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Abstract

This thesis examines the extraordinary counter trend by teachers in Victorian Catholic schools, during the period 1994 to 2004, to associate or join their trade union, the Victorian Independent Education Union (VIEU). During the period 1994 to 2004, while nearly all trade unions in Australia, including those in the education sector, were in decline, VIEU’s membership and union density consistently rose.

While the epistemological framework of the research is based on a constructivism using an interpretivist approach, in particular symbolic interactionism, the traditional ontological dichotomy between positivism and interpretivism was rejected. A continuum was substituted whereby the methods and methodology used were an eclectic, pragmatic mix recognising the complementary sources of positivism and interpretivism. Statistics, historical document research, legal documents and interview data were used as appropriate.

Symbolic interactionism’s successive Exploratory and Inspection Stages were employed to sift and sort the data gathered. Following an in-depth analysis of the literature on union density decline in Australia and worldwide, a three phased Exploratory Stage examined all possible explanations offered for the decline in the membership of unions and applied these to the opposite trend experienced in VIEU. Shister’s general model of union growth and decline was adopted as an initial conceptual framework. Those explanations that promised a possible explanation for VIEU’s counter trend were then examined in depth in the Inspection Stage.

The Inspection Stage data demonstrated that Shister’s model was inadequate in that it did not allow for sufficient input by employees and employers in positively influencing union membership and union, nor did it allow for the leadership of the union to overcome the combined negative effects of an unfavourable work environment and unsupportive socio-legal framework.

A new conceptual framework was developed that incorporated the two new factors and allowed for more than a simple equal and interdependent interplay between the three major factors outlined by Shister. Leadership proved to be a critical factor and the thesis concludes by making a number of recommendations for practitioners in the area of industrial relations in Australia with respect to halting what, up until now, has been regarded as an inexorable decline in union membership and density.
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Chapter 1  Introduction

1.1  BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH

The impetus for this research was a keen interest in industrial relations in the context of Catholic education. I have been involved in industrial relations in Catholic schools for over 30 years, both as an employee and employer representative. In this period, I was a foundation member of the Association of Teachers in Victorian Catholic Secondary Schools (ATVCSS) and its replacement, the Staff Association of Catholic Secondary Schools (SACSS) for 14 years. Thereafter, I worked for the Catholic Church employers in the Victorian Catholic Schools Association (VCSA) and the Catholic Education Office of Western Australia (CEOWA) for 19 years in Victoria and Western Australia respectively. At the outset of this research, I held the position of Assistant Director in the CEOWA with responsibility for industrial relations in Western Australian Catholic schools from an employer perspective.

During my professional life, my experience of industrial relations confirmed the benefits of trade unionism for both individuals and the wider society. I had come to appreciate the contribution that trade unions have made to Australian society. In Australia, trade unions took up that challenge from the 1890s and became, in the words of Manning Clark “an instrument for improving the standard of living of the workers within ... society” (Clark, 1969, p. 173). I was also aware of the historical support for trade unionism within the Catholic church. For example, Pope John Paul II in his encyclical Laborem Exercens states that the purpose of trade unions is to defend the vital interests of employees: “they are … a mouthpiece for the struggle for social justice, for the just rights of working people in accordance with their individual professions” (Pope John Paul II, 1981, para 20).

However, in recent years, I became aware of the contemporary decline of trade unionism in Australia. As Lewis (2000) states, the decline in trade union membership had become so rapid and unstoppable there was “the real risk that the movement could soon become an historical footnote from the industrial age” (p. 151), this despite the fact that between 1996 and 2002, Australian employees’ attitudes towards unions have become more positive with only 17% of employees in 2002, compared with 25% in 1996, stating that Australia would be better off without unions (Bearfield, 2003). It was this challenge to trade unionism in Australia and the implications of this challenge for industrial relations in Catholic education that led me to this research.
1.2 THE RESEARCH FOCUS

1.2.1 Introduction

This research focuses on the paradoxical growth of one union, namely, the Victorian Independent Education Union (VIEU) in an era of declining trade unionism in Australia. An initial analysis of statistical data in respect to trade union membership revealed a general decline in trade unionism in Australia, including in the teaching sector. However, statistical data for one trade union, namely VIEU, exhibited a counter trend. In an era of declining trade unionism in Australia, VIEU has dramatically defied the trend by significantly increasing its membership since its inception in 1994. This thesis investigates why VIEU became ‘the exception to the rule’ during the period 1994 to 2004 and outlines what separated VIEU from other Australian trade unions during this time. This focus was of particular interest to the researcher given that VIEU seeks to represent teachers in Victorian Catholic schools and, in doing so, is in relationship with the Catholic Church as employer.

1.2.2 Australia’s trade union density: overall workforce and for teachers

Trade unions have traditionally held a major role in the Australian industrial relations arena (Dabscheck, 1995; Hagan, 1986; Jackson, 1992; Markey, 1994). However, union density declined dramatically from 63% in the 1960s to under 20% by 2004 (Australian Bureau of Statistics [ABS], 2004b; Plowman, 1981). This decline continued unabated from 1994 to 2004 with membership falling from 2,283,400 members to 1,842,100 members (a 19.9% decrease) and from a density of 35.0% to 22.7%, as illustrated in Figures 1 and 2. This decline in numbers and density occurred despite Australia’s total workforce growing from 6,525,800 to 8,116,500 workers (a 24.4% increase) from 1994 to 2004 (Figure 1).

![Figure 1](image1.png)  ![Figure 2](image2.png)

**Figure 1** Total Australian workforce numbers and total union membership numbers

**Figure 2** Union membership as a percentage of the total Australian workforce

Similarly, from 1994 to 2004, teachers’ union membership density declined from 56.1% (1994) to 41.8% (2003) before making a small recovery in 2004 to 44.2% (Figure 3). This relative decline of 21.1% in union density was less than the overall workforce that declined by 35.1% (Figure 4).

![Figure 3](image1.png)

**Figure 3**
Teacher union membership density

![Figure 4](image2.png)

**Figure 4**
Relative decline in union membership for teacher unions and the total workforce

All statistics compiled from the ABS (1999, 2002a, 2004a)

### 1.2.3 VIEU’s membership numbers and density

VIEU was established in 1994 and since that time has represented the interests of teachers in Catholic schools in Victoria. From 1994 to 2004, VIEU’s membership in Catholic schools rose from 4,253 to 7,763 (an 82.5% increase) while the number of teachers in Victorian Catholic schools rose from 11,743 to 13,739 (a 17.0% increase) resulting in VIEU’s union density rising from 36.2% to 56.5% (a 56.0% increase) as illustrated in Figure 5 (see Appendix A, Table A1 for details).

![Figure 5](image3.png)

**Figure 5**
Total teachers in Victorian Catholic schools compared with VIEU members

In summary, from 1994 to 2004, when the total Australian workforce and its teachers’ sector union densities declined from 35.0% and 56.1% to 22.7% and 44.2%, respectively (relative declines of 35.1% and 21.1% respectively), VIEU’s union density rose from 36.2% to 56.5% (a relative increase of 56.0%), as demonstrated by Figure 6 (See Appendix A, Table A2 for details).

![Figure 6](image)

**Figure 6**
Union densities for the total Australian workforce, the Australian teaching workforce and VIEU from 1994 to 2004

Statistics compiled from ABS (1999, 2002a, 2004a) for the total workforce and for the education sector workforce. Statistics compiled from VIEU (2005c) for VIEU members.

1.2.4 In summary

The research problem was to find an explanation for VIEU’s dramatic counter trend. Teachers in Victorian Catholic schools, completely against the union density declines in the total Australian workforce and in Australia’s education sector, have chosen to associate with their union, thereby increasing their membership numbers by 82.5% and their density rate by 56.0%.

1.3 THE RESEARCH SITE

VIEU was established in 1994 to represent the interests of staff, teachers and non-teachers in Victorian non-government (Catholic and Independent) schools. VIEU is a branch of the Independent Education Union of Australia (IEUA) and is in the only state where the state branch does not have a separate state body. As such, it is a federally, not state, registered union and, therefore, subject to a range of statutory audits. This made VIEU’s membership figures more reliable and less subject to extraneous influences where federal statutory audits were not in place.
This research particularly focuses on VIEU during the time period 1994 to 2004 for three reasons:

1. VIEU commenced at the beginning of 1994 from an amalgamation of four pre-existing unions and became a federally registered union making it subject to the Australian Industrial Relations Commission (AIRC) audit processes.

2. The period of 1994 to 2005 is a period of stable leadership of VIEU with effectively only two General Secretaries: Michael Flinn from August 1994 (a few months after VIEU’s inception) to December 1999 and then Tony Keenan until his resignation as General Secretary in late 2005.

3. The VCSA, the registered employers’ association established in 1983, was dissolved in 2005 and a new industrial relations employer governance structure began.

In short, the research commenced with the inception of VIEU and concluded prior to 2005 when there was a change in both leadership groups.

1.4 PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

This research focuses on the paradoxical growth of VIEU in an era of declining trade unionism in Australia. The purpose of this research is to gain a more informed and sophisticated understanding of why teachers in Victorian Catholic schools chose to associate or not associate within their trade union, VIEU. Here it was assumed that this understanding could contribute to the development of a conceptual framework that would describe the determinants of union growth in a postmodern era. This conceptual framework would, in turn, inform a model of trade union leadership that would not only serve to strengthen trade unionism in Catholic education but also to arrest the decline of union membership in Australia.

1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESEARCH

There is, of course, an intrinsic value in researching any paradox, including the one that is the focus of this research. However, to date, this phenomenon has remained unexplored by researchers. An extensive search of the research literature identified a lacuna concerning trade union membership in education, in particular in Catholic education, not only in Australia but universally. A search of two significant databases established by the Australian Council of Educational Research (ACER), namely the ‘Australian Education Theses and Education
Research Online’ identified only one Masters study in the area of trade union membership (Walker, 1980). Walker’s thesis pre-dates the main timeframe of this research (1994 – 2005) and dealt with librarians in tertiary institutions and not with teachers in Primary and Secondary schools. Searches of Ovid Online and ERIC drew another complete blank on trade unionism in Catholic education in Australia.

As well as the intrinsic worth of researching an unexplained paradox, the significance and justification for this research lay in two areas. First, the Catholic Church in Australia is the nation’s largest private employer (Commonwealth of Australia, 2000). Unlike other employers, the Catholic Church has a duty to act as an employer, subject not only to civil legislation but also to the Church’s social teachings and Canon Law. As such, the Catholic Church has the potential and the responsibility to play a role as a leader in employment relations in Australia. As Molony (1991) states

in the future, others again will turn to it (Rerum Novarum) when the question is asked why the Catholic Church still retains a voice and role in the … most important affairs of the human race, …Workers (should) not be forgotten by the Church. Without the workers, the Church, the State under whatever form, and all human history have neither meaning nor finality. (pp. 5-6)

Second, as Lewis (2000) states, the decline in trade union membership in Australia has been so rapid and unstoppable that for trade unions there is “the real risk that the movement could soon become an historical footnote from the industrial age” (p. 151). The urgency to find a solution to the problem has been recognised by a series of the Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) Congresses. Declining membership was a particular focus for the 1987’s Congress, Future Strategies for the Trade Union Movement (ACTU, 1987), 1989’s The Way Forward (ACTU, 1989a), 1991’s Future Directions of the Trade Union Movement (ACTU, 1991) and 1999’s Unions @ work (ACTU, 1999). However, all attempts by the ACTU have so far failed to arrest the decline. In 1909, Clarence Darrow (as cited by Riley, 1992) wrote

with all their faults, trade unions have done more for humanity than any other organization of men (sic) that ever existed. They have done more for decency, for honesty, for education, for the betterment of the race, for the developing of character in man (sic), than any other association of men [sic]. (p. 147)

Riley (1992) states that “unions still have a vital part to play in improving the quality of life for their members” (p. 147), a view in line with the Church’s social teaching. Laborem Exercens states that the purpose of trade unions is to defend the vital interests of employees: “they are … a mouthpiece for the struggle for social justice, for the just rights of working people in accordance with their individual professions” (John Paul II, 1981, para 20).
The resolution of the paradox of VIEU’s counter trend in increasing membership density could form the solution, or at least part of the solution, for the ACTU in maintaining the relevance of unions in Australian society in the future. If so, this research will have helped meet, in a very practical sense, the exhortation of the Australian Catholic Commission for Employment Relations (ACCER) (2002a) that “Church employers should seek to establish a co-operative working relationship with trade unions” (p. 8).

1.6 THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1.6.1 Formulating the main research question and guiding questions

A literature review and Shister’s (1953) model formed the foundation for the guiding questions in the Exploratory Stage. Those factors that emerged from the Exploratory Stage formed the foundation for the guiding questions in the Inspection Stage.

1.6.2 The main research question

The main research question was,

what factors have contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union during the period 1994 to 2004?

1.6.3 The Exploratory Stage guiding questions

This research commenced with a literature review of all the explanations offered for the decline in the membership of unions. These reasons framed the research’s guiding questions for the Exploratory Stage. The four guiding questions for the Exploratory Stage were:

1  Is the profile of VIEU’s membership typical or atypical of union membership in Australia from 1994 to 2004? Six postulates were derived from the literature review for the Exploratory Stage Phase 1 part of the research.

2  Are the general factors cited worldwide and the specific factors cited for Australia for the decline of trade union membership present and have they impacted on VIEU from 1994 to 2004? Four postulates associated with the general factors cited
worldwide and nine postulates associated with specific factors cited for Australia were derived from the literature review for Exploratory Stage Phase 2 part of the research.

3 Are the factors cited by teachers for joining VIEU typical of union membership in Australia from 1994 to 2004? Three sub questions were derived from the literature review for the Exploratory Stage Phase 3 part of the research.

4 Is Shister’s (1953) model for the general growth of unions adequate in VIEU’s context? Two sub questions were derived from the literature review for this part of the research.

1.6.4 The Inspection Stage guiding questions

The confluence of questions in the Exploratory Stage eliminated some factors and highlighted others by an iterative process. The emergent issues revealed in the Exploratory Stage formed the focus for the Inspection Stage. Following a second literature review to clarify these issues, the resultant three guiding questions for the Inspection Stage were:

1 Have the leaders of the employee and employer groups consciously or unconsciously put in place practices and strategies that support union membership that are outside the typical approach of unions and/or employers? Three sub questions were derived from this literature review for the Inspection Stage Phase 1 part of the research.

2 Are the motivators for teachers different to the general population and, if so, how has this affected their decision to associate or not to associate with VIEU? Three sub questions were derived from this literature review for the Inspection Stage Phase 2 part of the research.

3 What evidence, consistent with the existing data, can be brought to bear to explain the dip that occurred in VIEU’s non-Catholic (independent) schools and Catholic non-teacher membership between 1997 and 2000?

1.7 DESIGN OF THE RESEARCH

The research design rejected the traditional dichotomy between the ontological bases of positivism and interpretivism, accepting Pawson’s (1985) view that the ontological debate was a
myth: "which ever way you look at it, it is clear that positivism versus phenomenology is a dead duck" (p. 72). The epistemological framework of this research was based on constructivism using an interpretivist approach, in particular “symbolic interactionism” (Charon, 2004, p. 189) with its two sequential Exploratory and Inspection Stages.

Symbolic interactionism is seen to be appropriate for studies involving the influence of social interactions on social structures and the individual’s self-identity (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007). Moreover, it is noted in the literature that a symbolic interactionist perspective has been effectively applied to research in respect to meaning making and identity formation in educational institutions (Kinney, Brown Rosier & Harger, 2003). Whilst symbolic interactionism cannot explain everything, it is nonetheless “an exciting and useful perspective for understanding human life” (Charon, 2004, p. 190). Given the strength of this claim and associated research activity, it was thought appropriate that symbolic interactionism inform the design of research that sought to investigate teacher perspectives in respect to association in their union.

Symbolic interactionism comes from the field of social psychology that subscribes to a deterministic view of human behaviour in which the reasons, or causes, of human behaviour are said to arise from the social situations that individuals encounter (Charon, 2004; Stryker, 2002). In particular, symbolic interactionism is influenced by four key beliefs. First, what is real for human beings always depends on their own active intervention, their own interpretation or definition. Second, the worthiness of knowledge is judged by how practical, applicable, and useful it is in helping to understand a given social situation. Third, the elements within the particular social situation are defined in terms of their specific usefulness in that situation. Finally, the initial focus of social research should be on the actions and behaviours that are occurring, which are then used to guide further exploration. Consequently, symbolic interactionism, as a research methodology, provides an example of social research of an “interpretivist persuasion” (Schwandt, 1994, p. 122).

In line with the theoretical framework of symbolic interactionism, the design of this research involved two stages of research: the “exploration” stage and an “inspection” stage. In Stage One, the exploration was designed to sensitise the researcher to the situation by coming to an understanding of “what’s going on around here” (Charon, 2004, p. 195). This exploration involved a number of phases including a contextual analysis, a review of the literature and a survey of VIEU members. This exploration of the research site resulted in the identification of specific issues for further inspection in the second stage of inspection. This inspection stage involved a further contextual analysis and review of the literature as well as a series of focus groups and a follow-up survey. In the course of this research, the researcher came to understand
this movement from exploration to inspection as a ‘learning journey’ that was not always linear but responsive to new understanding.

Thus, this research relied on a “mixed methods” (Cresswell, 2003, p. 17) procedure for data collection, analysis and interpretation. Consequently, it employed strategies of inquiry that involve collecting data either simultaneously or sequentially to best understand research problems” (Cresswell, 2003, p. 19). Moreover, quantitative and qualitative methods were employed resulting in the database including both numeric and descriptive information leading to the “integration of the two styles of research (was) not only feasible but also more constructive than relying on one method alone.” (Zhang, 2001, p. 97)

This research relied on a “modified analytical induction approach” (Wiersma, 1995, p. 220). This is an interactive approach to data collection and interpretation that starts with an overarching research question that was subsequently expanded into a number of guiding questions that attempted to gather in all the data and produce a comprehensive descriptive model or conceptual framework that produced a universal explanation of the phenomenon. In the course of the ‘learning journey’ that followed, these guiding questions were adapted and explanations that patently did not apply to VIEU’s situation were discarded. The explanations that could not be eliminated were then passed through to the next phase or stage of the research for further investigation and eventual incorporation into the conceptual framework that provided the comprehensive model for the explanation of VIEU’s counter-trend to union density growth.

Significantly, the research design used a learning journey approach, that is one where a predetermined, locked step research design was rejected. In conjunction with this open ended learning journey approach, the design employed Shister’s (1953) widely accepted general model for union growth and decline as an initial conceptual model. As a result, the data gathered in the Exploratory and Inspection Stages were used to modify and adapt this conceptual framework as the data emerged. A new conceptual framework resulted that allowed the main research question to be answered, not just for VIEU’s situation but for the trade union movement in general.

1.8 DEFINITIONS

A number of definitions have been adopted and they are contained in a glossary as Appendix B.
1.9 AN OUTLINE OF THE THESIS

This thesis has nine chapters including this introductory chapter. Each chapter presents a separate step or a sequence of steps along the learning journey taken.

Chapter Two describes the research design and methodology and situates the research within the theoretical framework of symbolic interactionism. It also provides details in respect to two stages of the research (i.e., exploration and inspection) as well as the mixed methods approach employed in the various ‘moment’ of data collection, analysis and interpretation. It establishes a broad map for the learning journey that is concerned more with how the decisions are to be made along the journey rather than establishing a predetermined map or plan on how the journey might unfold.

Chapter Three outlines the first step of the learning journey by clarifying the context in which VIEU is operating as a union. This contextual analysis recognised the postmodern challenge to trade unionism worldwide and confirmed the decline in trade unionism in Australia. At the same time, this context analysis reinforced the growth of union membership within VIEU and recognised that it operated in the education industry and with the Catholic Church as the predominant employer. Consequently, the researcher was again committed to investigating this paradoxical phenomenon with a view to arresting the decline of trade union membership.

Chapter Four is the second step of the learning journey. It is a literature review that encompasses all the explanations offered for the decline in union membership in Australia and worldwide. It establishes the framework for the Exploratory Stage research by identifying a series of guiding questions that in the course of the research allowed certain possible explanations to be discarded as being irrelevant to VIEU’s context. This review of the literature also highlights the seminal writing of Shister (1953) in respect to determinants of union growth. In conclusion, this review of the literature resulted in the acceptance of Shister’s model as the initial conceptual framework for data collection, analysis and interpretation that followed within this research.

Chapter Five reports on the third, fourth and fifth steps of the learning journey and it displays the data gathered from the Exploratory Stage. The data are displayed ‘in situ’ and are embedded within the learning journey process. The Exploratory Stage of the research identified eight factors as possible explanations for teachers in Victorian Catholic schools choosing to associate in their union.
Chapter Six reports on the sixth and seventh steps of the learning journey. The sixth step reviews the adequacy of Shister’s model as the initial conceptual framework whilst the seventh step offers an additional literature review based on the issues emerging from the Exploratory Stage. This review of the literature led the researcher to take the eight factors identified in the Exploratory Stage and coalesce them into two key themes. These themes were then re-framed as three guiding questions. These guiding questions then provided a framework for data collection, analysis and interpretation during the Inspection Stage of the research.

Chapter Seven reports on the eighth and ninth steps of the learning journey. It displays the data that were obtained from the Inspection Stage and discusses these findings in the light of the three guiding questions identified in Chapter Six.

Chapter Eight reports on the tenth and final step of the learning journey. It brings together the data obtained from the Exploratory and the Inspection Stages and ties the findings together into a coherent whole. It also presents a new conceptual framework that amends Shister’s (1953) model. In short, Chapter Eight assigns theoretical significance to the findings of this research.

