart, P. (2006). Employee Representation and Partnership in the Non-union Sector: a Paradox of Intention? *Human Resource Management Journal*, 393-410.
- Van den Berg, A., Grift, Y., & Van Witteloostuijn, A. (2011). Works Councils and Organizational Performance. The Role of Top Managers' and Works Councils' Attitudes in Bad vis-à-vis Good Times. *Journal of Labor Research*, 136-156.
- Walters, S. (2002). Female Part-time Workers' Attitudes to Trade Unions in Britain. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 49-68.
- Wilkinson, A., Dundon, T., Marchington, M., & Ackers, P. (2004). Changing Patterns of Employee Voice: Case Studies from the UK and Republic of Ireland. *The Journal of Industrial Relations*, 298-322.

APPENDIX

Appendix A: English Questionnaire Survey

The aim of this study is to measure graduate students' attitudes towards representation in the workplace. All replies will be kept confidential and individual participants will remain anonymous.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Age:

Nationality:

Undergraduate Degree:

Family Income (\$) 0-1000 1001-2000 2001-3000 3001-4000 4000

Job Experience None Less than a year 1-2 3 4 5 5+

Have you ever been a union member? Yes No

Have you ever been part of a representation mechanism where you worked?

Yes No

Is anyone in your family a union member? Yes No

In politics today do you consider yourself to be?

Conservative

Liberal

Social democrat

Socialist

None of the above

Instructions

Listed below are a series of statements that represent possible feelings that individuals might have about representation in the workplace. With respect to your own feelings about representation please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking one of the five alternatives below each statement.

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

Items					
In my job, I think I should have direct involvement and influence in deciding	1	2	3	4	5
• how to do my job and organize the work	1	2	3	4	5
• what training is needed in my work or department	1	2	3	4	5

• work schedules, including breaks, overtime and time off	1	2	3	4	5
• how much raise in pay the people in my work group should get	1	2	3	4	5
• goals for your work group or department	1	2	3	4	5
• what kinds of benefits are offered to employees	1	2	3	4	5
Companies should use participation mechanisms such as self-directed work teams, total quality management, quality circles	1	2	3	4	5
Participation mechanisms listed above would be more effective if employees, as a group, have more say in how these programs are run at a company	1	2	3	4	5
I would feel more comfortable raising workplace problems through an employee association, rather than as an individual.	1	2	3	4	5
When I have a workplace problem, I would feel more comfortable if a group of my fellow employees help me deal with management	1	2	3	4	5
If an election were held to decide whether employees at my workplace should be represented by a union I would vote for the union	1	2	3	4	5
In my workplace, I would prefer an organization run by employees to represent me.	1	2	3	4	5
In my workplace, I would prefer an organization run jointly by management and employees to represent me.	1	2	3	4	5
If it is an organization run by employees, I would be willing to volunteer two or three hours a month to discuss workplace issues with my company's management.	1	2	3	4	5
If it is an organization run jointly by employees and management, I would be willing to volunteer two or three hours a month to discuss workplace issues with my company's management.	1	2	3	4	5
Unions obtain more benefits for employees	1	2	3	4	5
A union would be more effective to solve problems which an individual would be unable to solve on his/her own	1	2	3	4	5
A nonunion representation mechanism would be	1	2	3	4	5

more effective to solve problems which an individual would be unable to solve on his/her own					
Union representation would result in hostile relationship between employees and management	1	2	3	4	5
Regular meetings between employees and their supervisors are an effective form of representation	1	2	3	4	5
Joint consultation committees are an effective form of representation	1	2	3	4	5
Collective bargaining carried out by an independent union is an effective form of representation	1	2	3	4	5
Employees should have a say in decisions affecting them	1	2	3	4	5
Employment relationship in a workplace would be more positive if there is a representation mechanism in place	1	2	3	4	5
Employees participating in decision making processes would impose restrictions on employers/managers	1	2	3	4	5
Employee representation mechanisms would strengthen industrial democracy	1	2	3	4	5
Employee representation mechanisms would give more control to employees in a workplace	1	2	3	4	5
Employee representation mechanisms can be instrumental in resolving conflicts between employees and management	1	2	3	4	5
Employee representation mechanisms would increase employee input in formulating policies	1	2	3	4	5
Employee representation mechanisms improve communication among employees	1	2	3	4	5
Employee representation mechanisms improve communication between employees and management	1	2	3	4	5
Employee representation mechanisms would decrease discrimination in a workplace	1	2	3	4	5
Employee representation mechanisms would increase your opportunity to participate in decisions that affect your job.	1	2	3	4	5