Chapter Nine concludes the thesis by answering the main research question. It includes a reflection on what constitutes ‘good union leadership’ and a set of recommendations for practitioners in the area of trade unionism, particularly those in an educational and Church context. Finally, it makes recommendations regarding further research in this area.
Chapter 2  Design of the Research

2.1  INTRODUCTION: A LEARNING JOURNEY AS THE MAIN FRAMEWORK

This chapter outlines the design of the research. Research is carried out to discover something about the world but in a systematic, not a haphazard way (Schumacher & McMillan, 1993; Wiersma, 1995). Consequently, in this research, the metaphor of a ‘learning journey’, an exploration into unknown lands, has been adopted to act as a framework to help structure a systematic approach. In field studies, “learning journeys are designed to surface, test and shift key assumptions” (Boyer, 2004, p. 1). The learning journey approach assumes that

- no two learning journeys are identical and, therefore, the pathways taken must be customised to the context of the research (Boyer, 2004)
- the journey is not unstructured, nor is it predetermined
  - a broad map of the journey can be sketched prior to commencing on the journey but, as the journey unfolds, different routes and unexpected detours will occur depending on what is discovered along the route taken to date (Boyer, 2004)
  - each component builds upon the preceding one; a discovery at one site on the route will shape the path that will be taken thereafter on the journey (Griffin, 1998)
  - multiple methods of data collection will be used to uncover the pathway (Ajjawi & Higgs, 2006)
- while the journey or exploration has a goal, that goal is the solution to a problem, not a known destination. It is a “learner directed, reflective journey of investigation” (Griffin, 1998, p. 5).

In line with this understanding of research as a ‘learning journey’, this chapter provides a broad ‘map’ that served to guide that learning journey that was this research. In particular, this chapter identifies the research paradigm and theoretical framework in which this research is situated, details the design of the research and explains the various methodological choices ‘along the way’. 
2.2 THE RESEARCH PARADIGM

As a starting point for the design of this research, it is important to state the researcher’s particular version of reality (ontology) and ways of knowing that reality (epistemology) based on a set of underlying assumptions (Neumann, 1994). Here it is noted that each research paradigm offers a distinct ontological and epistemological understanding of reality and knowledge and, consequently, recommends its own methodical procedures. Thus it is recommended that researchers at the outset of their research reflect on their “assumptions about how they will learn and what they will learn during their inquiry” (Cresswell, 2003, p. 6). The commonly accepted approach, as outlined by Cresswell (1998), to determine the research method and design is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ontological basis</th>
<th>The researcher’s view of reality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epistemological approach</td>
<td>What counts as knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>How the research is conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>The particular instruments used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7
Schema for determining the research method and design

While McLaughlin (2003) correctly asserts that “no research is atheoretical” (p. 7), in this research the traditional ontological dichotomy between positivism and interpretivism was rejected. Gone are the days when qualitative research was regarded as less rigorous than quantitative research so that “like the nets of deep sea explorers, qualitative studies may pull up unexpected and striking things for us to gaze on” (Barton and Lazarfield, 1969, p. 166) but without any exacting examination. Gone too is the insistence by researchers (e.g., Kemmis, 1982; Leedy, 1989; Sproull, 1988) that the ontological basis for research determined not only the epistemological and methodological approaches, but even the typical instruments employed. There is now a recognition of the complementary nature of the research methodologies (Guba, 1990; Guba & Lincoln, 2005). Initially, instruments traditionally associated with quantitative and qualitative research were blended in the one research design (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000) allowing an “unfolding (of) multiple realities” (Owens, 1991, p. 293), so that there were “successive approximations towards an accurate description and interpretation of the problem” (Wiersma, 1995, p. 85). These blended research designs eventually challenged the traditional theoretical framework divide (Brannen, 1992; Hammersley, 1992) arguing that the two paradigms were not “exclusive, but complementary” (Husen, 1997).
This research accepts, as Phillips (1983), Smith and Heshusuis (1986) and Platt (1986) argue, that the ontological debate was pointless, a ‘sociological babel’ (Bulmer, 1986) where supporters of the different paradigms in this ‘war’ (Gage, 1989) pointlessly wasted time and effort in the justification of their paradigm and the criticism of the opposite paradigm without success (Skrtic, 1991). It accepts Pawson’s (1985) view that the ontological debate was a myth, a non-debate caused by institutional inertia; "which ever way you look at it, it is clear that positivism versus phenomenology is a dead duck" (p. 72).

2.3 EPISTEMOLOGY: PRAGMATIC CONSTRUCTIVISM

McLaughlin’s (2003) schema below (Table 1) provides a neat overview of how the competing ontological approaches, epistemologies and methodologies have been blended, although he places the caveat that “this is an overview only. There is a degree of oversimplification in order to conceptualise the ‘competing theories’. One can have a positivist ethnography or case study. Likewise, one could use a survey in interpretivism research” (p. 9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE</th>
<th>OBJECTIVISM</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTIONISM</th>
<th>SUBJECTIVISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE</td>
<td>• Positivism • Post-Positivism</td>
<td>• Interpretivism • Symbolic Interaction • Phenomenology • Hermeneutics</td>
<td>• Critical Theory • Post Colonialism • Feminist Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODOLOGY</td>
<td>• Experimental Research</td>
<td>• Phenomenological • Grounded Theory • Ethnography • Biography • Case Study</td>
<td>• Action Research • Discourse Analysis • Feminist Standpoint Research • Critical Ethnography • Critical Case Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the purpose of this research is about a study of freedom of association, in particular attempting to identify why some teachers in Victorian Catholic schools choose to, or not to, associate (via a trade union), the data collected varied from numeric to descriptive. In terms of
McLaughlin’s (2003) overview, this immediately ruled out using a purely positivist (quantitative, nomothetic) approach or a purely subjective (qualitative, idiographic) approach. However, as Punch (1998) points out “by comparison with quantitative research, qualitative research is multidimensional and pluralistic with respect to paradigms” (p. 140) so while the former in its pure form can be eliminated entirely, the latter in a non-pure (in terms of being wholly subjective) and more inclusive form provided an appropriate methodology. Accordingly, an interpretivist/constructivist epistemology was regarded as the most appropriate because it emphasised that “the study of social phenomena … requires an understanding of the social world which people have constructed and which they reproduce through their continuing activities” (Blaikie, 1993, p. 36). This research assumed that when people chose to associate or not to associate

- while they did so for purely personal or subjective reasons, the respondents could articulate why they had chosen to associate or not to associate, even though those reasons would vary from group to group and possibly from person to person
- they consciously chose to identify as part of a group and, as such, act within a social setting; they had developed a meaning and sense of their world within the group setting (when associating). Conversely, in choosing not to identify as part of a group, they chose not to operate in that social setting.

In deciding upon the epistemological perspective for this research, the researcher recognised, as stated above, that various research paradigms claim legitimacy within the literature (Guba & Lincoln, 2005). However, constructivism offers a distinctive research paradigm because it “assumes a relativist ontology (there are multiple realities), a subjectivist epistemology (knower and respondent co-create understandings), and a naturalistic (in the natural world) set of methodological procedures” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003, p. 35). While constructivism is subject not only to reliability and validity criticisms including the “perdurable problem of criteria and objectivity” (Schwandt, 1994, p. 130) but also to the unresolved epistemological issue of whether “knowledge is shaped by external nature … (or) … that knowledge, and perhaps ‘nature’ itself, is shaped by human activity” (Bredo, 2000), both of these areas of concern are partially overcome by constructivism’s openness to multiple methodologies.

In particular, pragmatic constructivism was accepted as the epistemological perspective for this research, because it accepts multiple realities. It has been stated that constructivism itself is in “blooming, buzzing confusion” (Phillips, 2000) because it admits a variety of positions on perceived reality (Bredo, 2000; Woolfolk, 1998). Shulman (1986) initiated this strand of constructivism by arguing that different perspectives alert researchers to different phenomena of
interest, different conceptions of the problem and different aspects of events which would be likely to be ignored within a single perspective. Burbules (2000) extended the argument by stating that rather than trying to choose between the various polarised or dichotomised perspectives, scholars should adopt a more ‘pragmatic’ perspective; an approach that took constructivism beyond this epistemological impasse by arguing that each perspective should be viewed as an authentically separate, and not competing, source of knowledge. Reinforcing and extending this pragmatic approach, researchers including Gall, Gall and Borg (2006) and Best and Kahn (2006) have argued that while both qualitative and quantitative research are both good methods of evaluation applied individually, combining them to describe phenomena in a single case study greatly increases their benefits to the researcher by adding a degree of validity and reliability through triangulation of the evidence.

In addition, this research settled on the research paradigm of ‘pragmatic’ constructivism, as the most suitable epistemological basis for this research because it

- rejects the positivist assumption of an objective reality as well as rejecting post-positivism’s ‘critical realism’, which still accepts objective reality, albeit that it can only be gained imperfectly (Guba & Lincoln, 2005)
- has its strength in its ability to illuminate that about which little is known or is hidden from view (Heck & Hallinger, 1999)
- overcomes the hidden nature of phenomenon by gaining an understanding from the point of view of the lived reality of those people who are intimately associated with the phenomenon (Schwandt, 1994)
- gains knowledge by “individual reconstructions coalescing around consensus” (Guba & Lincoln, 2005, p. 194)
- relies on perceptions, meanings, understandings and interpretations of those intimately associated with the phenomenon to help to construct new knowledge about it (i.e., trade union membership) and, thereby, further clarify its nature (Coleman & Briggs, 2002).

2.4 THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE: SYMBOLIC INTERACTIONISM

Within pragmatic constructivism, symbolic interaction was chosen as the most appropriate theoretical perspective. Symbolic interactionism comes from the field of social psychology that subscribes to a deterministic view, that is, that the reasons for or causes of human behaviour arise from the social situations we encounter (Charon, 1998). Symbolic interaction is often associated with the social psychologist George Mead; however it was Blumer,
in 1937, who developed Mead’s thesis and coined the term symbolic interactionism (Gingrich, 2000). Blumer (1969) stated that

‘symbolic interaction’ refers … to the peculiar and distinctive character of interaction as it takes place between human beings. The peculiarity consists in the fact that human beings interpret or ‘define’ each other's actions instead of merely reacting to each other's actions. Their ‘response’ is not made directly to the actions of one another but instead is based on the meaning which they attach to such actions. Thus, human interaction is mediated by the use of symbols, by interpretation, or by ascertaining the meaning of one another’s actions. This mediation is equivalent to inserting a process of interpretation between stimulus and response in the case of human behavior. (p. 180)

While natural (behavioural) scientists subscribe to the following paradigm where the person makes a reflexive, involuntary response to a stimulus (they have no control and no choice

```
stimulus ➔ response
```

**Figure 8**

*The naturalist paradigm*

in their response), symbolic interactionism subscribes to a teleological paradigm where the person makes a purposeful, voluntary response to a stimulus. They have control and choice in their response. The meaning or interpretation they place on the stimulus influences or determines their response.

```
meaning
stimulus ➔ interpretation ➔ response
```

**Figure 9**

*The symbolic interactionist paradigm*

Symbolic interactionism rests on three primary premises (Charon, 1998)

- human beings act towards things on the basis of the meanings those things have for them. They do not respond passively to a reality that imposes itself but actively create and construct their world
- human beings learn about and come to understand their environment through interaction with others; thus, reality is largely social
- an interpretive process is used by each person in each instance in which that person must deal with things in their environment. Each interpretative process makes and modifies the person’s meaning or understanding. Individuals construct a view of themselves and society using symbols.
In short, symbolic interactionists argue that the “interaction that gives rise to our reality is symbolic – it is through symbolic interaction with one another that we give the world meaning and develop the reality toward which we act” (Charon, 1998, p. 61). This being the case, interpretation is vastly more important than a simple application of previously integrated meanings. It is, rather, an active process of formulation, reconsideration, and revision (Harris, 2002) focusing on “the instrumental and practical function of theory construction and knowing” (Crotty, 1998, p. 125) or the process of construction and meaning-making.

It is noted here that the critical theory approach as outlined by Vogt (1999) was considered but rejected because this research lacked an ultimate ‘call to action’ as required by critical theory. Granted, trade unions are political groups associated with emancipation from “the oppression of established power structures” (Gunter & Ribbins, 2002a, p. 378), with power struggles and social justice (Gunter & Ribbins, 2002b, p. 387) and with action “particularly toward more equity and justice (as the) end goal” (Lincoln & Guba, 2000, p. 172). However, this research is concerned with persons’ voluntary choices to associate or not to associate. When a trade union makes its ‘sales pitch’, the decision to accept or reject the invitation to join will, in large part, be dependent on what meaning and interpretation is placed on the incentives to join. Also, whether a person continues to associate or not to associate is an ongoing decision and not a ‘once and for all’ decision. As new incentives arise or as old threats diminish, the person’s commitment to association may wax and wane. Accordingly, this research was not concerned with a ‘call to action’ but an examination of reasons why people associate and, therefore, the symbolic interactionist approach was regarded as more appropriate because of its assumption that “the meaning of the human action is inherent in that action” (Schwandt, 2001, p. 134).

Significantly, in recent years, symbolic interactionism has taken a more pragmatic, constructivist ‘turn’ in respect to social research. Here, the emphasis is on ‘doing’ rather than ‘knowing’ as the researcher seeks to understand action from the perspective of those who act and to describe the elements of human interaction as well as its cause. As Charon (2004) argues:

Pragmatism is very important to symbolic interactionism primarily in its approach to how humans relate to their environment. It teaches that we always intervene in what is real, that knowledge is believed and remembered because it is useful to us. And that humans must be understood primarily by what they do in their situations. (p. 40)

The symbolic interactionist researcher asks, “What common sets of symbols and understandings (have) emerged to give meaning to people’s interactions?” (Best & Kahn, 2006, p. 255). Thus, symbolic interactionism offers an appropriate means of framing a pragmatic,
constructivist research project that seeks a more informed and sophisticated understanding of trade union membership. Finally, the symbolic interactionism approach within pragmatic constructivism allows for an acceptance of an eclectic range of data gathering processes and an evolving two phased Exploratory and Inspection Stage approach; the former being a broad ranging exploration of possible explanations to the issue and the second phase being an in-depth investigation of the probable explanations that surface in the Exploratory Stage.

2.5 METHODOLOGY

The design of this research required a number of methodological decisions in respect to the various moments of data collection, analysis and interpretation. Within this research, these decisions were informed by an understanding of symbolic interactionism as a method, the mixed methods approach to data collection as well as a modified analytical induction approach to data analysis and interpretation.

2.5.1 Symbolic interactionism as method

In line with the theoretical framework of symbolic interactionism, the design of this research was influenced by Charon’s “principles of investigation” (2004, pp. 193-196) to guide symbolic interactionist research. These state that symbolic interactionists

1. understand what is going on only if they understand what the actors themselves believe about their world
2. believe that it is important to gather data through ‘observing’ people in real situations
3. are critical of traditional social science, its use of scientific methodology for the study of human beings and its definition of important causal variables
4. regard a careful description of human interaction to be a central goal of social science
5. in studying human beings believe it is important to move away from mechanical models of causation (characteristic of natural science) to process based models.

In addition, it was quickly decided that this research should involve two stages, namely, “exploration” and “inspection” (Charon, 2001, p. 208). The Exploration Stage within the research design seeks to collate the data and gives a detailed description of ‘what’s going on around here’ in this particular area. Whilst giving a general description of the research problem, the Exploration Stage also identifies issues for further investigation. This investigation is carried out in the second stage of the research design, the Inspection Stage. This second stage involves
identifying key coded elements and themes around the issues identified during the Exploration Stage. Accordingly, both the Exploration and Inspection Stages allow the rich meanings and perspectives of the participants in the research to be voiced. This understanding of a two-stage research approach reinforced the researcher’s initial understanding that this research would represent a ‘learning journey’.

2.5.2 Mixed methods approach

This research employed a mixed methods approach to data collection (Zhang, 2001). In short, mixed methods approach is one in which the researcher tends to base knowledge claims on pragmatic grounds (e.g., consequence-oriented, problem-centred, and pluralistic). It employs strategies of inquiry that involve collecting data either simultaneously or sequentially to best understand research problems. The data collection also involves gathering both numeric information (e.g., on instruments) as well as text information (e.g., on interviews) so that the final database represents both quantitative and qualitative information. (Cresswell, 2003, p. 18)

This mixed methods approach is underpinned by the philosophy of pragmatism in that it is not committed to one philosophical world view or one ontology, epistemology or methodology (Cresswell, 2003). Thus “inquirers draw liberally from both quantitative and qualitative assumptions when they engage their research. Individual researchers have the freedom of choice. They are ‘free’ to choose the method, techniques and procedures of research that best meet their needs and purposes” (p. 12).

Within this research, the use of mixed methods approach, including both quantitative and qualitative methods, resulted in an extensive database. Quantitative data sources included numeric information descriptive statistics, legislative documents, ABS reports and surveys. This numeric information was supplemented by qualitative, text information collected from historical documents, legislative documents and focus group interviews. This research accepts the case for combining quantitative and qualitative approaches for two reasons. Firstly, the methods or particular instruments that were used in the research were associated with both ontological bases; statistics were appropriate for resolving the answers to some sub questions and historical data analyses were appropriate for resolving the answers to other sub questions. Secondly, the weft of the quantitative methods was used to bind the warp of the qualitative methods to create a rich weave. As Blaikie (1993) points out, “no one approach or strategy … provides a perfect solution to the researcher; there is no one ideal way to gain knowledge of the social world” (p. 215). Reinforcing this point, Saludadez and Garcia (2001) state the complementary nature of
 qualitative and qualitative methods means that the methodologies need to be seen as a “continuum rather than a dichotomy” (p. 8) leading to a situation where qualitative and quantitative approaches are used “in a complementary manner to provide a more holistic solution to the inquiry … (where) …each approach is used in relation to … different aspects of a research problem” (p. 9).

2.5.3 A modified analytical induction approach

Finally, the researcher adopted Wiersma’s (1995) modified analytic induction approach to data analysis and interpretation. This approach used in preference, but not to the total exclusion of the ‘funnel’ approach (Sprinthall, Schmutte & Sirois, 1991) (see Figure 10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funnel Approach</th>
<th>Modified Analytic Induction Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General questions which initiate the study</td>
<td>Specific research problem or questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible sites</td>
<td>Initial data collection - descriptive model that covers all cases of the phenomena under study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible subjects</td>
<td>Continued data collection cases that fit the model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential sources of data and data collection procedures</td>
<td>Continued data collection cases that do not fit the model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial data collection</td>
<td>Reformulation of the model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisions – moving toward specific group(s)/sites/conditions</td>
<td>Continued data collection and reformulation of the model as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased focus on the phenomena and subjects</td>
<td>Comprehensive descriptive model which is a universal explanation of the phenomena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More narrow data collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific phenomena and focused conclusions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10
Characteristics of the funnel and the modified analytical induction approaches

The modified analytical approach begins with a specific research question and then examines all examples or ‘cases’ of the phenomenon in attempting to build a comprehensive descriptive model. In particular, this modified analytical induction approach incorporated five characteristics appropriate for the research design. An initial moment of data collection follows with the intention of developing a comprehensive conceptual framework or descriptive model based on this review of the literature. Moments of data collection follow with the ‘learning’ from each research stage being incorporated into a reformulated conceptual model using an iterative
approach to data analysis and interpretation. This process allows for new paths of inquiry to be embarked upon during the learning journey as unexpected or unforeseen data is revealed. This research finishes with a new conceptual framework that incorporates all of the data collected in a comprehensive, cohesive way. Consequently, this new conceptual model provides a “satisfactory, universal explanation (for) the phenomenon under study” (Wiersma, 1995, p. 219) to ultimately resolve the research question and explain the paradox under investigation.

However, the disadvantage in the modified analytical induction approach was that it did not allow for the elimination of irrelevant data, as is the case with the ‘funnel’ approach. The ‘funnel’ approach might also be entitled the ‘filter’ approach because it examines all data and eliminates or filters out data that does not assist in explaining the phenomenon under investigation. In doing so, it gradually focuses in on certain data that hold the key to solving the mystery under investigation (Sprinthall, Schmutte & Sirois, 1991; Wiersma, 1995). This aspect of the ‘funnel’ approach was incorporated into this research design in Exploration Stage Phases 1 and 2 where a raft of explanations was examined in terms of its relevance to VIEU’s situation. Where those explanations proved to be inapplicable in VIEU’s situation, the potential explanation was eliminated as an explanation for VIEU’s counter-trend growth.

Thus, the design of this research was fundamentally underpinned by the modified analytical induction approach in that it was an iterative process that started with one overarching question and expanded into a number of guiding questions that attempted to gather in all of the data and produce a comprehensive descriptive model or conceptual framework that produced a universal explanation of the phenomenon. However, it is adapted in the early Exploration Stages (Phases 1 and 2) to allow for the elimination of those explanations that patently did not apply to VIEU’s situation. The explanations that could not be eliminated were then passed through to the next stage of the research for further examination and eventual incorporation into the conceptual framework that provided the comprehensive model for the explanation of VIEU’s counter-trend to union density growth.

In summary, the design of this research followed a number of methodological decisions. Firstly, this research applied “principles of investigation” (Charon, 2004, pp. 193-196) associated with symbolic interactionism as a method. Secondly, again in line with symbolic interactionist research, this design involved two stages of research activity, namely an “exploration” and an “inspection” (Charon, 2001, p. 208). Thirdly, this research applied a “mixed methods approach” (Creswell, 2004, p. 13) involving both quantitative and qualitative research methods. Finally, this research engaged a Wiersma’s (1995) modified analytic induction approach to data collection, analysis and interpretation. The bases for these decisions are summarised in Table 2.
Table 2
Design pathway and reason chosen or why the alternatives were rejected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Pathway and reason chosen</th>
<th>Reason why the alternatives were rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontology:</td>
<td>A rejection of the ontological debate (positivism versus phenomenology) accepting multiple realities</td>
<td>The purely positivistic and the purely subjective approaches are exclusively quantitative and qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>Pragmatic Constructivism offers a wide-ranging eclectic framework and emphasises an understanding of the social world which people have constructed</td>
<td>The relativist strand (critical theory, post colonialist, feminist theory) highlight the political nature of research and reject objective truth but accept an ideology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Particular theoretical perspective | **Symbolic Interactionism** arises from a deterministic view; i.e., human behaviour arises from the social situations and assumes that people
- make a purposeful, voluntary choices and actively create and construct their world
- act towards things based on the meanings those things have for them using an interpretive, learned, interactive process
Symbolic interactionists
- accept an eclectic range of data gathering processes
- use a two phased exploratory and inspection process | In both the interpretivism and hermeneutic approaches there is an assumption that the meaning of the human action is inherent in that action |
| Methodology     | **Symbolic interaction’s** two phased process works with a learning journey framework
**Mixed methods** allows both qualitative and quantitative approaches
**Modified analytical induction approach** both incorporates and eliminates cases | The purely quantitative and qualitative approaches restrict the range of appropriate data gathering instruments |
| Methods         | **Quantitative**
- Descriptive statistics
- Inferential statistical analysis
- ABS reports | The purely quantitative and qualitative approaches restrict the range of appropriate data analysis techniques |
|                 | **Qualitative**
- Historical document analysis
- Legislative document analysis
- Focus group interviews
- Surveys |                                                                                           |

How these aspects of the research design came together on the ‘learning journey’ is illustrated in Figure 11.
Figure 11
A summary of overall Research Design
2.6 METHODS EMPLOYED AND DATA COLLECTION

The following section outlines the steps taken in each part of the research, the methods used in each step and how the design was modified in line with the modified analytical induction framework adopted. Also outlined is how in each step, the research question and the attendant guiding questions were framed to structure the pathways taken on the learning journey.

2.6.1 Step 1: Setting the context

The initial first step in this research examined the context in which VIEU operated. It established that VIEU existed

- in a postmodern world
- as part of the Australian industrial relations system
- specifically within the Australian education ‘industry’
- with the Catholic Church operating as an employer

and that each of these four worlds brought a unique perspective to the meaning of work and its purpose. It established that this context had led to union membership and density dramatically declining from 1994 to 2004, both in the total Australian workforce and its education sector, yet VIEU had gone against this general trend. In doing so, the main research question was framed, that is

what factors have contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union?

2.6.2 Step 2: Gathering possible explanations and data

On the basis of the contextual factors, the next step was a wide-ranging analysis of the literature encompassing the explanations that have been proffered to date for the decline in union density in Australia and the reasons given by employees for joining unions. The four areas examined were

- the structural factors associated for the decline in union density in Australia: the literature review revealed six possible explanations derived from structural (demographic contextual) factors
- the full array of historical and contextual reasons offered for the decline; first, those worldwide and then those specific to Australia. The literature review revealed 13 possible explanations cited from worldwide and Australian literature (historical contextual factors)
the reasons given by employees in Australia as to why they chose to join or not to join unions and whether these reasons were present in the current Australian industrial situation. The literature review revealed that there were seven reasons given by employees as to why they choose to join unions, with one of those reasons no longer being applicable in Australia, reducing the final number of reasons for further investigation to six.

an examination of Shister’s (1953) model for the general growth and decline in union density. Shister (1953) lists three interdependent factors necessary for growth that provided a comprehensive conceptual framework for the factors revealed by the literature review.

In this step there is also presented a framework for disaggregating the overarching research question and thereby established four guiding questions for the Exploratory Stage. The four guiding questions were each associated with one of the four sections outlined above. Each of the four guiding questions were then further disaggregated into a number of statements derived from a specific potential explanation examined in the literature review.

2.6.3 Step 3: The Exploratory Stage Phase 1
VIEU’S demographic and contextual profile

Guiding Question 1. Is the demographic and contextual profile of VIEU’s membership typical or atypical of union membership in Australia from 1994 to 2004?

The statements derived from the literature review were that

• as males are replaced in the total Australian workforce and in the Australian education sector’s workforce by females, there is a negative impact on union density
• as full time workers are replaced by part time workers in the total Australian workforce and in the Australian education sector’s workforce, there is a negative impact on union density
• as full time males are replaced by part time females in the total Australian workforce and in its education sector’s workforce, there is a negative impact on union density
• as blue collar workers are replaced by white collar workers in the total Australian workforce, there is a negative impact on union density
• as public sector workers are replaced by private sector workers in the total Australian workforce, there is a negative impact on union density
• as younger workers replace older workers in the total Australian workforce, there is a negative impact on union density.

Each of these structural reasons given for the decline of the Australian trade union movement was then applied to the Catholic sector of the Victorian education industry. The general proposition was that if the factor was present in the same way as in the general trade union scene and its education sector, then a corollary decline should have been experienced.

The appropriate method to test the six resultant propositions in all six cases was statistical analysis, consisting of an analysis of the rate (the relative percentage change) and the direction (positive or negative) of the growth for the total Australian workforce, its education sector and VIEU over the period 1994 to 2004. The ABS data were used for the total Australian workforce and its education sector. Data supplied by VIEU (for its membership) and by the Catholic Education Office of Melbourne (for the total cohort of Victorian Catholic teachers) were used for Victorian Catholic schools. Data were available from all sources for full time/part time status, male/female and the intersection of this group. Limited age specific data were available only from ABS. In Table 3 is presented a summary of the statistical method used for each area of examination.

Table 3
Examination method for the structural reasons given union density decline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of examination</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• as males are replaced in the total Australian workforce and in the Australian education sector’s workforce by females, there is a negative impact on union density.</td>
<td>Statistical analysis. For each of these 3 factors, an examination of the trend in the total Australian workforce and its education sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• as full time workers are replaced in the total Australian workforce and in the Australian education sector’s workforce by part time workers, there is a negative impact on union density.</td>
<td>• the relative strength and direction of the trend in the total Australian workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• as full time males are replaced in the total Australian workforce and in the Australian education sector’s workforce by part time females, there is a negative impact on union density.</td>
<td>• whether it is paralleled in its education sector or if there are differences and whether this trend is evident in VIEU’s membership numbers and density or whether VIEU is atypical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of examination</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• as blue collar workers are replaced in the total Australian workforce by white collar workers, there is a negative impact on union density</td>
<td>Statistical analysis. An examination and comparison of manufacturing sector’s (representing blue collar workers) and the education sector’s (representing white collar workers) relative strength and direction of union membership growth/decline and density rates over the period 1994 to 2004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• as public sector workers are replaced in the total Australian workforce by private sector workers, there is a negative impact on union density.</td>
<td>Statistical analysis. An examination and comparison of the public sector’s and the private sector’s relative strength and direction of union membership growth/decline and density rates over the period 1994 to 2004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• as younger workers are replaced in the total Australian workforce by older workers, there is a negative impact on union density.</td>
<td>ABS reports. An examination of 2 ABS reports, Research Note (Kryger, 2005) entitled ‘Australia’s ageing workforce’ and ABS’ Australian Labour Market Statistics: Australia Now (ABS, 2004a).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each potential explanation was examined separately and then it was determined whether that factor was either

- unique to VIEU and, therefore, a possible source that contributed to VIEU’s increasing union density between 1994 and 2004, (the proposition derived from the possible explanation was demonstrated to be true) or
- in common with Australia’s unions (the proposition derived from the possible explanation was demonstrated to be false) and, therefore, not a possible source that contributed to VIEU’s increasing union density between 1994 and 2004.

Those factors common to Australia’s general union movement were eliminated and those factors unique to VIEU were retained and used to inform the research focus in the subsequent Inspection Stage.

In examining these six demographic factors, two issues arose that required further exploration

- first, the one contextual factor that was not eliminated by this examination was that the employer of VIEU’s members was the Catholic Church (and its approach to employment relations)
- second, the one anomaly that occurred regarding the demographic profile was that the education sector did not fit the normal white collar template because its
density rates started higher than expected (i.e., higher than blue collar rates) and declined less than expected (i.e., decline less than blue collar rates).

Given the incremental design of this research, where one step informed the focus of the next step, both of these issues caused this Exploratory Stage Phase 1 to be extended

- first, to test the proposition that a factor may be that the employer of VIEU’s members was the Catholic Church, by examining the density rates of the two components of VIEU’s membership; those employed by Catholic schools and those employed by Independent (non-Catholic) schools and
- second, to test the proposition that a factor may be that the members were teachers. by examining the density rates of the two components of VIEU’s membership, teachers and non-teachers.

The examination that occurred in this extension caused a further extension to the first phase of the Exploratory Stage. A decline in VIEU’s membership was found in two sectors over a limited time period but not with teachers in Catholic schools. There was a decline in membership density that occurred for Independent, non-Catholic schools from 1997 to 2000 but not in Catholic schools and for non-teaching staff in Catholic schools from 1996 and 2001 but not for teaching staff.

2.6.4 Step 4. The Exploratory Stage Phase 2
The historical and contextual profile

*Guiding Question 2. Are the general factors cited worldwide and the specific factors cited for Australia for the decline of trade union membership (arising from the parent literature review) present and have they impacted on VIEU from 1994 to 2004?*

The statements derived from the literature review from the general factors cited worldwide were that

1. unions should hold a narrow view of their proper functions and confine their activities to the direct and immediate matters of wages and working conditions to avoid membership decline

2. the membership figures supplied by unions have been inflated, particularly in past years, and that the decline is a result of a comparing previously inflated figures with current accurate figures
the HRM shift from management-trade union relations to management-employee relations (addressing local concerns) has made unions (with centralised concerns) become increasingly irrelevant.

Australia is simply part of the international decline in the trade union movement.

The statements derived from the literature review from the specific factors cited for Australia were that

1. trade unions in Australia, founded on the British trade union model, use a conflict-based model for dispute settlement that is now unattractive to many workers who prefer the agreement-based model of Enterprise Bargaining.

2. trade unions’ density suffered from the loss in the 1990s of the long standing legislation that protected and prescribed the role of the trade union movement in Australia.

3. the political affiliation of trade unions has caused them to lose membership.

4. the poor public perception of trade unions has caused them to lose membership.

5. where trade unions lose preference clauses, this has resulted in them losing membership.

6. the changes brought on by the Accord process (specifically the acceptance by unions of the need to support the Hawke and Keating governments’ social changes) resulted in them losing membership.

7. the changes brought on by the EBA process (specifically the loss of the automatic right to be the bargaining agent for employees) resulted in unions losing membership.

8. the amalgamation of unions into larger, more bureaucratic institutions (causing members to feel disenfranchised) resulted in unions losing membership.

9. the internal political structures of unions (specifically their lack of democratic procedures) resulted in unions losing membership.

The potential explanations were not hypotheses as such but statements that give guidance to what issue needed to be resolved. As Wiersma (1995) states, in historical research “when hypotheses (propositions) are stated, they are usually not stated in a statistical sense ...
rather hypotheses are conjectures about the characteristics, causes of effects of the situations (and) issues or phenomenon under study” (p. 237).

The appropriate method to test the 13 resultant potential explanations varied. For the greater part, this section relied on historical research and document analysis. As Wiersma (1995) states, historical research is ‘both science and art’ (p. 232) because it requires the researcher to be especially sensitive to relevant data. Wiersma establishes two criteria to ensure that the documentation analysed is valid and reliable, and states that documents must undergo ‘external criticism’ and ‘internal criticism’. His schema is outlined in the Figure 12.
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**Figure 12**

**Criteria to ensure document analysis is valid and reliable**


In sourcing historical documents, wherever possible the documents relied on were from VIEU’s official publication VIEUPOINT and were authored by VIEU’s General Secretary at the time so that it was an openly published and authoritative source. Similarly, when sourcing VCSA documents, those relied on were from the VCSA Bulletin and were authored by the President at the time. The actual legislation was used whenever possible as the source for legislative precedent. In quoting legislation, the full citation is used and not a paraphrased version in keeping with legal protocols for citing legislation. Documents sourced for the history of VIEU and its precursors were predominantly from unpublished Masters’ theses to ensure that rigour in accuracy was maintained. Wiersma (1995) notes that the author is an important factor
in not only establishing the authenticity of the document in historical research, but also in establishing that the source was “competent to give an accurate report” (p. 240).

Table 4 lists the methods used to test each of the 13 propositions.

### Table 4
Examination method for the historical and contextual reasons given union density decline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of examination</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worldwide factor 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;that unions should hold a narrow view of their proper functions</td>
<td>Document analysis&lt;br&gt;An examination of VIEU’s website to check if a broad or narrow focus was taken in their recruitment literature and their view on the purpose of trade unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worldwide factor 2</strong>&lt;br&gt;false membership figures supplied by unions</td>
<td>Document and legislation analysis&lt;br&gt;An examination of the ABS data collection procedures and VIEU auditing requirements under the Workplace Relations Act (1996) and by the Australian Electoral Commission (AEC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worldwide factor 3</strong>&lt;br&gt;the shift from IR to HRM</td>
<td>Historical document analysis&lt;br&gt;An examination of the VCSA’s historical data to ascertain their approach and whether it was HRM or IR focused as well as VIEU’s response to the VCSA’s approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worldwide factor 4</strong>&lt;br&gt;that Australia was simply part of the international decline in the trade union movement</td>
<td>Statistical and literature review.&lt;br&gt;An examination of OECD’s data on worldwide union density decline to check if there was a pattern in like countries to Australia; an examination of the literature in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australian factor 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;the origins of the trade union movement in the British model with its concomitant <em>modus operandi</em></td>
<td>Historical document analysis including legislative precedents&lt;br&gt;Research into the historical beginnings of the Catholic unions and whether this reveals any source of inspiration or reflection in their <em>modus operandi</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of examination</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Australian factor 2 | Historical document analysis and contemporaneous legislation  
the role of legislation in protecting and prescribing the role of the trade union movement  
An examination of whether VIEU (or its immediate precursors) did enjoy the full legislative protection afforded to Australian unions particularly through the period 1994 to 2004 |
| Australian factor 3 | Historical document analysis  
the political affiliation of the trade union movement  
Research into whether/when the Catholic unions were affiliated with the general trade movement through the ACTU or the Victorian Trades Hall Council (VTHC) or the Australian Labor Party (ALP). An examination of VIEUPOINT to determine whether any political bias was present and whether a political ideology was promoted, particularly during election periods. |
| Australian factor 4 | Historical document analysis and statistical analysis  
a change in the Australian public perception of trade unions  
An examination of Australian public opinion polls on trade union membership |
| Australian factor 5 | Historical document and legislation analysis  
the loss of union preference clauses  
An examination of whether VIEU or its predecessors enjoyed union preference clauses, whether and when these clauses where excised from Awards and the effect of the removal of these preference clauses |
| Australian factor 6 | Historical document and legislation analysis  
the changes brought by the Accord process  
An examination of whether VIEU was affected by the Accord (Marks I to VII) process including the changes to the IR system that resulted. |
| Australian factor 7 | Historical document and legislation analysis  
the introduction of Enterprise Bargaining Agreements (EBAs) and Australian Workplace Agreements (AWAs) over the award system  
An examination of whether VIEU was affected by the introduction of EBAs and AWAs including the VCSA’s attitude to changes to the IR system that resulted and VIEU’s response to that |
### Table: Area of examination and Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of examination</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian factor 8</td>
<td>Historical document analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the effects of amalgamation of unions</td>
<td>An examination of the documents relating to VIEU and its precursors over the time of the period of the ACTU orchestrated amalgamation of unions and the corollary changes to the Victorian Catholic teacher trade union movement over the same time period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian factor 9</td>
<td>Historical document analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The internal political structures of unions and democracy</td>
<td>An examination of the literature and structures of VIEU and its predecessors and whether the union structures had been democratised over that time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these potential explanations given for the decline of the Australian trade union movement was applied to the Catholic sector of the Victorian education industry. The general proposition was that if the factor was present in the same way as in the general trade union scene and its education sector, then a corollary decline should have been experienced. Each potential explanation (factor) was examined separately and then it was determined whether that factor was either

- unique to VIEU and, therefore, a possible source that contributed to VIEU’s increasing union density between 1994 and 2004, (the proposition derived from the postulate was demonstrated to be true) or
- in common with Australia’s unions (the proposition derived from the postulate was demonstrated to be false) and, therefore, not a possible source that contributed to VIEU’s increasing union density between 1994 and 2004.

Those factors common with Australia’s general union movement were eliminated and those factors unique to VIEU were retained and used to inform the research focus in the subsequent Inspection Stage. In this second phase of the Exploratory Stage, no issue arose that required further exploration.
2.6.5 Step 5: The Exploratory Stage Phase 3

Reasons cited for joining trade unions in Australia

Guiding Question 3. Are the factors cited by teachers for joining VIEU typical of union membership in Australia from 1994 to 2004?

Sub question 1: are the factors cited by the general population also cited by teachers?
- A: protection from the employer
- B: improving pay
- C: improving teaching conditions (e.g., reduced workload)
- D: services such as credit facilities, insurance (health, property, etc.), discount purchasing, professional indemnity, professional development
- E: ideological belief in unions and/or politics
- F: solidarity with teachers in the school and the system?

Sub question 2: are there any different factors cited by teachers specific to the sector?

Sub question 3: are the factors cited by teachers given the same priority as the general population?

Sub question 4: are there demographic group differences between the options cited by teachers?

The survey of teachers

The third part of the Exploratory Stage involved a survey of teachers in Victorian Catholic schools and an analysis of the survey’s data. The information gathered in this research project was not objective but attitudinal or subjective. A survey was chosen for this part because the data being gathered was “attitudes (and) opinions” (Wiersma, 1995, p. 169). “Questionnaires and interview schedules should be used ... when people’s attitudes, values, beliefs or self-reports are desired” (Sproull, 1988, p. 190). Burns (1990) describes the questionnaire as “an efficient way of collecting data in large amounts” (p. 287) that is conducted to establish “what exists” (Travers, 1969, p. 191). Simple data gathering, is not, in itself, research although “well-conceived surveys of a broad field ... are, at times, useful starting points” (Hoy & Miskel, 1991, p. 5).

The survey was sent to all teachers in Victorian Catholic schools and was accompanied by a covering lettering and a pre-paid addressed envelope to return to the researcher (see Appendix C including the Human Research Ethics Committee approval).
It focused on the six reasons given for joining or not joining VIEU that were revealed by the literature review. The data collected were

- demographic: to provide a profile and allow an analysis of different sub-groups
- attitudinal: to allow an analysis of the relative importance of each cited reason.

The statistical analyses undertaken were

- Goodness of fit tests to determine whether the full sample of respondents and the sub-sample of VIEU members were significantly different from the population from which they have been drawn. A one-way chi-square test or ‘goodness-of-fit’ test was applied for each combination under the demographic data collected
- Description frequency tables to determine a rank order of each of the six reasons given for joining VIEU
  a protection from the employer
  b improving pay
  c improving teaching conditions (e.g., reduced workload)
  d services such as credit facilities, insurance (health, property, etc.), discount purchasing, professional indemnity, professional development
  e ideological belief in unions and/or politics
  f solidarity with teachers in the school and the system
- Measures of central tendency (mean, median, grouped median) to rank the six reasons given for joining VIEU. A synoptic view of the measures of central tendency was compiled to create an initial rank order of the six reasons cited for joining VIEU
- Wilcoxon signed rank (non-parametric) tests of significance were then conducted to determine if there were any statistically significant differences between the ranks and, thereafter, to compile a hierarchy of the six reasons given for joining VIEU
- Student t (a parametric alternative) tests of significance were then conducted on the same data to cross-validate the Wilcoxon signed rank (non-parametric) tests to determine if there were any statistically significant differences between the ranks and, thereafter, to compile a separate hierarchy of the six reasons given for joining VIEU. A joint hierarchy of reasons was then compiled from the results of these two processes using those results that were replicated in both the Wilcoxon and Student t tests of significance. To conduct the Student t (parametric) tests of significance on the same data to cross-validate the
Wilcoxon signed rank (non-parametric) tests, the ordinal data from the survey was transformed to interval data. A justification for this procedure and the attendant caveats is outlined in Section 4.7 (justification for the transformation of ordinal to interval scales in Steps 5 and 9 of the research design)

- Chi\(^2\) (non-parametric) tests of significance were then conducted to determine if there were any statistically significant differences between demographic groups for the ranks and, thereafter, to compile a matrix of significant differences. The demographic groups were
  a primary and secondary respondents
  b male and female respondents
  c respondents with 9 or less or 10 or more years of experience
  d full time and part time respondents
  e metropolitan and country respondents

- ANOVA (a parametric alternative) tests of significance were conducted as a way of cross validating the results obtained by using the Chi\(^2\) tests (parametric) for statistically significant differences between demographic groups for the ranks and, thereafter, to compile a separate matrix of significant differences. A joint matrix of differences between demographic groups was then compiled from the results of these two processes using those results that were replicated in both the Chi\(^2\) and ANOVA tests of significance

- Descriptive frequency tables to ascertain whether there were any different factors cited by teachers, specific to VIEU, that were not revealed by the literature review

- Finally, frequency tables, measures of central tendency (means, medians, grouped medians, modes), Wilcoxon Signed Rank and Student t tests of significance were conducted on the corollary six reasons given by teachers for not joining VIEU. A hierarchy of reasons was compiled and checked against the other hierarchy of reasons given for joining VIEU. No tests were conducted for differences between the demographic groups for this section.

The data demonstrated that there were factors that needed to be examined further. Accordingly, these two factors were used to inform the research focus in the subsequent Inspection stage and, consequently, a further literature review was needed to assist in framing the guiding questions for the Inspection Stage.
2.6.6 Step 6: A revision of Shister’s model.

The adequacy of the initial conceptual framework in terms of explaining the data gathered at this stage

Guiding Question 4. Is Shister’s model adequate in VIEU’s context?

Sub question 1: were there any different factors revealed in the Exploratory Stage that were specific to the sector?

Sub question 2: if so, does this indicate a revision of the conceptual framework?

This part of the Exploratory Stage did not involve any gathering of new data. Instead, it applied the data gathered in the first three phases of the Exploratory Stage to Shister’s (1953) model and found that the model was deficient in that it did not allow for an active role for the employer in supporting union growth; nor did it allow for an active role by members and prospective members to influence union leadership. A tentative revised model was devised for testing in the Inspection Stage.

2.6.7 Step 7: The Pre-Inspection Stage literature review

The final stage of the research design, the Inspection Stage, examined the eight factors that surfaced as part of the Exploratory Stage. Prior to framing the guiding questions for this stage, a second literature review was conducted that examined the two issues that caused Shister’s model to be amended as well as a review on the development of leadership theory. Those issues were

- the factors that motivate teachers, particularly where those factors are not the same as the motivators for the general population. That literature reviewed revealed that teachers were motivated by intrinsic rewards and not by extrinsic rewards
- the active role of employers in promoting union membership. The Catholic Church’s social teaching in this area was re-visited and a more in-depth review in the area of freedom of association was conducted. This review revealed that the Catholic Church demanded that a quietist view on freedom of association should not be adopted by the Church, even as an employer itself.
The eight factors that surfaced as part of the Exploratory Stage were initially coalesced under two themes, following the pre-Inspection Stage literature review and the re-examination of Shister's model at the end of the Exploratory Stage. The two themes were

1 Leadership influence
   a VIEU leadership's *modus operandi*
      o its awareness of the Catholic Church’s social teaching and its effect on its approach to industrial relations
      o the foundations of VIEU as a professional association
      o the conscious use of strategies (e.g., the use of democratic structures in its operations) to grow union membership
   b VCSA’s leadership’s *modus operandi*
      o its awareness of the Catholic Church’s social teaching and its effect on its approach to industrial relations

2 The motivators of teachers
   o VIEU’s members are teachers
   o Solidarity as a reason for joining VIEU (linked to VIEU’s members are teachers)
   o the length of time spent in VIEU as a member.

The Inspection Stage had three parts but they were not sequential phases as in the Exploratory Stage. One part examined the leadership groups of VIEU and the VCSA. The second part examined the motivators for teachers with respect to union membership. The third part examined the dip in VIEU’s non-Catholic and non-teacher membership that was revealed in the first phase of the Exploratory Stage in the light of the data gathered in the latter phases of the Exploratory Stage and then the Inspection Stage. Each part had a guiding question.

Given that “inspection involves isolating important factors within the situation, and describing the situation in relation to those elements … (and) forming descriptive statements about that element in a situation, then applying that to other interactive situations” (Charon, 1998, p. 212), the appropriate methods were essentially qualitative in nature, although some quantitative analysis was performed on the email survey results.

Two data collection processes were used
- focus group interviews with the leadership groups of the VCSA and VIEU
- a follow up email survey with respondents from the first survey who had indicated that they were willing to participate in such a follow up.
2.6.8 Step 8: The Inspection Stage Phase 1

Focus Group Interviews

Guiding Question 1

Have the leaders of the employee and employer groups consciously or unconsciously put in place practices and strategies that support union membership that are outside the typical approach of unions and/or employers?

The sub questions for this guiding question were:

- were the leadership groups aware of the Church’s social teaching in the area of work and freedom of association and, if so, did this influence their approach to trade unionism?
- did the fact that VIEU started out as a professional association of teachers, rather than as a union, have any lasting impact on it as a union?
- did the union leadership put in place strategies and practices that attempted to recognise and respond to its unique context?

Two focus group interviews were conducted; one with the leadership group of VIEU (the three General Secretaries for almost the entire period of time from 1994 to 2004) and one with the leadership group of the VCSA (the three Presidents during the period 1994 to 2004). The size of the focus group is important and is mainly determined by the purpose (in this case the number of leaders of the associations) but should consist of no more than six to eight respondents who meet with a moderator-analyst for the group discussion (Krueger & Casey, 2000). Given that opinions and attitudes are by definition subjective, a structured interview was used. In a structured interview a series of set questions are prepared to cover the topics to be covered. The interviews in this research used a semi-structured design because it allowed the interviewer to freely explore, probe and ask questions of the focus group interviewees to elucidate and illuminate answers within the questions posed (Morrison, 2002; Patton, 2002). However, the focus group interviews were not merely interview schedules but allowed flexibility and sought to add the dimension of ‘verstehen’ - a sympathetic understanding - focusing in on the meaning behind the facts (Bantock, 1973) because, as Vockell & Asher (1995) state, “it is important to probe to obtain further, more detailed and relevant information” (p. 199).

Focus group interviews were chosen at this stage of the research for a number of reasons. Focus groups are best used to ask specific questions about issues after having completed considerable research (Fontana & Frey, 2000) and can elicit what Saludadez and Garcia describe, from one reported experience, as “shared meaning … as they engage(d) themselves in
It was important to gather shared views where possible without requiring consensus because the factor being investigated was the leadership *modus operandi* and not the leadership style of one person. Accordingly, in the data recording where a statement is recorded that was not attributed to one of the participants, it indicated that there was general agreement on that point by the end of discussion of that issue. Conversely, attributed statements indicated that one or more of the participants held that view but that there was no general agreement on the point.

Focus groups also had the advantage of a naturalistic setting that allowed the researcher to confirm not just the facts but “the meaning behind the facts” (Grudens-Schuck, Allen & Larson, 2004) and allowed the participants to “tell the interviewer of their information on their own terms” (Vockell & Asher, 1995, p. 199). As Bell (2005) puts it, “focus groups are undoubtedly valuable when in-depth information is needed about how people think about an issue – their reasoning about why things are as they are and why they hold the views they do” (p. 162).

Participants were provided with a list of questions 48 hours before the focus group discussion (see Appendix C) as well as a copy of the initial survey to teachers (to assist with the answer to one of the questions) so that the interviewer could “reduce (his) reactions and interventions to a minimum” (Vockell & Asher, 1995, p. 199) given that the structure of the interview was established. The interviews were tape-recorded. Each of the focus group’s discussions were summarised by the researcher. These summaries were circulated to each member of the respective focus interview groups and each of them was asked to confirm the accuracy of the record or, alternately, to suggest any deletions, additions or amendments. No deletions, additions or amendments were requested by any of the participants. In reporting the findings of the focus group interviews, only the material in these summaries was used. This was done because, as Bell (2005) states, “wherever possible statements quoted in the report should be verified with the respondent” (p. 165).

The disadvantages of the focus group interview technique are, first, that the researcher needs to ensure that the focus group is not dominated by one person to avoid ‘groupthink’ and, second, that the results are not easily generalised (Fontana & Frey, 2000). However, these disadvantages can be tempered by using summaries (Punch, 1998) as in this research and by the researcher prompting participants. The researcher did not notice any domination in either group. This was not surprising given that each of the participants had been leaders of major institutions and, therefore, comfortable with being able to put their point of view.
2.6.9 Step 9: The Inspection Stage  Phase 2

Follow up survey

Guiding Question 2

Are the motivators for teachers different to the general population and, if so, how has this affected their decision to associate or not to associate with VIEU?

The sub questions for this guiding question were

- were the motivators for teachers those that address higher order needs rather than lower order needs?
- if so, were these higher order needs associated with long term members of VIEU rather than more recently joined members of VIEU?
- was the union leadership aware of these motivators and had the union leadership put in place strategies and practices that had attempted to meet these motivators?

This part of the Inspection Stage was conducted via a follow up email survey with respondents from the first survey who had indicated that they were willing to participate in such a follow up. The survey was used to collect data on sub questions one and two. Given that this was a follow up survey, the reasons for selecting the survey as a method were not repeated at this stage but the reasons relied upon for the initial survey were relied upon again at this stage (refer to Burns, 1990; Hoy & Miskel, 1991; Sproull, 1988; Travers, 1969; Wiersma, 1995).

The survey listed four statements

- Statement 1
  Preferably, VIEU should work collaboratively with the employers to progress matters and avoid adversarial approaches whenever possible
- Statement 2
  Being part of the union gives me a say in issues (educational and industrial) at both the school level and at the system level
- Statement 3
  It is important to me that VIEU listens to my point of view and is willing to change its policies as a result
- Statement 4
  It is important to me that VIEU has a ‘big picture’ view and addresses broad social justice issues (e.g., the common good to foster a more inclusive and just society) and not just address industrial relations issues.
Each of the four statements expressed a different aspect of the higher order needs that were raised in the Exploratory Stage (collaboration, participation, democratic structures and solidarity) and which were confirmed in the pre-Inspection Stage literature review as factors that motivate teachers. There was a hierarchy of statements, with Statements 1 (security in collaboration rather than conflict) and 2 (belongingness through participation), reflecting the lower order needs and Statements 3 (esteem and recognition through decision making) and 4 (solidarity through self actualisation) reflecting the higher order needs.

Respondents ranked each of the four statements on a Likert scale as follows

A: Strongly disagree  B: Broadly disagree  C: Somewhat disagree
D: Somewhat agree  E: Broadly agree  F: Strongly agree

The statistical analyses undertaken were

- descriptive frequency tables to determine the strength of agreement with each of the four statements. The statements concerned
  - the issue of collaboration
  - the issue of participative access
  - the issue of democratic processes
  - the issue of solidarity
- measures of central tendency (mean, median, standard deviation) to rank the six reasons given for joining VIEU
- Chi² tests (non-parametric) tests of significance were then conducted to determine if there were any statistically significant differences between the ranks and, thereafter, to compile a hierarchy of the six reasons given for joining VIEU
  - one to ascertain whether there was a difference between the ratings across the four statements
  - one to ascertain whether there was a difference between grouped Statements 1 & 2 and statements 3 & 4
  - six tests to ascertain whether there was a difference between each set of paired statements and for that to generate a hierarchy of statements
- Student t tests (parametric) were conducted to support the fact that there was a difference between the four statements for the total six options as revealed by the Chi² tests (non-parametric)
- a hierarchy of responses was compiled using the coalesced data obtained from the Chi² tests and the Student t tests
• further Chi^2 tests of significance were conducted to ascertain whether there was a difference between the responses to these four statements from respondents depending on their answer to the first survey

• Student t tests (unpaired) were conducted on those respondents who chose solidarity between the two sub-groups of those with 9 years’ experience or less and of those with 10 years’ experience or more

• a final Chi^2 test of significance was conducted on those respondents who chose solidarity as a sole reason for joining VIEU between the two sub-groups of those with 9 years’ experience or less and of those with 10 years’ experience or more.

To conduct the Student t (parametric) tests of significance on the same data to cross-validate the Chi^2 (non-parametric) tests, the ordinal data from the survey was transformed to interval data. A justification for this procedure and the attendant caveats is outlined in Section 4.7 (justification for the transformation of ordinal to interval scales in steps five and nine of the research design).

With regard to sub question three, two sources of data were used to examine this question. First, the focus group interview where the leaders were asked “which of the six reasons from the survey do you believe is the most popular reason why teachers join the union?” and “which of the six reasons from the survey do you believe is the least popular reason why teachers join the union?” This addressed the first part of the question, namely, ‘was the union leadership aware of these motivators’. Given that this was not a separate focus group exercise, the reasons for selecting the focus group as a method will not be repeated at this stage but the reasons relied on previously for using focus groups were relied upon again at this stage.

The second part of the question, ‘has the union leadership put in place strategies and practices that have attempted to meet these motivators’ was addressed by an examination of VIEU’s historical documentation through its website and publication VIEUPOINT. It was appropriate to use historical documentation for this part of the sub question because it produced actual data on what had been done rather than relying on VIEU leadership’s opinion (through their focus group answers) on whether these actions had been taken.
2.6.10 Step 10: The Inspection Stage Phase 3

Reconciling the anomalous dip in VIEU’s union density

Guiding Question 3

What evidence, consistent with the existing data, can be brought to bear to explain the dip that occurred in VIEU’s non-Catholic (independent) school and Catholic non-teacher membership between 1997 and 2000?

The final part of the Inspection Stage did not involve any gathering of new data. Instead it applied the data gathered in the Exploratory Stage and the Inspection Stages to this apparently contradictory set of data to test the robustness of the adapted conceptual framework.

2.7 JUSTIFICATION FOR THE TRANSFORMATION OF ORDINAL TO INTERVAL SCALES IN STEPS 5 AND 9 OF THE RESEARCH DESIGN

To conduct the measures of means and the Student t and ANOVA (parametric) tests of significance on the same data to cross-validate the measures of modes and medians and the non-parametric Wilcoxon signed rank and Chi² tests, the ordinal data from the surveys in Step 5 and 9 respectively of the research design were transformed to interval data. All data is either parametric or non-parametric. Data is considered to be parametric if three assumptions are met

- that the population is normally distributed
- that the population has equal variances and
- that the population is measured on an interval scale (Hays & Winkler, 1970).

However, the term non-parametric does not imply that these tests completely lack parameters but rather that the parameters are flexible and not fixed in advance and are, therefore, sometimes referred to as ‘distribution free’ tests (Zar, 1999). The general advice provided by “authors of introductory textbooks in psychology, education and other fields (is) that researchers use non-parametric tests when assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance (are) not satisfied” (Zimmerman, 1998, p. 56).

This advice is based on ‘representational theory’ and its underpinning measurement levels (nominal, ordinal, interval and ratio) which were first categorised by Stevens (1946) and then later used to develop what he called ‘permissible’ tests. Stevens (1959) devised a hierarchy
of ‘permissible’ tests; “the appropriateness of a given statistic is conditioned by the nature of the scale against which the measurement is made” (Stevens, 1959, p. 29) (summarised in Table 5).

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Data classified by</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Permissible measures</th>
<th>Example of permissible tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nominal</td>
<td>type or characteristic</td>
<td>non-parametric</td>
<td>mode</td>
<td>Chi²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordinal</td>
<td>with logical order</td>
<td>non-parametric</td>
<td>median</td>
<td>Wilcoxon rank order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interval</td>
<td>and equal differences between levels,</td>
<td>parametric</td>
<td>arithmetic mean</td>
<td>t tests and ANOVAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ratio</td>
<td>and having a true zero starting point</td>
<td>parametric</td>
<td>geometric mean</td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“This taxonomy was subsequently adopted by several important statistics textbooks and has thus influenced the statistical reasoning of a generation. Although criticised by statisticians, Stevens’ categories still persist in some textbooks” (Velleman & Wilkinson, 1993, p. 2). Stevens’ strict (representational theory) taxonomy has come under continuous criticism by ‘classical’ and ‘operational’ theorists (Velleman & Wilkinson, 1993) and, consequently, “the controversy over measurement scales and statistics, begun by Stevens (1946), still persists” (Zimmerman, 1998, p. 398).

The supporters of the representational theory presumed that they knew what measurement really was and they have taken it on themselves to prescribe some aspects of statistical practice within psychology. This presumption has not gone unchallenged. The representational theory is not the only theory of measurement. There are at least two others, the operational and the classical. (Zimmerman, 1998, p. 406)

Classical theorists, in particular, argue that the assertion, common to many traditional statistics texts, that ‘data values are nominal, ordinal, interval, or ratio’ simplifies the matter so far as to be false. Scale type, as defined by Stevens, is not an attribute of the data, but rather depends upon the questions we intend to ask of the data and upon any additional information we may have. It may change due to transformation of the data, it may change with the addition of new information that helps us to interpret the data differently, or it may change simply because of the questions we choose to ask. (Velleman & Wilkinson, 1993, p. 10)
Stevens’ taxonomy has been criticised by ‘classical’ and ‘operational’ theorists

- because they claim that “measurement scales are not related to statistical techniques (because) scale properties do not enter into any of the mathematical requirements for the various statistical procedure” (Gaito, 1980, p. 564)
- for being internally inconsistent, in that Stevens’ nominal level does not fit even his own definition of measurement (Duncan, 1984)
- because the generalised assumptions associated with parametric and non-parametric schemas often fail when tested on identical data (Zimmerman, 1998)
- but more importantly because the taxonomy is so inflexible, statisticians lose interpretative power particularly in relation to ordinal data when the assumption is uncritically applied that the differences between levels are not so large as to be of genuine concern (Michell, 1986).

In relation to this point about the transformation of ordinal data into interval data, Michell (1986) argues that

a researcher using such a scale may take it that the attribute being rated (say, degree of agreement with some attitude statement) is a continuous quantity and that subjects can judge numerical relations on this attribute to a certain (perhaps, rough) degree of precision. Thus, such a researcher will take these ratings to be quantitative information in the full-bodied, classical sense (though they may also be seen as containing a high degree of error). The objection that such a researcher's assumptions may be false is true of course, but irrelevant in this context. The point is that in using statistical procedures that leave Stevens's followers outraged, a researcher may be interpreting measurements within the classical theory, and so may be acting quite properly according to this theory. (p. 406)

As Velleman and Wilkinson (1993) point out

even Stevens himself waivered. In Stevens (1951, p. 26) he admitted that ‘As a matter of fact, most of the scales used widely and effectively by psychologists are ordinal scales. In the strictest propriety the ordinary statistics involving means and standard deviations ought not to be used with these scales ... On the other hand, ... there can be invoked a kind of pragmatic sanction: in numerous instances it leads to fruitful results. (pp. 6–7)

In short, strict inflexibility with regard to ordinal data denies the researcher an important interpretative tool by not being able to use parametric measures such as means (after converting an ordinal scale to an interval scale) and parametric tests such as t tests and ANOVAs

Experience has shown in a wide range of situations that the application of proscribed statistics to data can yield results that are scientifically
meaningful, useful in making decisions, and valuable as a basis for further research. (Velleman & Wilkinson, 1993, p. 7)

As Labovitz (1970) has argued, assigning numbers is an aid to data analysis (by permitting the use of sensitive, versatile, and interpretable statistics) and the procedure is not risky if care is taken to avoid extreme exponential distributions. In defending his position, he states that

the advantages of using interval transformations far outweigh the slight chance of falling upon an extreme exponential \((e^x)\), an highly unlikely example ... If a procedure is helpful nearly all the time, it should not be dropped because an unlikely example is presented. (Labovitz, 1971, p. 522)

So that, provided that a reasonable assumption can be made that the differences between the ordinal points is roughly equal and that the population distribution is reasonably normal, then the risk of transforming an ordinal into an interval scale is minimal. To assist in making these assumptions in the case of the surveys in Steps 5 and 9, it is noted that the risk involved in assuming that the differences between ordinal points are roughly equal are minimised when using large samples (i.e., samples \(\geq 25\)) with the two surveys being 3,555 respondents and 77 respondents respectively.

Large data sets present no problems. It is usually easy to tell if the data come from a Gaussian population, but it doesn’t really matter because the nonparametric tests are so powerful and the parametric tests are so robust. (Motulsky, 1995, p. 299)

Considerable progress has been made in recent years (Michell, 1997) in challenging the Stevens’ traditional taxonomy and while the debate between representational and classical theorists has not been, and is unlikely to ever to be resolved because ontological based differences are essentially incapable of compromise, recent texts (Clason & Darmody, 2005; Garson, 2008) have exhibited a relaxing of the rule with regard to using ordinal data and parametric tests, given some caveats.

The theory upon which the ... \(t\) test is based requires the ... sampled populations be normal and have equal variances. ... Fortunately ... most of the commonly employed tests are sufficiently robust to allow us to disregard all but severe deviations from the theoretical assumptions. ... It is sometimes declared that only non-parametric testing may be employed when dealing with ordinal scale data, but this is not so. There is nothing in the theoretical basis of hypothesis testing that requires interval or ratio scale data. (It might be argued, however, that a population of ordinal scale data is more likely to deviate unacceptably far from normality than is a population of interval or ratio data). (Zar, 1999, p. 146)

Accordingly, the ordinal data in the surveys in Steps 5 and 9 of the research design were transformed into interval data on the assumption that the differences between the ordinal points
was roughly equal and that the population distribution was reasonably normal. However, to ensure that the risk of this procedure was minimised even further, in reporting the results of the subsequent statistical measures and analyses, the evidence of the non-parametric measures and tests were treated as the primary source and the evidence of the parametric measures and tests were treated as secondary sources; i.e., they were used to illustrate and cross-validate the non-parametric evidence rather than to contradict it.

2.8 THE LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE USED AND BONFERRONI’S ADJUSTMENT

Some statisticians (Bland & Altman, 1995; Peres-Nato, 1999; Recsei & Seneta, 1987) state that a Bonferroni correction should be made when there is a series of the same statistical tests being done in a research project. The Bonferroni correction is designed to adjust the appropriate statistical (p) level downwards to allow for chance results and avoid making a Type I error (i.e., incorrectly declaring a significantly different result when one does not exist). Customarily, in social science research, the significance level is set at 0.05 so that, theoretically, in no more than 1 in 20 statistical tests will that test return a significant result when in reality there is none. The more tests, the more chance that a Type I error will occur, so that by using the Bonferroni method the significance level for the group of tests should remain at 0.05.

However, there is a serious drawback to this practice in that, by reducing the chance of a Type I error, the chance of a Type II error proportionally increases (i.e., incorrectly declaring no significant difference when one does actually exist). Recent articles have opposed the application of the Bonferroni adjustment for this and other reasons (Nakagawa, 2004).

There is still some debate among statisticians about when a Bonferroni correction should be applied with most opposing it (Perneger, 1998) to the stage that Morgan (2007) decries the “fetishism of p values” that has resulted. However, some statisticians (Zar, 1999) still insist that the Bonferroni adjustment is appropriate, in particular when exactly the same test is repeated across many sub-samples from the same sample population such as the demographic comparisons (experience, sex, full time/ part time status, etc.) made in this research.

In this research design it was decided, when dealing with a grouped series of tests, to act conservatively and apply the Bonferroni adjustment so that the chance of making a Type I error was reduced even if this was at the expense of increasing the chance of making a Type II error. Additionally, as previously explained as a further procedure to reduce the chance of errors, the
results of the non-parametric tests were cross checked against the more robust parametric equivalent (after the ordinal scale was converted to an interval scale) and where these test hypotheses’ results agreed, those results were accepted in preference to non-agreed (cross checked) results.

Without using the Bonferroni adjustment (i.e., if no correction was applied), the Bonferroni procedure returned a result that stated there was a chance of 0.8339 (83.39%) of finding one or more significant differences in 35 tests (this was the number of $\chi^2$ tests as well as the number of ANOVA tests that were conducted, in series, to test the demographic pairs). To return the significance level overall to 0.05, Bonferroni's adjustment returned a result that required the significance for each test to 0.001428571. As a result, in this research design the significance level for those two batteries of tests was set with $p$ at 0.001 and not 0.05.

2.9 CONCLUSION

Data collected in this thesis came from a wide range of sources including statistics, historical documents and respondent opinion expressed through surveys and interviews. These data were collected as part of a learning journey. Wiersma’s (1995) modified ‘analytic induction approach’ and the two stage symbolic interactionism model were used to structure the learning journey undertaken and, incrementally, to build a comprehensive descriptive model or conceptual framework capable of incorporating all of the factors that were revealed in the methodology’s Exploratory and Inspection Stages. The end product was a “satisfactory, universal explanation (for) the phenomenon under study” (Wiersma, 1995, p. 219) to resolve the research question.
Chapter 3   A contextual analysis

3.1  SETTING THE CONTEXT (STEP 1)

3.1.1  The background

Chapter Two describes the context of this research. It provides the background situation in which occurs the intriguing paradox that is the focus of this research. An examination of this trend to run against the norm must be placed against a contextual backdrop as each aspect of the background influences the growth of VIEU as an association; VIEU is a trade union operating in the late 20th and early 21st century, in Australia, in education where the Catholic Church is the employer.

Put into context, VIEU exists

- in a postmodern world
- as part of the Australian industrial relations system
- specifically within the Australian education ‘industry’
- with the Catholic Church operating as an employer.

Each of these four dimensions brings a unique perspective to the meaning of work and its purpose. Teachers in Victorian Catholic schools, like workers in all settings, are influenced by their context and their view of work will be coloured by it (Berrell, 1994). “Teachers and their associations frequently describe and dignify what they do as a profession, skilled craft or career. Teaching, however, is fundamentally a kind of work” (Hargreaves, 1994a, p. 39). Work defines people

Work is an essential part of being alive. Your work is your identity. It tells you who you are ... People don’t work for the sake of working ... It’s not the work itself that’s important to them. There’s such a joy in doing work well. (Kay Stepkin, as cited by Terkel, 1974, p. x)

This chapter has two parts. The first part outlines the history and development of the Western, Christian world’s understanding of work and how this has led to there being several perspectives on the purpose of work. If workers have a clear purpose for work, they have a clear purpose to associate in trade unions to further their work. Conversely, where workers have no clear purpose for work they potentially lack the motivation to associate in order to further their
work. The second part outlines how each of these varying perspectives have impacted on the four contexts in which VIEU operates and how each then potentially influences the purpose of work and the purpose in associating to further that work.

3.1.2 The limitation of this research to VIEU and its context

Prior to outlining VIEU’s context, it is important to note why this research is limited to VIEU and, therefore, the increase in Victorian Catholic schools. VIEU is a branch of the Independent Education Union of Australian (IEUA); however, comparative statistics on membership densities for other IEUA state-based unions were not possible for three reasons

- VIEU is the IEUA’s only state-based union where the state branch does not have a separate state union. VIEU is a federally registered, not state registered, union. This is a result of the abolition of the Employment Relations Commission of Victoria (ERCV) under the Commonwealth Powers (Industrial Relations) Act 1996 (Vic) (Act No.59/1996) whereby the state of Victoria referred certain of its power concerning industrial relations matters to the Commonwealth of Australia pursuant to s.51 (xxxvii) of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act (“the Constitution”) (Zeitz, 2000). The registration of federal unions is more tightly monitored with a requirement to lodge union membership under a statutory declaration each year to the AIRC and to the AEC. As such, VIEU is the only state-based union with coverage of Catholic teachers whose membership records are subject to independent audit. This makes VIEU’s membership figures more reliable and less subject to extraneous influences that might result in overstating membership such as maintaining unfinancial members on its membership database

- the IEUA has a wider coverage of the education sector than VIEU, including teachers working in some private pre-school (kindergarten and child minding centres) settings, Life Education Centres, business colleges and private English Language colleges. Accordingly, its reported overall membership figures would include some categories of workers not covered by VIEU and, therefore, the membership figures would not be comparing like with like

- IEUA was unable to provide a breakdown of its Catholic/non-Catholic membership or of its teacher/non-teacher sectors from its overall membership figures.
3.2 THE CHANGING VIEWS OF WORK FROM THE CLASSICAL CIVILISATIONS TO MODERNISM

The Western, Christian world’s view of work, particularly the purpose of work, has changed considerably over time.

There are myriad views on work, many of them embedded in our deepest unconsciousness, having been transmitted over centuries, and often associated with religious teaching. There is the curse of work ... the concept of work as divine service ... the idea of work as duty ... (as) a prime means of personal growth and self-fulfilment ... (as) something to do as little as possible, to earn as much money as possible to be spent on non-work or leisure. Socially work can be seen as an important means of self-definition in society, through which people gain a sense of usefulness, of status, of security, of where they fit into their community and into society at large. (Ekins, 1987, p. 86)

The current western, secular understanding of work and its purpose has been and still is influenced by a mix of the classical (Greco-Roman) perspective, the Jewish perspective in the Old Testament, the early Christian Church’s new perspective, the Reformation and Renaissance periods, the Age of Enlightenment, the industrial revolution and capitalism in the 19th century and scientific management, economic rationalism and the pervasiveness of information technology in the 20th century.

Furthermore, a worker’s understanding of the purpose of work will have an impact on their propensity to association in a union. If the worker believes a union will assist in fulfilling their purpose for work, then the propensity to associate in that union will be increased and vice versa. Significantly, also, the Catholic Church’s understanding on the purpose of work has, throughout time, consistently differed from the prevailing secular view on the purpose of work. This, in turn, has led the Catholic Church to a differing perspective from the prevailing secular view on the role and value of trade unions. The foundations of these differences are outlined in historical outline on the Western, Christian world’s view of work that follows.

3.2.1 Classical views from Ancient Greece and the Roman Empire

The ancient Greeks regarded work as a curse, if not “the primal curse” (Thomas, 1999, p. 3), their word for work being *ponos*, from the Latin *poena* for sorrow (Tilgher, 1930). Work was seen as demeaning, a corrupt waste of time (Anthony, 1977) and only fit for slaves (Braude, 1975). As Mackenzie (2003) states, for the Greeks “there was nothing spiritually meaningful or uplifting about everyday work” (p. 1).

The Romans had a similar attitude to work regarding it as the domain of slaves (Lipset, 1990) although their approach was tempered by their penchant for organisation and order. “Men
who learn trades and their descendents are held in less regard than other citizens, whilst any who need not work with their hands are considered noble” (Herodotus in *Histories c.480-c.425BC* as cited by Thomas, 1999, p. 38). The Roman view of work, through the spread of the Roman Empire and their habit of intermingling cultures in occupied territories, had a significant effect on many later cultures (Tilgher, 1930).

3.2.2 The Jewish tradition in the Old Testament

In some ways the Hebrew view of work was similar to the Greek and Roman tradition in that work was viewed as a "curse devised by God explicitly to punish the disobedience and ingratitude of Adam and Eve" (Rose, 1985, p. 28). However, the Hebrew view of work differed in that it was the lazy person who was despised, not the worker (Proverbs 10:4 and 13:4); it brought a release from poverty (Proverbs 14:23, 20:13 and 24: 30-34) and was not an activity done by those less fortunate for the benefit of others (Sir: 33:25-32). Most significantly, it was good and proper for people to work (Job 5:7) when it was “embraced as part of God's purposes” (Mackenzie, 2003, p. 1). These differences are reflected in the fact that the Old Testament uses two principal words for work; *mela*kh*a*, “which denotes God’s creative work and includes his presence within human history in carrying out his divine plan” (May, 1994, p. 992) and *avoda*, which denotes the labour of slaves.

3.2.3 A new perspective in the early Christian Church

1 The New Testament

The New Testament removed the difference in the value of work done by the mind and the body. May (1994) points out the two major themes of the New Testament are *soteriological* (Christ is man) and *eschatological* (Christ is God) and Christ became a man, an ordinary carpenter who did not avoid work. “Ordinary work thus has a soteriological significance, for it can and ought to be integrated into the being of Christians as they seek, in, with, and through Christ to be a holy people and to share in Christ’s redemptive work” (May, 1994, p. 993). The parables of Jesus are almost always about work and workers: the fisherman, the sower, the herdsman, the tax collector and the workers in the vineyard. "The worker deserves his pay", Jesus reminds his listeners (Gillet, 2003, p. 1). St Paul exhorts the Thessalonians to work and shun being lazy; going beyond that to state that there is an obligation to work and that whoever doesn’t work doesn’t deserve to eat. He states that to work is to do good so that work takes on an eschatological significance, for through work “Christians prove themselves worthy of their
vocation, give glory to God and to Christ and prepare the way for his coming in glory (2 Thess 1:11-12)” (May, 1994, p. 993).

2 The Patristic period

The early Christian Church fell back to the Greek and Roman views on work and the higher value of work was lost so that Eusebius around AD300 regarded manual work as “a kind of secondary grade of piety” below spiritual work (Mackenzie, 2003). Augustine in his Rule similarly distinguishes between the ‘active life’ and the ‘contemplative life’ with the later clearly being seen as a higher calling (Mackenzie, 2003) as did St Benedict in his Rule and motto ‘ora et labora’ (Pahl, 1988). However, while Eusebius’, Benedict’s and Augustine’s views prevailed, there continued a strain of theological thought supporting the dignity of work and that it was inherently meaningful when it contributed to the building up of creation. For instance, St Augustine of Hippo states, “those things which God had created, benefited by the help of human work” (as cited by Gillett, 2003, p. 2). Another early church theologian, St John Chrysostom, linked the divine creation with the nobility of work (Vacek, 1987).

3 The Medieval Church and the Middle Ages (c.400AD to c.1500AD)

In medieval Europe the influence of the Church pervaded everything including views on work (Burrell, 2002). The Middle Ages saw the rise of guilds and the associated arts. St Thomas Aquinas was the pre-eminent theologian on the era and while he was a firm believer in the rigid hierarchical ordering of society, he nonetheless developed detailed views about what we would call ‘economic justice’, writing on issues such as a ‘just price’ and a ‘fair profit’. For example, Aquinas wrote, ”To keep back what is due another (e.g., a fair wage!) inflicts the same kind of injury as taking a thing unjustly” (as cited by Gillett, 2003, p. 3).

Thus the groundwork for a more comprehensive theology of work was present. Nonetheless, such a theology did not emerge chiefly because of the widespread attitude, derived largely from the monastic tradition, that life in the world and ‘worldly’ work inhibited and did not contribute to the ‘spiritual life’ of the Christian. (May, 1994, p. 995)

Work was still largely viewed negatively as demonstrated by the following extract from Thomas a Kempis’ (1379-1471) Imitation of Christ published just before the start of the Renaissance: “Truly it is a misery to live upon the earth … to labour, and to be subject to other necessities of nature is truly a great misery and an affliction to a pious man who desires to be released and free from all sin” (a Kempis, 1424/1992, pp. 77-78).
3.2.4 The Renaissance and the Reformation (c.1400AD to c.1600AD)

The Renaissance from the Latin *rinascere* means the act of being reborn and it was the Renaissance that saw a move away from the study of theology to the study of humanities and the return to the classical antiquity of the Greeks and the Romans (Mohlo, 2002) and their view of work, as epitomised by Michelangelo:

> Works are not to be judged by the amount of useless labour spent on them but by the work of the skill and mastery of their author. Were it not so, one would not pay a larger sum to a lawyer for giving an hour’s attention to an important case than to a weaver for all the cloth he weaves during a lifetime or to a peasant who toils all day at his diggings. (Michelangelo Buonarroti, 1475 to 1564, as cited by Thomas, 1999, p. 435)

However, it was the Reformation that led to Protestantism and a reconceptualising of work to a religious calling beyond religious orders (Ingeborg, 1999). Luther believed that work was good and introduced the notion of vocation, a calling to glorify God through work (Lipset, 1990). It was not the type of work done that was pleasing to God but that the person performed the work to which they were called, whether that was a contemplative or a labourer’s lot (Tilgher, 1930). Calvin differed from Luther in that the accumulation of wealth by hard work was lauded as a virtue and thus commenced the ‘Protestant work ethic’. Work became a social obligation, a necessary duty and a form of self-discipline (Yankelovich, 1981; Williams, 2002). In contrast, the Catholic Church rejected the work ethic approach and remained, as epitomised by St Thomas More’s Utopia, in the still idealised notion of work in the classic mould where all things came by nature and the need for work had vanished (Thomas, 1999).

3.2.5 The Age of Enlightenment or Reason (c.1600AD to c.1800AD)

Age of Enlightenment or Reason was a period in history when philosophers emphasised the use of reason as the best method of learning truth. Its leaders include the founder of modern economics, Adam Smith. If the Reformation made labour culturally acceptable, then the age of reason raised labour and capital to the status of false gods by secularising the Protestant work ethic. Work lost its spiritual context and the original Protestant work ethic became a creed of personal success with an ethic of self-interest and expediency (Henley, 1997). Capitalism was born and a mercenary or utilitarian value was given to work whereby your just rewards became a comfortable if not idle retirement; work became a means to something else.

How much the "spirit of capitalism" was a true product of the Protestant work ethic or a corruption of it is still debated. (However), it is clear that with the passing of time the concept of vocation became so closely associated with a person’s occupation or career that these words became synonymous and secularised without any reference to the calling of God. So the pursuit of a vocation became an end in itself. (Mackenzie, 2001, p. 3)
In short, under capitalism, the priorities were reversed so that before, people worked to live and after, they lived to work. Capitalism made the minimisation of labour costs acceptable in order to optimise profits. It also established the precondition, under extreme capitalism, for the mercenary exploitation of labour.

3.2.6 19th century – The Industrial Revolution and Capitalism

The industrial revolution introduced several changes to the views on work. It changed the economy from one based on manual labour to one based on machinery; a division occurred between labour and capital (Gilbert, 1977) and created a significant rift between the rich and the poor as the value of labour and the labourer was demeaned (Molony, 1991). Marx was strongly critical of this division of labour and the capitalist philosophy that underpinned it (Anthony, 1977; Bernstein, 1988). Weber concluded that countries with belief systems that were predominantly Protestant prospered more under capitalism than did those that were predominantly Catholic (Rose, 1985). The reality was that work, as a result of the industrial revolution became degrading and oppressive. Importantly, it also set the scene for criticism from the Catholic Church through Leo XIII and Rerum Novarum and introduced a significant separation between the predominant secular view of work and a Church view of work (Molony, 1991).

3.2.7 20th century – Scientific Management, Economic Rationalism and the Information Technology Age

In the 20th century the views on work were dominated by economists (growing economic rationalism in particular) and sociologists. The early scientific management model viewed "the average worker … (as) basically lazy and … motivated almost entirely by money (Daft and Steers, 1986, p. 93). There was high ‘assembly-line’ task specialisation with a division of jobs into simple tasks resulting in an alienation of the worker from contributing to work design. Thomas Merton (1968) summed up the irreconcilable difference as

it is precisely the illusion that mechanical progress means human improvement that alienates us from our own being and our own reality. … Technology was made for man, not man for technology. In losing touch with being and thus with God, we have fallen into a senseless idolatry of production and consumption for their own sakes. We have renounced the act of being and plunged ourself into process for its own sake. (p. 222)

As scientific management became more widespread, it became apparent that factors other than pay were significant to worker motivation. By the 1970s scientific management was
considered inadequate and outdated (Jaggi, 1988) and alternative theories emerged, particularly HRM theories. While HRM aimed to make people feel useful and important at work (Daft and Steers, 1986), profit remained the basic motivation. In the 1950s job enrichment (achievement, recognition, responsibility) instead of job enlargement became the motivator (Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman, 1959). In the 1960s McGregor’s theory "X" (authoritarian management) and theory "Y" (participatory management) supported greater worker input through participation but was still production (end product) focused (McGregor, 1960; Jaggi, 1988). Lansbury’s (1982) HRM model sums up the whole of the HRM movement stating that the philosophical base that the “key determinant of organisational effectiveness (is) the management of human resources” (p. 30) and that “the ultimate objective of human resource planning should be to improve organisational effectiveness” (p. 32) measured by profit margins. The human was just one factor in the production process, albeit the most important factor for human resources managers. Economic rationalism was the end product of the HRM approach.

Economic rationalism separated work from life for the worker; the purpose of work was to maximise profit or economic gain. The personal health or social effect on the worker was irrelevant provided that the effect on the profit margin for the company was optimal. Medical studies demonstrated that work had a significant effect on health as well as motivation. Theorell and Karasek (1990) linked the prevalence of heart disease to work design (refer Table 6). Work adversely affected the worker’s health where the worker had little control over the outcome but the work demands were high. Conversely, where the work demands were low and the worker had high control over the outcome there was no (stress related) heart disease.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological demands (the need to be alert to make a response)</th>
<th>Decision latitude (the ability to control the outcome)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological demands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Theorell & Karasek, 1990)

Theorell and Karasek (1990) also found that if a person did not feel supported then depression was likely but if they felt supported, depression was reduced and the demands of the job did not matter as much. Marmot, Kogevinas and Elston (1987) found that mortality over a 10 year period, was 3.5 times greater for those in low level (low latitude) jobs compared with those in higher level (high latitude) jobs. Being at the bottom of the work ladder, these employees
felt picked on, put down or talked down to. Scientific management approaches fell into the low decision-making and high psychological demands category of work design.

The Information Age of the 1980s and 1990s was lauded in its early days as the introducer of a new liberating view of work. Yankelovich and Immerwahr (1984) and Miller (1986) contrasted the work required of most people during the industrial age and scientific management age (simple tasks requiring low discretion and little decision making) to the information age (jobs have high discretion and required considerable thinking and decision making). Workers began to find more self-fulfilment in their work (Yankelovich & Harmon, 1988). Work began to be perceived as good and rewarding in itself (Wattenberg, 1984). Higher levels of education became necessary along with skills at solving problems, managing people and applying the latest information to the tasks at hand and the motivators for workers became trust, meaning and opportunity for personal growth and dignity (Maccoby, 1988). Workers anticipated that talent and hard work would be the basis for success rather than chance or luck (Sheehy, 1990). Yankelovich and Immerwahr (1984) noted that in the jobs that were not updated and remained low discretion work, the workers were more likely to be union members, to be in blue collar jobs and to be working in positions characterised by dirt, noise and pollution.

The Information Technology Age, along with promising more fulfilling work, also promised less work and greater leisure but in the view of many it has not delivered on this promise.

In the last twenty-five years alone, new inventions and improvements have utterly transformed the way we live. Personal computers and fax machines, cordless phones and wireless speakers, e-mail and other hi-tech labor-saving conveniences have revolutionized our work and home life. Yet have they brought us the peace and freedom they seemed to promise? Without realizing it, we have become dulled, if not brainwashed, in our eagerness to embrace technology. We have become slaves to a system that presses us to spend money on new gadgets, and we have accepted without question the argument that, by working harder, we will have more time to do more important things. It is a perverse logic. (Arnold, 1998, p. 75)

Like Merton’s (1968) earlier critique of scientific management, any work theory that views the worker as a resource in production must fail. As Pope John Paul II (1981) states in Laborem Exercens: “… the basis for determining the value of work is not primarily the work being done but the fact that the one doing it is a person” (para 6). Work exists for people, not people for work. Work has a consequence for the worker beyond the value of the task being performed.
3.2.8 The changing views on the purpose of work – a summary

The Western tradition as Ekins (1987) states, has provided myriad views on work and the purpose of work that have changed over time. While there is no summary that all writers will accept regarding the purpose of work, Schumacher (1979) sums up the three main reasons from the traditions above.

It has been recognized in all authentic teachings of mankind that every human being born into this world has to work not merely to keep himself alive but to strive toward perfection. To keep himself alive, he needs various goods and services, which will not be forthcoming without human labor. To perfect himself, he needs purposeful activity in accordance with the injunction: "Whichever gift each of you have received, use it in service to one another, like good stewards dispensing the grace of God in its varied forms." From this, we may derive the three purposes of human work as follows:

First, to provide necessary and useful goods and services.
Second, to enable every one of us to use and thereby perfect our gifts like good stewards.
Third, to do so in service to, and in cooperation with, others, so as to liberate ourselves from our inborn egocentricity. (pp. 2-3)

In short, the purpose of work is seen variously as, to survive, to better oneself and to be part of one’s community. One, some or all of these are the motivators to work for all individuals. The purpose that a worker sees in their work will have an impact of their propensity to association in a union. If the worker believes a union will assist in fulfilling their purpose for work, then the propensity to associate in that union will be increased and vice versa.

Having defined the varying views on the purposes of work and the origins of these views, the next part of this chapter examines the impact that these views of work have had on each of the four contexts in which VIEU and its members operate as a union and as teachers respectively.

3.3 VIEU OPERATES IN A POSTMODERN WORLD

Modernists held that society developed in an orderly and rational way. In the modernist’s world, society always progressed positively. Civilisation advanced inexorably as reason triumphed over ignorance, science triumphed over superstition and order was created out of disorder (Thomas, 1999). In the modernist’s world, work liberated humanity from toil and led to greater leisure. Capitalism’s entry into the modernist’s world merely added a mercenary value to work so that work’s just reward became a comfortable, idle retirement; work became a means to escape work (Henley, 1997).
Postmodernism rejected this view and opted for a more multi-dimensional view, accepting that society fragmented as well as developed. Postmodernists criticised capitalism as an inherently inequitable and exploitative model that deliberately favoured capital over labour (Gephart, 1999). In the postmodern world, people’s view of work changed dramatically, particularly amongst more affluent societies where individuals moved up the Maslow (1943) hierarchy of needs and began to view work as a way of self actualisation, a way of adding to the creative and social capital of the world; work was viewed more as a vocation, as a calling to fulfilment (James, 1997). The postmodern view of work moved away from Schumacher’s (1979) first purpose of work and adopted the second purpose, an individual finding self-fulfilment, or in Maslow’s hierarchy, self-actualisation.

This shift from modernism to postmodernism was important for trade unions. In the postmodern world, there is a tendency to globalisation that mitigates against traditional (locally organised) unionism (Keenoy, 1995) as well as a tendency to individualism instead of collectivism (increased self employment, working at home, working over the ‘net’ rather than together in a defined physical environment), which mitigates against traditional (collective) unionism (Alivin & Sverke, 2000; Wright, 1997). Game (1991) argues that the pace of change is now so rapid that today’s generation lives in a world that is vastly different to their parents’ world, a world that Giddens (1983) argues eschews tradition and a sense of community or collectivism. The unions that served their parents’ needs well were founded in the modernist, collective, locally oriented world and are struggling to survive in the postmodern, individualistic, global world (Wright, 1997).

Postmodernism is, almost by definition, a transitional cusp of social, cultural, economic and ideological history when modernism’s earnest principles and preoccupations have ceased to function but have not yet been replaced by a totally new set of values. (Adair, 1992, p. 15)

Trade unionism, which grew out of a need to combat capitalism, may have run its useful race if the postmodern view is true; that old capitalism is dead because capital no longer dominates labour. As Bennett (2004) argues, once the average worker could afford his/her own means of production (e.g., a laptop to program code) “by strict Marxist definitions, capitalism ended some time in the early 1990s” (p. 49). Postmodernists would not agree that capitalism is dead but that the old capitalism that produced trade unionism is dead and has been replaced by a ‘new capitalism’ or ‘global capitalism’ with which local and national trade unions find difficulty coping (Keenoy, 1995).
3.4 VIEU IN THE AUSTRALIAN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS SYSTEM

Aligned to this change of focus within the postmodern world are significant changes that have occurred to the industrial relations world. The trade unions’ strong traditional role has weakened and its membership has consequently declined, not the result of a single factor but rather a combination of a number of factors working in concert (ACIRRT, 2002a). As the world moved from modernity to postmodernity, from capitalism to late capitalism, the industrial scene changed with it.

- National industrial relations agenda were replaced by global industrial relations agendas with governments becoming involved in international convention and these being used as the head of power to create industrial legislation instead of the former dispute settling provisions of the Australian Constitution
- National economic agendas were replaced by global economic agendas with Australia following the international trend to structural efficiency, economic restructuring and benchmarking ‘world’s best practice’ as economic operating principles
- Centralisation was replaced by decentralisation with the consequent breakdown in the central wage fixing role of the AIRC
- Scientific management was replaced by HRM as the employers’ preferred modus operandi with the concomitant move to direct dealing with employees and the removal of third parties such as unions
- Awards (determined remotely by third parties) were replaced by collective agreements (where the workers had a right to be involved in determining the terms of the bargain)
- Collective bargaining was broken down even further by individualisation with the introduction of individual agreements (AWAs) that were able to overrule any collective agreement or award (Wailes & Lansbury, 2000).

Lewis (2000) sums up the issues for union leaders as they struggled with this new postmodern approach to industrial relations when stating that in the face of significant change to the structural and legislative changes occurring, “the leadership structures of unions ... seemed incapable of adapting to smaller, more fragmented workplaces and the demands of more skilled, service-industry workers” (p. 151).

Trade unionism that grew in Australia during the structured modernism times, where there was a protected role for unions and they were seen as a major player in industrial relations
determinations, have failed to modernise and have adapted poorly to the postmodern approach. As Johns (2002) states

The old certainties are less evident, and the workforce belief in the purpose and strength of unionism has diminished. A survey of workers’ attitudes to trade unions, conducted by the NSW Labour Council, shortly after Labor’s Federal 1996 defeat, found that while there was some residual commitment to unions based on the heritage of the movement, they were nevertheless, perceived to be ‘dinosaurs.’ Trade unions find themselves in an alien environment; an open economy, a less regulated bargaining system, and competing in a market of interest groups, but with a smaller and less loyal membership. Coping with individualism of the new workforce will be the trade union movement’s greatest challenge. Traditional collectivist notions will increasingly be seen by the workforce as reflecting the philosophy of a by-gone era. (p. 5)

Despite being aligned to a postmodernist view of the world, the changes in the industrial relations system during the 1990s were based on a view of work more in line from Schumacher’s (1979) first purpose of work. The structural efficiency principle was based on increasing productivity with profit being the basic motivation (Yerbury & Karlsson, 1992) as was the HRM model (Lansbury, 1982). Workers were paid more if they produced more or were more efficient (Bray, Deery, Walsh & Waring, 2005). Workers were valued more if they were more productive (Daft & Steers, 1986).

3.5 VIEU IN THE ‘EDUCATION INDUSTRY’

The fact that VIEU works in the education sector brings two differing perspectives to the equation; the first, a different view on postmodernism to that of the general population and second, a different view on work to the general population.

3.5.1 A different view on postmodernism to the general population

VIEU operates within this postmodern world but with the caveat that educational bureaucracies and schools, as institutions, have often been seen as fundamentally conservative and slow to change (Bates, 1991; Roeder, 2000) with more modernity characteristics than postmodernity characteristics (Hargreaves, 1994b). Blackmore (1999) states that educational institutes and bureaucracies have colluded to resist postmodernism state bureaucracies, in seeking certainty in an era of uncertainty, have produced highly modernist responses (hierarchical, individualised, fragmented, technical, impersonal, instrumental, non-reflexive, unilateral) to postmodernist demands (flexibility, change, emotional management, teamwork, listening, nurturing, interpersonal competence, coping with value conflicts, gaining self knowledge, embracing error), the former leading to conformity to bureaucratic norms rather than innovative bureaucratic leadership. (p. 114)
Indeed, Sungaila (1994) argues that, as postmodernists, educationists should actively oppose some of the societal changes that are impacting on the world of education and not remain silent to the pervasive ‘reform agenda’ currently occurring in education.

The power of modern society to oppress and to ignore, to marginalise and exclude ... is one of the powerful themes of postmodern thought. And it demands that we should not be silent. ... where too many among us Australians believe in nothing but living for ourselves alone; when ours is a nation at much greater risk than international economic uncompetitiveness. ... we are allowing our Australian education and training systems to be geared to achieving solely the goals of material prosperity. (pp. 249 - 250)

Possibly as a result of this conservative resistance to postmodernism, the relative decline of trade unionism from 1994 to 2004 in the education sector of the total Australian workforce at 21.1% has been less severe than the decline in union density in the total workforce at 35.1% (ABS 2004a). The decline in the teaching workforce (Education Sector) compared with the total Australian workforce has been similar in absolute terms, declining by 11.9% (from 56.1% to 44.2%) and 12.3% (from 35.0% to 22.7%) respectively (Figure 13). However, the decline in the teaching workforce compared with the total Australian workforce has been less when compared in relative terms, declining by 21.1% and 35.1% respectively (Figure 14). Additionally, the decline in the total Australian workforce has been consistent, declining in each year since 2004. However, in the teaching workforce, there were small reversals (both in absolute and relative terms) in 1996 (before again declining) and in the last year, 2004.

All statistics compiled from the ABS (1999, 2002a, 2004a)
3.5.2 A different view on work to the general population

Teachers have traditionally taken a different view on the purpose of work and have seen themselves as different to other workers. This has been a longstanding view. P W Reilly, the Federal President at the time of the Australian Council of Salaried and Professional Associations (ACSPA), the Association to which teacher unions were affiliated in 1977, on speaking to the members on the prospect of amalgamation into the predominantly blue collar ACTU, stated

Teachers are as much concerned with how they shall fill young minds as they are with filling their own pockets. They raise matters of conscious transcending traditional industrial relations. ... While not suggesting that the hip-pocket nerve has been anaesthetized, it is nevertheless discernable that ‘quality of life’ issues – issues of basic logic and integrity – have entered (their) minds. (address in June 1977 as quoted by Hagan, 1986, p. 263)

All teachers see themselves as professionals (Bessant & Spaull, 1972; Hargreaves, 1994a; Nash & Spaull, 1986) and many teachers in Catholic schools can have an added view of work as a vocation (Cahill, 1992; Eggleston, 1979) with a sense of mission (Eggleston, 1980) and with a connectedness to the work of God (Treston, 1994). As Chapman (1994) states, there is a strong “belief among teachers that they belong to a professional community with rights and expertise to define and enforce its own standards of practice” (p. 205) which are primarily directed to enhancing the quality of education, not primarily wages and conditions. This view of work was more in line with Schumacher’s (1992) third reason based on adding value to the worker’s community.

3.6 VIEU AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AS AN EMPLOYER

The largest employer with which VIEU works is the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church, as an employer, has a well defined set of principles outlined in its social teachings and a particular view on the meaning and purpose of work. However, this social teaching, particularly in the area of work, is perhaps its best keep secret (Henriot, De Berri & Schultheis, 1992). In this research the ‘Catholic Church’ is defined both as the universal Church centred on Rome and the Catholic Church operating in Australia. Its magisterium is the “the pastoral teaching … of bishops and pope” (Rigali, 1994, p. 559) including, therefore, the encyclical letters of the pope and the pastoral letters and statements of the Australian Catholic bishops on employment matters.

At the universal level, the Catholic Church’s magisterium has been developed through a series of encyclical letters. Since the publication in 1891 of The Condition of Labour (Rerum Novarum) by Pope Leo XIII (1891/1960), the Catholic Church has taken a leading role in
developing social theory in the area of the employment relationship between employers and employees. Ensuing encyclicals to commemorate *Rerum Novarum*, particularly *Quadragesimo Anno* by Pius XI in 1931 (1931/1960), Christianity and Social Progress by John XXIII (1961) and the two major works by Pope John Paul II, *Laborem Exercens* in 1981 and *Centisimus Annus* in 1991, as well as the Second Vatican Council (1965) document *Gaudium et Spes* have continued to spell out the guiding principles that should govern the employment relationship.

Where none had existed before, a theology of work began to emerge in the middle of the 20th century, initially with Chenu (1963), based on ties with the theology of creation along with a spirituality of work (Diehl, 1991; Haughey, 1989). For Chenu (1970), work was liberating, a vocation, a way of connecting to the creating, sustaining and transforming work of God. Similarly, for Illanes (1982), all work, no matter how humble or grand, was good and should be well done so as to create a Christian world and build on the work of God. This view of work is in line with Schumacher’s (1979) second reason, self-fulfilment, as well as his third reason based on adding value to the worker’s community. Furthermore, this view of work leads the Church to social action as Mackenzie (2001) states: “this will not be a quietist view of Christian vocation that surrenders to the status quo, but one that will contest corruption and exploitation and work to name and resist what is evil and to transform bad circumstances” (p. 1).

Consequently, the Church time and again through its social teaching defends the right of trade unions to exist and the right of workers to freely associate to protect the dignity of work ((Molony, 1991). The Catholic Church and trade unions have been natural allies in defending the right of workers to a just wage and to maintain human dignity through their work. At the Australian level these principles have been adopted and adapted by the Australian Bishops through publications of pastoral letters and statements and through the establishment under the Australian Catholic Bishops Conference (ACBC) of the Bishops’ Committee for Industrial Affairs (BCIA) and, later, the ACCER. In particular, the guiding principles encompass, among others

- the dignity of work
- the right to work and to withdraw that work
- the legitimate right of workers to be collectively represented
- the right to a just family wage.

These principles are meant to govern the employment relationship between the employer and the employee in Church settings and come out of the Church’s particular view on work. VIEU forms part of that employment relationship where employees choose to associate in their union and to be represented collectively by it. Additionally, the VCSA forms part of that
employment relationship where employers choose to associate in their employer association and be represented collectively by it. The ACCER’s (2002a) statement The Church as an Employer in Australia Today states

Pope John Paul II stated in *Laborem Exercens*: “… the basis for determining the value of work is not primarily the work being done but the fact that the one doing it is a person.” Work is for people, not people for work. Through work, individuals not only transform the world but also achieve fulfilment as human beings. In this sense, work has a consequence for the employee beyond the immediacy of the task being performed. The Church teaches that employees and employers should be regarded as partners in their place of work and in their respective roles. Mutual respect, esteem and goodwill should underpin the relationship between the employer and the employee. Church employees should be encouraged and enabled to see their work not merely as a source of income, but as providing a service and a benefit to others in society and, in its ultimate sense, the mission of the Church. (pp. 2-3)

In respecting collectivism and adopting a different view on the meaning of work, the Catholic Church through its social teachings is at odds with the current postmodern societal views and the principles behind the Australian industrial relations legislative framework.

### 3.7 CONCLUSION

In setting this context, it would be tempting to state simply that inexorably the forces of change brought on by postmodernism will overcome whatever resistance occurs or consign what institutions remain to an historical anachronism. However, it has also been argued that the decline of unions has been associated with a change in Australia’s values, values that need to be preserved. Australia’s history has always had a sense of the need for mateship to ensure ‘a fair go’ in the struggle between the establishment and the ordinary worker (Clark, 1969) supported by unions. This quintessential Australian value dates back to Banjo Paterson’s ‘Waltzing Matilda’ and Henry Lawson’s ‘Freedom on the Wallaby’ (“They needn’t say the fault is ours if blood should stain the wattle!”) (Gregory, 2002). Both poems arose from the shearers strikes in the 1890s with the jolly swagman reputedly the leader of a failed strike, where the sheds were burned down, who preferred death to being taken by the police (National Library of Australia, 2003) and Lawson’s poem a critical comment on the use of the military to put down that strike (Kingston, 2002). In recent times, a number of commentators have expressed concern that this ‘fair go’ is being lost to the Australian culture. Former Prime Minister and President of the ACTU, the Hon R J L Hawke AC (2002) in a speech entitled Solidarity Forever stated that unions in Australia “developed in an atmosphere where the concepts of mateship and a fair go were congenial to this fundamental truth ... the anthem of trade unionism: ‘what force on earth is weaker than the feeble strength of one?’” (p. 2). Justice Kirby, former Deputy President of the Australian Conciliation
and Arbitration Commission (the precursor to the AIRC) and from 1996, one of the seven Justices of the High Court of Australia, Australia’s federal Supreme Court made the same point about the AIRC when its powers were reduced, stating “it has been an agency of something more important - industrial equity, a ‘fair go all round’ or, as many would now describe it, human rights” (as cited by Dabscheck, 1995, p.xi).

Ruthven (1995) states that in the industrial battle between unions (proxies for workers) and management (proxies for owners), both are losing and that with the coming individualism of the 21st century, further loss is inevitable without significant change based on a recognition that the context is undergoing fundamental change. A solution is demanded.

This chapter has presented the context in which VIEU operates as a union, one operating in late 20th and early 21st century postmodern Australia, in its industrial relations system, in education and with the Catholic Church as the employer. Each of these four contexts brings a unique perspective to the meaning of work and its purpose and, in turn, these perspectives have impacted on VIEU. Workers will associate with a union if they believe that the union will assist them in fulfilling their purpose for working. In terms of Schumacher’s (1979) summary, all three motivators for work have been present, albeit with a leaning to the higher order reasons with the notable exception of the changing industrial relations scene. Additionally, the four contexts themselves were not in harmony with each other with the postmodernist and industrial relations settings not meshing easily with the education and Church settings.

The context for the total Australian workforce and its education sector has led to the number of union members and union density dramatically declining from 1994 to 2004. Despite this, VIEU has experienced unparalleled, consistent growth in membership and union density. By accident or design, VIEU would appear to hold the key to unlocking the mystery of this decline and thereby stopping the virtual extinction of trade unions in Australian society over the next few decades. In answering the main research question

what factors have contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union?

the answer to stopping the general decline of trade unionism in Australia may be found.
Chapter 4  An initial Literature Review for the Exploratory Stage

4.1  GATHERING THE EXPLANATIONS (STEP 2)

In Chapter Three the focus of the research was introduced: VIEU’s membership grew at a time when union density worldwide was in decline. It outlined VIEU’s general contextual situation as a trade union operating in a postmodern world, as part of the Australian industrial relations system, within the Australian education ‘industry’ and with the Catholic Church as the major employer of its members. It established that these four contexts all bring a different view on the meaning of work to bear on VIEU’s membership and, subsequently, VIEU’s union density. This context provided the framework for the overarching research question

what factors have contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union?

This chapter is the second step of the learning journey. It is a literature review to assemble, for later testing, all of the explanations offered by writers in the area for the decline in union membership. It has four sections

• the first outlines the structural factors associated with the decline in union density in Australia
• the second presents an array of historical and contextual reasons offered for the decline; first, those worldwide and then those specific to Australia
• the third lists the reasons given by employees in Australia for joining unions
• the fourth outlines Shister’s (1953) model for the general growth and decline of union membership. It examines Shister’s model both as framework for the comprehensiveness of the Exploratory Stage literature review and as an initial conceptual framework for this research.

Using this structure, the overarching research question was disaggregated into a series of guiding questions that were used to frame each factor uncovered by the literature review

• a succinct statement of a possible explanation
• the expected result that would have been experienced by VIEU if the factor was a potential explanation.
The end result was a comprehensive framework of propositions to be tested in the Exploratory Stage against VIEU’s profile

- each framed to be specific to VIEU, and
- each associated with a particular possible explanation that was derived from this initial literature review.

There was no attempt at this stage of the research to accept, reject or prioritise any of these possible explanations despite the fact that the relative effects of these explanations on union density are disputed in the literature (Griffin & Svensen, 1996). Whilst not accepted apodictically, they were all accepted at face value as potential explanations for later testing. It was during the Exploratory Stage that the veracity of each of these potential explanations was tested with each potential explanation either being discarded as being irrelevant to VIEU’s context or retained for further examination in the Inspection Stage.

4.2 THE STRUCTURAL FACTORS LINKED TO THE DECLINE IN UNION DENSITY

4.2.1 An overview

A range of general demographic and economic structural factors are associated with individuals making the decision to join or not to join a union (Deery & Plowman, 1991; Yerbury & Karlsson, 1992). In general, there is a greater tendency for older, male, Anglo-Saxon, permanent, full time, blue collar persons employed in the public sector to join unions than for younger, female, non Anglo-Saxon, part time or casual, white collar persons who are employed in the private sector. This section examines the three main demographic factors of sex, full time/part time status and age and their impact on union density between 1994 and 2004 on Australia’s total workforce and its education sector. It also examines the two main economic structural factors; the public/private and white collar/blue collar sectors.

4.2.2 The growth in female workers compared with male workers

The Australian workforce has had an increasingly female composition since 1994 (Figure 15) and, within both the total Australian workforce and its education sector, females are less likely to become union members than are males (Deery, Plowman, Walsh & Brown, 2001).
This growing feminisation of the workforce was recognised early by the ACTU when its 1989 Congress emphasised the significance of attracting the membership and involvement of women (and young workers) to counter the overall decline in union membership and density (Yerbury & Karlsson, 1992). In terms of the total Australian workforce, for the period of this research (1994 to 2004)

- male union membership fell from 2,283,400 to 1,842,100 and union density from 37.9% to 23.5% (Figure 16) and
- female membership fell (less severely) from 907,500 to 826,500 and union density from 31.3% to 21.7% (Figure 17).

In short, while these figures show that while females were still less likely to be union members, (male 23.5%, female 21.7%), the difference was less pronounced by 2004.

Despite the fact that in 1994 the education sector was already significantly more feminised (64.9%) than the total Australian workforce (44.4%) (Figure 15), the same pattern of increasing feminisation existed in it within the education sector where

- male union membership fell from 305,300 to 270,500 in 2000 but recovered to 294,600 and union density fell from 58.1% to 43.6% in 2001 but recovered to 45.5% by 2004 (Figure 16)
- female membership fell from 194,100 to 177,100 in 2000 and then rose to 198,100 and union density fell from 55.0% to 40.5% in 2003 but recovered to 43.7% in 2004 (Figure 17).

Again, females were always less likely to be union members for the whole of the period 1994 to 2004, although the difference was negligible.
Considering these figures from 1994 to 2004, arguments could be made that

- the stabilisation of female union density rates in the total Australian workforce since 2002 (21.5% to 21.7%) has been a ray of hope for unions in the face of the continuing decline of male membership and density rates. Similarly in the education sector, the stabilisation of density rates since 2000 and slight upturn in 2004 (males 45.2% to 45.5% - females 43.5% to 43.7%) has been a rare positive for the unions overall (Figures 16 & 17)

- the male/female difference is now almost defunct with density rates in the total population becoming increasing similar (23.5% and 21.7% respectively); similarly in the education sector with density rates of 45.5% and 43.7% respectively (Figures 16 & 17).

However, given that females have lower union density rates than males and from 1994 to 2004 the workforce became more feminised, there was an effect on the overall union density rate related to this factor. Therefore, the possible explanation derived from this literature review to be tested against VIEU’s profile in the Exploratory Stage was

that as male workers are replaced in the total Australian workforce and in the Australian education sector’s workforce by female workers, there is a negative impact on union density.

If VIEU’s profile reveals that male teachers have not been replaced by female teachers from 1994 to 2004, then this may form part of the explanation for VIEU’s density trend.
4.2.3 The growth in part time workers compared with full time workers

The Australian workforce has had an increasingly stronger part time composition since 1994 (Figure 18) and, within the total Australian workforce and its education sector, part time employees are less likely to become union members than full time employees (Deery et al., 2001).

The 1993 ACTU Congress recognised that these structural changes to the workforce, “more … part timers, casuals” (Workforce, 1993, p. 3), with the increasing feminisation of the workforce, were the major reasons for falling membership. Booth (1986) argues that unions themselves were to blame for this situation because they did not try to recruit part time and casual workers, preferring full time employees because of the ease of administration. Booth (1986) also states that casual and part time workers saw less benefit in becoming a member of a union because of the variable and more transitory nature of their work (they tended to change employers more frequently than full time employees).

As a result, the increasing part time composition of the workforce has led to decreasing overall union density rates.

In terms of the total Australian workforce from 1994 to 2004, part time employees in the workforce increased by 44.6% whereas full time employees increased by only 17.5%, narrowing the full time/part time ratio. This was compounded by the fact that there was a decline in both full time and part time densities

- full time employees increased from 4,872,700 to 5,725,200 and union density fell from 39.1% to 25.3% (a 35.3% decline) (Figure 19)
• part time employees increased from 1,653,100 to 2,391,200 and part time union members’ numbers actually rose from 378,700 to 395,500 but their density declined from 22.9% to 16.5% (Figure 20) so that the increasing part time composition of the workforce led to decreasing overall union density rates in the total Australian workforce.
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**Figure 19**  
Full time density rates. Total Australian workforce and education sector  
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**Figure 20**  
Part time density rates. Total Australian workforce and education sector  

However, the same trend did not occur in the education sector

• Full time members and density rates fell from 252,300 and 65.6% in 1994 to 216,900 (in 2000) and 51.3% (in 2001) before numbers increased and density rates stabilised in the period up to 2004 (224,600 and 51.8%) (Figure 19)

• Part time members increased, albeit inconsistently, from 53,000 to 70,100 and densities remained relatively stable from 1995 after starting at 33.2% in 1995 (from 1995 at 30.1% to 2004 at 30.2%) (Figure 20).

However, given that part time employees still had lower union density rates than full time employees and, from 1994 to 2004, the workforce became more part time, there was an effect on the overall union density rate related to this factor. Therefore, the possible explanation derived from this literature review, to be tested against VIEU’s profile in the Exploratory Stage was

that as full time workers are replaced by part time workers in the total Australian workforce and in the Australian education sector’s workforce, there is a negative impact on union density.

If VIEU’s profile reveals that full time teachers have not been replaced by part time teachers from 1994 to 2004, then this may form part of the explanation for VIEU’s density trend.
4.2.4 Full time males being replaced by part time females

From 1994 to 2004 the growth in Australia’s total workforce (24.4%) was stronger
- in the female (31.1%) sector than male (19%) sector, and
- in the part time sector (44.6%) than the full time (17.5%) sector.

The combined effect was an increase in part time employees (male and female) at the cost of full time male but not female employees. This resulted in a change in the overall balance in Australia’s workforce with male full time employees reduced from 49.1% to 45.4% of the total workforce; predominantly replaced by female part time employees who increased from 18.9% to 21.7% of the workforce (Figure 21).
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**Figure 21**
Total workforce composition (%) by sex and full/part time status
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**Figure 22**
Teachers workforce composition (%) by sex by full time/part time status


In the education sector, the combined effect produced a similar result. Part time employees (male and female) increased at the cost of full time male but not female employees. Male full time employees increased 3.4%, female full time employees 19.9%, male part time employees 68.8% and female part time employees 41.8%. This resulted in a change in the overall balance in Australia’s teachers’ workforce composition with male full time employees reduced by 4.8% from 31.1% to 26.3%. They were predominantly replaced by female part time employees who increased by 4.0% from 25.3% to 29.3% with female full time (39.6% to 38.8%) and male part time (4.1% to 5.6%) remaining relatively unchanged with 0.8% and 1.5% changes respectively (Figure 22). Consequently, the relative make up of Australia’s education sector changed between 1994 and 2004
- full time male teachers slipped from the 2nd to the 3rd largest group while
- part time females moved up from the 3rd to the 2nd largest group.
As demonstrated earlier, both males and full time employees are more likely to join unions than females and part time employees. The combined effect of the structural change of full time males being replaced by part time females had a marked effect on union densities in the total Australian workforce but less so in its education sector (Figures 23 & 24).

The education sector’s union density declined less in each sub section of the education sector than in the total Australian workforce

- male full time by 20.4% (teachers) to 37.1% (total workforce)
- male part time by - 6.9% (i.e., teachers increased) to 33.8% (total workforce)
- female full time by 21.8% (teachers) as to 31.4% (total workforce)
- female part time by 10.2% (teachers) to 26.1% (total workforce).

(Figures 23 & 24)

Accordingly, the argument can be sustained that the decline in union membership in the total Australian workforce is as a result of the structural changes and these changes are reflected in its education sector but to a lesser degree; i.e., as full time males (initial density rates of 40.5% and 62.7% respectively) are replaced by part time females (initial density rates of 24.5% and 34.8% respectively), the change in the balance has resulted in a loss of union overall density (Figures 23 & 24).

However, what cannot be sustained is that the decline in union density is predominantly the result of these structural changes in the Australian workforce because the decline in the sectors affected was not as drastic as the decline in the overall union density as demonstrated in Figure 25.
• Trade union membership declined from 35.0% to 22.7% of the total workforce, a cumulative loss of 12.3% while
• Full time employees declined from 74.7% to 70.5%, a cumulative loss of only 4.2% and
• Male employees declined from 55.6% to 53.2%, a cumulative loss of only 2.4%.

Figure 25
Relative declines in the union densities and the compositional percentages of the total workforce

However, despite the relative differences between the total Australian workforce and its education sector, the possible explanation is established because the trends are the same. Therefore, the possible explanation derived from this literature review, to be tested against VIEU’s profile in the Exploratory Stage was that as full time males are replaced by part time females in the total Australian workforce and in its education sector’s workforce, there is a negative impact on union density.

If VIEU’s profile reveals that full time male teachers have not been replaced by part time female teachers from 1994 to 2004, then this may form part of the explanation for VIEU’s density trend.
4.2.5 The growth in white collar workers compared with blue collar workers

McKibbon (1994) claims that the decline in trade unions went “pari passu with the decline of the working class” (p. 37). From 1994 to 2004 there was a consistent growth in white collar workers vis-à-vis blue collar workers with white collar service industry employees being less likely to join unions than blue collar employees (Deery & Plowman, 1991; Peetz, 1990) although the union density rates between these two sectors narrowed (Western 1996). Traditionally, this was because the main employer of white collar workers was the public service, and public servants initially formed themselves into professional associations not unions:

It was only after the Commonwealth Association of Government Employees Organisations (CAGEO) – a peak council of federal public sector unions – merged with the ACTU in 1979, and the Australian Council of Salaried and Professional Associations (ACSPA) – a peak council of white collar unions – merged with the ACTU in 1981, that a single overwhelmingly representative national peak council has emerged. (Easson, 1994, p. 154)

The ABS noted that in the period 1992 to 1999

Industries with high union membership ... tended to be industries with below average growth in employee numbers. Of the eight industries with the highest union membership rates in 1992, five experienced net job losses ... and two others had below average employee growth ... The industries that experienced above average growth in employee numbers, on the other hand, tended to be the ones with below average union membership rates. (ABS, 2002a, p. 4)

In the figures overleaf, the blue collar and white collar sectors are represented by the manufacturing and education sectors respectively (the ABS does not provide a specific white collar and blue collar breakdown but the manufacturing sector is predominantly comprised of traditional blue collar occupations in the statistics provided)

- the manufacturing sector union membership numbers declined from 421,600 members to 262,600 members while the education sector declined from 305,300 members to 294,600 members (Figure 26)
- the manufacturing sector union density declined from 40.8% to 26.0% and from 56.1% to 44.2% in the education sector (Figure 27)
- the decline in the manufacturing sector was relatively greater than the education sector, declining 63.7% to 78.9% (Figure 27).

In fact, these figures demonstrate that the education sector does not fit the normal white collar template because, unexpectedly

- its membership figures start lower (305,300 to 421,600) but finish higher (294,600 to 262,600) than the blue collar figures (Figure 26)
- its density rates start higher (56.1% to 40.8%) and finish higher than the blue collar manufacturing rates (44.2% to 26.0%) (Figure 27)
- the relative decline (63.7%) in the manufacturing density rates is greater than the education density rates (78.9%) (Figure 28).

The possible explanation derived from this literature review, to be tested against VIEU’s profile in the Exploratory Stage was

that as blue collar workers are replaced by white collar workers in the total Australian workforce, there is a negative impact on union density.

This white collar/blue collar anomaly was examined in the Exploratory Stage to test whether VIEU followed the same pattern as the Australian education industry.
4.2.6  The shift from public to private sector employment in the Australian economy

From 1994 to 2004 there was a consistent decline in both private sector union members and public sector union members with private sector employees being less likely to join unions than public sector employees (ABS, 2002a; Deery & Plowman, 1991; Peetz, 1990).

Jackson (1992) cites that in the private sector, with organisations of less than 100 employees, union density averaged 20% but in the public sector, with organisations of 50,000 or more employees, union density averaged 60%. Barrett and Buttigieg (1999) state that, in large workplaces, the employer is more remote and easily stereotyped, whereas in small workplaces the employer could, by personal approach, more effectively oppose trade unions. Grimes (1990) and Christie (1992) confirm that establishment size has a positive effect on the likelihood of union membership.

In the period 1994 to 2004

- public sector union members declined from 1,006,100 to 692,100 while private sector union members declined from 1,277,200 to 1,150,000; the public sector started stronger than the private sector in terms of numbers but finished weaker. However, these figures mask the fact that there was overall growth in the private sector’s workforce (4,912,300 to 6,609,200) as compared with an overall decline in the public sector’s workforce (1,614,900 to 1,491,600) (Figure 29)
- public sector union density declined from 62.3% to 46.4% whereas private sector density declined 26.0% to just 17.4% (Figure 30)
- the decline in the private sector was relatively greater, declining to 66.9% of its 1994 figures as compared with a decline to 74.5% in the public sector (Figure 31).

However, given that private sector union members have lower union density rates than public sector union members and from 1994 to 2004 the private sector of the total Australian workforce increased at the cost of the public sector of the total Australian workforce, there was an effect on the overall union density rate related to this factor.
Therefore, the possible explanation derived from this literature review, to be tested against VIEU’s profile in the Exploratory Stage was that as public sector workers are replaced by private sector workers in the total Australian workforce, there is a negative impact on union density.

4.2.7 The age of the workforce

From 1994 to 2004 the Australian workforce’s median age consistently increased (Figure 32) from 36.7 for males and 35.1 for females to 39 for both males and females.
Additionally, younger employees were less likely to join unions than older employees (ABS, 2002a; Deery & Plowman, 1991; Peetz, 1990). Norris, Kelly and Giles (2005) attribute this to the fact that older workers are more likely to be concerned about the threat of redundancy than young workers but Lowe and Rastin (2000) attribute it to the structural factors that younger workers were more likely to be part time or casual and also more willing to change jobs if they are dissatisfied with the workplace, therefore, less likely to join unions as a strategy to protect their jobs. This was particularly true for those workers under the age of 25, whereas the union density rates of the age brackets above 25 were reasonably similar with the age range 45 to 54 being the most unionised (Figure 33).
In its standard publication, ‘Employee Earnings, Benefits and Trade Union Membership’ (Catalogue 6310.0), the ABS does not include age breakdowns for trade union membership as a whole, for teachers within the total workforce or for teachers who are members of trade unions. However, in a Research Note entitled ‘Australia’s ageing workforce’ (Kryger, 2005) provided to the Department of Parliamentary Services, a number of salient points for the period 1984 to 2004 are illustrated (see Figure 34), namely

- for the past two decades the workforce (and especially the full time workforce) aged at a faster rate than the general population
- between 1984 and 2004, the average age of the general population increased by 2.2 years from 36.6 to 38.8 years
- between 1984 and 2004, the average age of the total workforce increased by 2.8 years from 35.8 to 38.6 years
- between 1984 and 2004, the average age of full time employees in the total workforce increased by 3.5 years from 35.9 to 39.4 years.

![Chart 1. Average age of full-time workers and civilian population aged 15-64 years](image)

**Figure 34.**

Average age of full time workers and civilian population aged 15 to 64 years

(Kryger, 2005, p. 1)

Additionally, the Research Note points out that

- between 1984 and 2004, the average age of female workers increased by 5.6 years from 32.9 to 38.5 years, almost double the corresponding increase for male workers which increased by 2.8 years from 37.1 to 39.9 years
- in 2004, when the average age for the total workforce was 38.6 years, the average age of teachers was 43.4 years, the oldest of any industry sector
- while the average age of the total workforce increased by 2.8 years between 1984 and 2004, the average age of teachers increased by 5.2 years.
What can be deduced from these figures, in the absence of other ABS data, is that the average age of part time workers either decreased or increased at a lesser rate (the average age of full time employees in the total workforce increased by 3.5 years whereas the average age of the total workforce increased by only 2.8 years). Lowe and Rastin (2000) note that the younger workers tend to have a greater proportion of the temporary and part time positions in Australia’s workforce.

Ironically, the report ascribes the main cause of the ageing Australian population to a rise in educational participation with a consequential fall in the number and proportion of young people participating in full time employment. In 1984, persons aged 15 to 24 years comprised 23.1% of the total workforce compared with 13.6% by 2004. The secondary cause is ascribed to the increasing number of older women participating in the workforce. The ageing of the population workforce has led to some concern that the nation will suffer from the ‘burden’ of too many elderly people (Curnow, 2000). However, McDonald and Kippen (1999) have projected the age cohort proportions for the Australian workforce over the next 50 years and found that the proportions change very little and never become less favourable than the present.

In summary, as Australia’s workforce ages, by older workers retiring the workforce (who have higher union density rates) being replaced by younger workers entering the workforce (who have lower union density rates), overall union density declines. Therefore, the possible explanation derived from this literature review, to be tested against VIEU’s profile in the Exploratory Stage was

that as younger workers replace older workers in the total Australian workforce, there is a negative impact on union density.

If VIEU’s profile reveals that the teaching workforce has significantly aged from 1994 to 2004, then this may form part of the explanation for VIEU’s density trend.

4.2.8 A summary of the structural changes cited in the literature review

Peetz’s (1990) study provided a comprehensive analysis of the structural changes in the Australian workforce at that time and their effect on trade union density. In 1990 he estimated that approximately half of the decline in union membership in the 1980s was the result of structural change; that is, the decline parallels declines in the traditional union strongholds in the Australian economy of full time, male, blue collar employees in the manufacturing sector and the concomitant rise in part time/casual, female, white collar employees in the service sector of the economy. Borland and Ouliaris (1994), applying a refined econometric statistical model, agree
that structural factors were the major determinant of the loss of union membership in the 1980s along with rates of unemployment, although a number of authors disagree (Drago & Wooden, 1998; Lewis, 2000; Peetz, 1998; Turnbull, 1996). Turnbull (1996) argues that structural changes are not an explanation because decline occurs across the board in all groupings (e.g., male and female, blue collar and white collar), albeit more steeply in some (e.g., males than females).

In a later study, Peetz (1998) notes that structural changes were the main reason for union density decline in the 1980s but that these were overtaken in the 1990s by changes to the sociolegal environment, particularly the removal of compulsory unionism. Drago and Wooden (1998) and Lewis (2000) concur with this summary. Peetz’s (1990; 1998) studies highlight the changing opinions of writers (in this case the same writer) in this area as the period develops. As a result, historically contemporaneous sources were used throughout this literature review, whenever possible, rather than relying on the later, and retrospective, views on each issue. This was particularly necessary when dealing with the historical and contextual explanations that follow in the next section of this literature review. This examines these sociolegal and other non-structural factors that have impacted on Australia’s union density in the period 1994 to 2004.

4.3 AN OVERVIEW OF EXPLANATIONS CITED FROM WORLDWIDE AND AUSTRALIAN LITERATURE TO EXPLAIN THE DECLINE IN UNION DENSITY

4.3.1 General worldwide explanations

1 The primary concentration of trade unions on improving wages and conditions of workers as their raison d’être

Australian unions have been criticised, particularly by long standing members, for losing focus on their primary function. This explanation of union decline states that they should hold a “narrow view of their proper functions … (and) … confine their activities to the direct and immediate matters of wages and working conditions” (Deery et. al., 2001, p. 204) rather than offer “all kinds of incentives and gimmicks, including access to a range of discounted retail goods and cheap holidays” (Cook, 2000, p. 1) because, by being distracted from their ‘proper’ purpose they lost the support of workers.

In 1988 an Australian National Opinion Poll (ANOP) commissioned by the ACTU revealed that most unionists, at that time, saw the function of their union in a very narrow, traditional role; i.e., “to look after … (their) interests – specifically to increase their pay, improve working conditions and protect their jobs” (ANOP, 1989, p. 35). Joining a union was “like
insurance and those members who (take it) … prefer to be protected against some future threat” (ANOP, 1989, p. 17). Unions operated on the premise that successful industrial action was associated with union growth and research at that time confirmed this view (Cameron, 1985).

Moreover, the ABS’s Quarterly Summaries of Industrial Disputes (refer to Table 7) reflected the importance that trade unions placed during the 1970s and 1980s on their traditional role of protecting wages and conditions through industrial action.

**Table 7**  
Proportion of working days lost by cause, all industries, Australia (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Traditional function of unions</th>
<th>Non-traditional function of unions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>Hours of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 to 89</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


However, this table also illustrates the waning of the dominance of wages and working conditions (hours of work, leave) as the reason for industrial action and the rise of managerial policy (matters such as disciplining employees, dismissals, promotion and retrenchments) particularly as employers adopted more participative managerial styles (Noakes, 1994). The final edition of this ABS series (a change in format occurred in 2003) (refer to Table 8) showed that the trend continued through the 1990s (under enterprise bargaining where there were set periods between bargains where no wages and conditions negotiations could occur) with managerial policy increasing from 23.8% (Table 7) to 43% (Table 8) with wages diminishing further from 14.7% (Table 7) to 7.7% (Table 8) and conditions diminishing from 9.0% (Table 7 combined hours of work plus leave) to 2.6% (Table 8 combined hours of work plus leave).

**Table 8**  
Cause of dispute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause of dispute</th>
<th>Number of disputes</th>
<th>Employees involved</th>
<th>Working days lost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of work</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave, etc.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial policy</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>137.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical working conditions</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade unionism</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>198.3</td>
<td>318.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Quarterly Summaries of Industrial Disputes (ABS, 2003).
At the time, unions turned to other avenues to attract members as outlined by Macken (1997)

The executive meeting of the ACTU in December 1996 … developed an initiative to provide workers with a discount shopping scheme … a travel discount scheme and a wine buying arrangement; even housing loans … It sees workers ‘dropping out’ of the basic concept of unionism and joining a friendly society. This is true even when the worker joins principally as a means of insurance that will get for him or her representation when they are sacked or in trouble at work. (p. 207)

However, the empirical evidence indicates that very few workers join unions for non-work related (private) benefits such as trade discounts, financial packages or other direct services (Waddington & Whitston, as cited by Turnbull, 1995). Therefore, the possible explanation derived from this literature review, to be tested against VIEU’s profile in the Exploratory Stage was

that unions should hold a narrow view of their proper functions and confine their activities to the direct and immediate matters of wages and working conditions to avoid membership decline.

If VIEU’s profile reveals that it held a narrow view of its function and confined its activities to the direct and immediate matters of wages and working conditions from 1994 to 2004, then this may form part of the explanation for VIEU’s density trend.

2 The reporting of false figures

The decline in union membership has been attributed, in some unions, to an adjustment from overly inflated figures in earlier decades back to genuine figures in recent years; i.e., the decline was a paper decline rather than a real decline (ABS 1988; Fox, Howard & Pittard, 1995).

False impressions of the union membership rates came from two sources in the past by

1 not distinguishing between financial and unfinancial members. Up until 1985, the ABS did not distinguish between whether the members of a union were financial or unfinancial. An average 5% to 6% difference in membership rates occurred if financial members only were counted, with the difference being more pronounced for male than female members, as shown in Table 9 below (the financial members are shown in brackets).
In short, for the period shown in Table 9, part of the drop in density is actually a result of a change in the method of data collection by the ABS.

The ABS data collection procedures for its trade union reports up until 1981, in its publication Trade Union Statistics (Cat. No.6323.0) were compiled from questionnaires completed by individual trade unions with respect to their memberships. Fox et al state that the “higher figures obtained from union questionnaires can be explained by double counting resulting from multiple union membership” (1995, p. 174) but that this is a minor factor in comparison to the first factor regarding unfinancial members.

Therefore, the possible explanation derived from this literature review, to be tested against VIEU’s profile in the Exploratory Stage was

that the membership figures supplied by unions have been inflated, particularly in past years, and that the decline is a result of a comparing previously inflated figures with current accurate figures.

If VIEU’s profile reveals that it artificially inflated its membership figures from 1994 to 2004, then this may form part of the explanation for VIEU’s density trend.

3 A shift in the underlying philosophy from IR to HRM

During the 1970s and 1980s the IR approach to personnel management was replaced by the HRM model (Fox et al., 1995). Where “industrial relations” is narrowly described as the “the management or study of the relations between employees, working groups, unions, managers, employers and employer associations, and the intervention in those relations of governments, government agencies and tribunals (Yerbury & Karlsson, 1992, p. 172), HRM refers to a broad understanding of
personnel management, especially in relation to work force or manpower planning. This may include such functions as job design, job evaluation, recruitment, selection, placement, pay and conditions, staff development, management development, training, equal employment opportunity, industrial democracy, industrial relations, occupational health and safety, redeployment, retirement, redundancy, superannuation, leave career planning, work force planning, discipline, performance appraisal, the formulation of competencies, etc. (Yerbury & Karlsson, 1992, p. 157)

The change was more than cosmetic (Fox et. al., 1995; Lucio & Simpson, 1992) and the main differences are outlined by Schuler, Dowling, Smart and Huber (1992) as

- a consultative rather than autocratic or top-down approach
- direct communication with employees instead of no communication or communication through representatives, particularly non-employee representatives such as unions
- a strategy of building mutual respect rather than a competitive relationship between the employer and employees
- a recognition that focusing on the common interests (rather than the conflicts of interest) between the employer and employee.

In short, “what is … important is a commitment to involve employees in any issue of concern” (Schuler et. al., 1992, p. 461) so that the traditionally antagonist approach of industrial relations is replaced by a mutual attempt to resolve conflict at the local level involving the parties directly affected by the problem. It involved “a shift from management – trade union relations to management – employee relations” (Deery, Plowman & Walsh, 1997, p. 39). As Gollan (2002) states, HRM provided a nexus between employees’ desire for equity and fairness and the employers’ desire for increased efficiency and productivity; a strategy of employers getting close to their employees and telling them that trust will eliminate the need for third parties. It is even suggested that HRM originated in the United States as a “process by which management bypasses the union(s) and negotiates directly with the employees, and by making suitable concessions reduces or removes the need or motivation for the union to function” (Yerbury & Karlsson, 1992, p. 157). Therefore, the possible explanation derived from this literature review, to be tested against VIEU’s profile in the Exploratory Stage was

that the HRM shift from management–trade union relations to management–employee relations (addressing local concerns) has made unions (with centralised concerns) become increasingly irrelevant.

If VIEU’s profile reveals that it was not subject to the changes brought on by the shift from IR to HRM from 1994 to 2004, then this may form part of the explanation for VIEU’s density trend.
4 The decline is part of an international trend

Australian trade unions have traditionally played a major role in industrial relations, one that has been relatively greater than in most countries, including those with similar economic and industrial profiles to Australia. Prior to the dramatic decline in union density in the 1980s, Australia’s density rate was high at 50% compared with other advanced OECD countries such as Britain (43%), Canada (35%) and the United States (22%) (Plowman, 1981). The international decline that started in the 1980s and continues today, therefore, had more potential to impact in Australia. However, significant decline occurred in the vast majority of advanced OECD countries including those that changed their wage fixing systems to a more centralised approach (Italy 49% to 39%), a more decentralised approach (United Kingdom 50% to 34%) and those that made no change at all (US 22% to 16%) (ABS, 2002a; Norris et. al., 2005). Therefore, the possible explanation derived from this literature review, to be tested against VIEU’s profile in the Exploratory Stage was

that Australia is simply part of the international decline in the trade union movement.

If VIEU’s profile reveals that it was not subject to these international trends from 1994 to 2004, then this may form part of the explanation for VIEU’s density trend.

4.3.2 Explanations specific to Australia

1 The origins of the trade union movement in the British model (upon which the Australian model is based) with its concomitant modus operandi

Trade unions in Australia were founded on the British ‘Anglo-Celtic’ model (Martin, 1992) with the majority of their members in these formative years being from British and Irish backgrounds (Deery et. al., 2001). The Australian union movement was almost solely British in flavour until the ACTU’s formation in 1927 when distinctly Australian standards, expectations and methods were introduced (Hagan, 1986). Being British based, Australia’s unions had a high-density rate (Jackson, 1992; Markey, 1994), were occupation, not workplace based (Dabscheck, 1995) and, significantly, were based on a conflict model of dispute resolution within a government legislative based framework (Bray et. al., 2005).

Deery et. al. (1997) state that the three theoretical approaches to the employment relationship are

- the unitary approach where the management is the only one source of power. Unions are unwelcome and conflict seen as a ‘pathological deviation’
• the pluralist approach where a variety of legitimate sources of power are recognised. Unions are recognised as one source of legitimate power and conflict is managed by structured ‘rule setting’ (this is the traditional, British based approach adopted by Australia in its industrial relations framework)
• the radical approach where labour (workers) and capital (employers) are seen as fundamentally and irreconcilably opposed.

Deery et. al. (1997) note a shift has occurred from a pluralist to a unitary approach and that this change systematically disempowered unions who remained locked into the pluralist approach. Therefore, the possible explanation derived from this literature review, to be tested against VIEU’s profile in the Exploratory Stage was

that trade unions in Australia, founded on the British trade union model, use a conflict-based model for dispute settlement that is now unattractive to many workers who prefer the agreement-based model of Enterprise Bargaining.

If VIEU’s profile reveals that it was not founded on the British trade union model, then this may form part of the explanation for VIEU’s density trend.

2 The historical role of legislation in protecting and prescribing the role of the trade union movement in Australia and the complementary role of the Australian arbitral system

While the country of origin might provide the framework for the style of trade unionism, as Sisson (1986) states, the way it develops and changes is dependent on the historical situation in which it is placed, particularly during its early formative years. In Australia, the unions’ failure in the Great Strikes’ of 1890 to 1894 (Hagan, 1986) and the following economic depression ensured that unions did not seek to rely on industrial action alone but on a strong political alliance with the Australian Labor Party (ALP) that resulted in their role being enshrined in legislation both at state and federal level (Macintyre & Mitchell, 1989). As a result, since the beginning of Federation and the enshrinement of trade unions in the Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904, unions have had an automatic (protected) role granted to them in legislation. Unlike other industrial relations systems, such as in many European countries where the employer is only forced to recognise unions when the majority of workers are a part of the union, in Australia, unions are registered by industrial tribunals at law (Deery & Plowman, 1991) and are given coverage of employees whether these employees are members of the union or not. Unions needed only to create a paper dispute via an ambit claim to force the employer into negotiations with the union under federal legislation (Bull, 1998; Frazer, 1994). A by-product of this
legislation was that industrial regulation needed to be dispute based in Australia; tribunals and wage boards could only be reactive and respond to formally declared disputes. In short, a dispute had to exist for wages and conditions to be advanced. While this automatic status for unions was seen by some as unreasonable, it was generally acknowledged that the unions’ role was also beneficial to employers because unions were charged with ensuring their members’ compliance with court orders and awards (Frazer, 1995), were not “worried by complaints of individual employees … that any complaints should be presented collectively by some responsible union” (Justice Higgins, the second President of the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration as cited by Hagan, 1986, p. 14) and encouraged employer organisations to form to assist individual employers (Wells, 1994). Thus, for example, in Victoria when the initial Teachers (Catholic Schools) Conciliation and Arbitration Board was established in 1983 (IRCV, 1983) it forced the formation of the VCSA (Sexton, 1986) as an employer organisation to sit on this Board opposite the two teacher unions. While the employee associations, the Victorian Catholic Primary Teachers Association (VCPTA) and the Association of Teachers in Victorian Catholic Secondary Schools (ATVCSS) had formed in 1974 (Cahill, 1992; Feenan, 1993), the collective Catholic employer voice (VCSA) came later in 1983 and only as a result of legislative need.

However, the Australian industrial relations legislation has been seen as a two-edged sword for trade unions because it not only guaranteed a protected and primary role for the trade unions in wages and conditions determination, it also resulted in what was seen as a dependence on the centralised arbitral system rather than a facilitation of local dispute settlement (Weeks, 1995). Jackson cites Isaac as follows:

One of the outstanding features of industrial relations in Australia is the important place occupied by industrial tribunals in settling disputes and fixing the terms of employment by legally binding awards and determinations. The influence of these tribunals is so deep and pervasive as to distinguish the character of Australian industrial relations markedly from most other countries where collective bargaining operates. (1992, pp. 153-154)

Jackson (1992, p. 300) further cites Isaac as stating that the Australian reliance on arbitration is such as to make the term ‘collective bargaining’ a misnomer because so few decisions on pay and conditions were reached voluntarily. Niland (1978) reinforces this view, arguing that the easy over-reliance on arbitration by both employer and employee associations meant that genuine bargaining was encouraged or developed. Fells (1987) concurs that industrial relations at the local level was stunted by dependence on arbitration, although Hince (1980) argues that the Victorian model of Wages Boards brought a model of consensus to dispute resolution. However, Lansbury and Macdonald (1992) report on a series of case studies on
industrial relations at the workplace level, in particular on the influence of arbitral systems on workplace industrial relations, and conclude that by 1992 the influence of the compulsory conciliation and arbitration system on workplaces varied considerably and was not as pervasive as previously reported and that the “unions were not as influential as might have been expected in such highly unionised workplaces” (Lansbury & Macdonald, 1992, p. 232).

In summary, the legislative based role of Australian unionism was born out of the failed industrial action of 1890 to 1894 and the ensuing economic depression that ensured that the trade unions sought no longer to rely on industrial action alone. Instead unions formed a political party that became the ALP that, in turn, resulted in the unions’ role in industrial disputes being enshrined in legislation both at state and federal level. This protected role, established in 1909 remained in placed for almost 90 years without challenge.

The conciliation and arbitration system was not subject to any major public inquiry until the Committee of Review of Australian Industrial Relations Law and Systems (The Hancock Committee of Inquiry) was established in 1984. Perhaps because the forces of microeconomic reform had not then gathered full momentum, the findings of the Hancock Inquiry were conservative. The committee recommended that the system of conciliation and arbitration should be retained and the recommendations it made aimed to improve, but not fundamentally change, the structures or processes established under the Act. (Australian Mines and Metals Association [AMMA], 1999, p. 2)

It was not until 1993 when the Industrial Relations Act 1988 was changed to allow non-union agreements that unions lost this protected role that had always been provided by legislation (Bennett, 1995; Mallesons Stephen Jaques, 1993).

Therefore, the possible explanation derived from this literature review, to be tested against VIEU’s profile in the Exploratory Stage was

that trade union density suffered from the loss in the 1990s of the long-standing legislation that protected and prescribed the role of the trade union movement in Australia.

If VIEU’s profile reveals that it was not subject to this loss of legislative protection, then this may form part of the explanation for VIEU’s density trend.
3 The political affiliation of the trade union movement

In Australia, unlike other countries, the trade union movement is tied to one political party, the ALP, and this relationship has placed it in a position of power in influencing employment relations. When the Australian colonial unions commenced forming political parties, attempts were made to ensure that only those eligible to join a trade or labour society should be likewise eligible to join the political party. Indeed, it was not until 1893 that the right of non-unionists to join the Political Labour League (the predecessor of the ALP) was recognised in all colonies of Australia (Clark, 1969, p. 174). Following the turbulent period of industrial unrest in Australia in the 1890s, the fledging unions’ and labour councils’ response was to form the ALP with the purpose of “neutralising the state apparatus which had intervened so decisively against unions in the 1890s strikes” (Markey, 1994, p. 28). Hagan (1986) sums up the ALP – trade union relationship succinctly:

Because of their special relationship with the trade union movement, Labor governments have been capable of winning greater loyalty from the trade unions than anti-Labor coalitions… In return, the trade unions have expected that Labor governments would enact legislation and administer government ways compatible with trade union policy. (p. xiii)

A simple example of the benefits to trade union membership in an alliance with Labor governments was when the Whitlam Labor government (1972 to 1975) introduced a range of improved working conditions to federal public servants such as parental leave, increased annual leave, annual leave loading and improved maternity leave “and greatly increased their unions’ size by threatening to give improved conditions only to members” (Sheridan, 1994, p. 107).

Non-politically aligned trade unions in many other countries, particularly the European countries, had been less effective in influencing government policy and, therefore, less effective in attracting high membership (Jackson, 1992). However, the downside to political affiliation was that some employees (supportive of another political ideology) would not join the union (Ward & Stewart, 2005) and the affiliation left the union movement open to attack by governments of another political ideology (Fairbrother & Griffin, 2002) but this was a diminishing reason for not joining unions. As the trade union movement broadened its membership base in the latter decades of the 20th century, the unions that emerged to represent teachers, public servants, nurses and a burgeoning range of other white collar and salaried professionals did not affiliate with the ALP. Those unions that were affiliated with the ALP tended to be industrial and craft unions and were no longer typical of the wider trade union movement (Ward & Stewart, 2005). Therefore, the possible explanation derived from this literature review, to be tested against VIEU’s profile in the Exploratory Stage was
that the political affiliation of trade unions has caused them to lose membership.

If VIEU’s profile reveals that it was not seen as politically affiliated, then this may form part of the explanation for VIEU’s density trend.

4 A change in the public perception of unions

In Australia, public opinion polls have consistently revealed that many people regard unions “as being too powerful” (Deery & Plowman, 1991, p. 230) and where a person has a negative perception of unions, regardless of other factors, this becomes a veto influence (Youngblood, DeNisi, Molleston & Mobley, 1984) on them joining a union.

Peetz (2002) compiled a comprehensive list of the published public opinion polls on the issue of whether unions were perceived as having too much power, including those undertaken by commercial organisations (Morgan Gallup Poll, Australian Public Opinion Polls, Age Poll, Newspoll) and academic institutions (the National Social Science Surveys and Australian Political Attitude Survey) from 1967 through to 1992. He states that, while the use of strikes by Australian unions had caused them to be unpopular with the public in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, attitudes towards unions stabilised during the 1990s, perhaps as a result of the Accords (Peetz, 1998). He concludes that the decline in union density between the early 1980s and the late 1990s cannot be directly attributed to a shift in union sympathy ... while sympathy rose, union density fell, principally … because of increasing employer and state resistance to unions. (Peetz, 2002, p. 72)

Despite the stabilisation of the unpopularity of unions in terms of them being seen as too powerful, as demonstrated by Peetz’s (1998) work, the high unpopularity level in the mid 1960s was still a concern to the union movement. Johns (2002) notes that the ACTU recognised that trade unions had not been effective at defining their role in influencing the broader social agenda and that their focus on labour rights only had been counterproductive to their public image. As a result the Unions@Work campaign was launched in August 1999 and had a stated aim to ‘form strong alliances with other groups in the community’ (ACTU, 1999, p. 22) in an attempt to address this issue.

While some writers (Kelly as cited by Bray et. al., 2005) maintain that there is no obvious recruitment and membership pay-off for cultivating public opinion, Deery and DiCieri (1991), in an Australian study, found that prospective members who held a negative opinion of
unions were unlikely to join their union. In short, the evidence remains that the public perception of unions remains poor and is seen as an issue of concern by the unions themselves.

Therefore, the possible explanation derived from this literature review, to be tested against VIEU’s profile in the Exploratory Stage was

that the poor public perception of trade unions has caused them to lose membership.

If VIEU’s profile reveals that it was not subject to this poor public perception, then this may form part of the explanation for VIEU’s density trend.

5 The loss of union preference clauses

Peetz (1998) states the removal of compulsory unionism was the major factor contributing to the union density decline of the 1990s. Drago and Wooden (1998) and Lewis (2000) concur. While compulsory unionism has never been permitted under Australian industrial law, a number of state industrial tribunals (New South Wales, Queensland and South Australia) have allowed preference clauses to be inserted into awards. Preference clauses allow preferential hiring, that is “the hiring of labour on the basis of employing union members before non-union members” (Yerbury & Karlsson, 1992, p. 270). Rawson (1986) states that such conscripts to unionism soon leave unions when there is no compulsion to remain and, therefore when preference clauses were removed in the early 1990s, union density declined markedly (Wooden, 2000).

Zappala (1991a) notes two surveys conducted in 1978 and 1990 by the Roy Morgan Research Centre where the repeated survey of 1990 found that union density fell considerably to 25% (for unwilling conscripts) and to 29% (for willing conscripts). Zappala (1991b) and Lehman (1990) state that closed shops had a number of deleterious effects on trade union effectiveness, including poorer services to members and apathy amongst central union organisers. Additionally, Fox et. al. (1995) point out that this apathy is extended to a reluctance to become union delegates who are then coerced or cajoled into becoming the delegate. “The reluctant delegate will often undertake the minimum of union functions, and may only serve as a communication point between union, management and membership” (Fox et. al., 1995, p. 205).

The result of this combination of apathy and reluctance is nominal union membership and ineffective action by the union. Unions became dependant on closed shops and lost the ability to recruit and retain members (Crean & Rimmer, 1990). Gill and Zappala (1990) raise the issue that
closed shops in Australia have been used by unions against unions so that one union locks out another union, thereby alienating members who want to be a member of the other union.

Griffen and Svensen (1999) found that individuals who joined unions for normative or compulsory reasons had lower levels of satisfaction and commitment to unions and were more likely to leave when the source of the compulsion was removed. They noted that the removal of preference clauses through the Workplace Relations Act 1996 and other legislative measures had contributed to the decline in union density. Therefore, the possible explanation derived from this literature review, to be tested against VIEU’s profile in the Exploratory Stage was that where trade unions lose preference clauses, this has resulted in them losing membership.

If VIEU’s profile reveals that it was not subject to this loss of preference clauses, then this may form part of the explanation for VIEU’s density trend.

6 The changes brought by the Accord process

The trade union movement’s close alliance to the Labor Hawke and Keating governments from 1983 to 1996 through the ‘Prices and Income Accords’ (Fairbrother, Svensen & Teicher, 1997; George, 1997; Hampson & Morgan, 1998) resulted in the unions becoming more responsive to the “economic realities by joining with the federal government to tackle some of the difficult economic and social issues” (Easson, 1994, p. 156). The irony for the unions in supporting the Labor governments and being more economically responsible was a “decline in the union movement not only in membership … but also in the confidence of its own officials, activists and members” (Easson, 1994, p. 158).

The effect of the Accords on union density is a hotly contested issue with some arguing it reduced inflation and introduced long term social reform (Borland & Ouliaris, 1994; Lye & McDonald, 2004; Sheridan 1994), while others argue it was to the detriment of unions (Brewer & Boyle, 1996; Costa, 1997; Lewis, Garner, Drake, Juttner, Norris & Treadgold. 1998; Peetz, 1997; Wailes & Lansbury, 2000) and others believe there were positives and negatives in the Accord for unions (Cooper & Patmore, 2002; Kenyon & Lewis, 1996) and still others believe that the effect was moot (Fox et. al., 1995; Maso & Bain, 1993; Vandaele 2005). Regardless, there is no disputing that some union members were disenchanted with the union movement for entering the Accord. Cook (2000) sums up the proposition here by stating “workers have
increasingly turned their backs on the unions because, far from defending their interests, the unions ... have overseen the wholesale destruction of conditions won by past generations” (p. 2).

Therefore, the possible explanation derived from this literature review, to be tested against VIEU’s profile in the Exploratory Stage was

that the changes brought on by the Accord process (specifically the acceptance by unions of the need to support the Hawke and Keating governments’ social changes) resulted in them losing membership.

If VIEU’s profile reveals that it was not subject to the Accord process, then this may form part of the explanation for VIEU’s density trend.

7 The introduction of enterprise bargaining and AWAs over the award system

The shift towards decentralised wage fixing through collective EBAs and individual AWAs that occurred in the 1990s (Fells, 1993) was a significant factor in the decline of union density rates (ABS, 2002a). EBAs, introduced in 1993 through the Industrial Relations Act 1988, allowed employees to change their wages and conditions without recourse to unions (Bennett, 1995; Mallesons Stephen Jaques, 1993); this despite the fact that the legislation was designed by Bill Kelty of the ACTU and introduced by the Hawke Labor Government (McCallum & Ronfeldt, 1995) and was meant to make trade unions more relevant (ACCIRT, 1999) because the decentralised bargaining system was designed to make unions more visible at the local level.

With EBAs, employees were no longer reliant on unions to represent them in negotiations (Blain, 1993; Frazer, 1995) and they reached agreements that suited their local needs (Ross, 1995). Hall and van Barneveld (2000) note, following their 1999 survey of workplace agreements, that only 38.4% involved union officials in the agreement making process while another 38.4% involved employees acting collectively without union involvement. Significantly 85% involved managers from the workplace and only 2.9% involved federal or state industrial relations tribunals in the agreement making process. Between 1990 and 1995, collective agreements overtook awards as a primary function through which wages and conditions were negotiated. By 1995, the Australian Workplace Industrial Relations Survey (AWIRS) survey revealed that the number of employees covered by federal awards had fallen to only 12% and that more than 50% were covered by EBAs or individual arrangements (Morehead, Steele, Alexander, Stephen, & Duffin, 1997).
In Australia, the move to enterprise bargaining was accompanied by an organised campaign against unions by the ‘New Right’ (ACCIRT, 1999) whereby a concerted campaign was waged to reduce union influence. Employer opposition to unions, while a significant factor overseas (Deery 1995), had not been an issue in Australia up until this time because of the centralised IR system requiring the employer to participate (Crean & Rimmer 1990). In disputes such as the Mudginberri and the Dollar Sweets cases, employers turned away from the AIRC to settle disputes and successfully sued unions for millions in damages through civil courts under the Federal Trade Practices Act (1974) and had union funds sequestered to enforce payment (Yerbury & Karlsson, 1992). This concerted campaign financially crippled the unions and restrained others in the use of some traditional union tactics in tackling employers.

Further changes (Department of Industrial Relations, 1996), introduced through the Workplace Relations Act (1996), by the newly elected non-Labor Howard Government (Abbott, 2002), reduced the scope of federal awards and the AIRC’s arbitral role (Creighton, 2000), introduced AWAs to the exclusion of awards (ABS, 2002a; Ronalds, 1997) and further reduced the monopolistic power of unions to represent employees (McCallum, 2002; Patmore, 2000; Stewart, 2000). Frazer (1995) observed that “the traditional role of unions in Australian industrial law is under threat” (p. 52) due to EBAs and that their most significant impact “will be to provide a framework for the acceleration of the de-unionisation of the Australian labour force” (Nomchong & Nolan, 1995, p. 154). Frazer (1995) observed that unions were “ceasing to have a mandate to act and speak in the interests of employees” (p. 53), at least the vast majority of employees as individual contracts replaced collective arrangements (Peetz, 2006). Leck and Chadbourne (1998) in an examination of the effect of EBAs on non-government schools in Western Australia concluded that EBAs, while having an effect on salaries, made little difference to student learning, work organisation and, most significantly, to teacher unionism.

Employers supported EBAs because they gave them local flexibility (van Barneveld, 2001; van Barneveld & Arsovska, 2001), could be used to formalise existing custom and practice (Plowman, 2002) and reduced the role of unions (Forsythe, 2003). AWAs were not taken up as strongly with only 1.8% of the workforce covered by them (ACCIRT, 2002a) and then mainly in the mining sector (AMMA, 1999, 2004a, 2004b). Therefore, the possible explanation derived from this literature review, to be tested against VIEU’s profile in the Exploratory Stage was that the changes brought on by the EBA process (specifically the loss of the automatic right to be the bargaining agent for employees) resulted in unions losing membership.

If VIEU’s profile reveals that it was not subject to the changes brought on by the EBA process, then this may form part of the explanation for VIEU’s density trend.
The effects of union amalgamation in the early to mid 1990s

At the same time as Enterprise Bargaining (an external threat) was being developed, unions faced an internal threat when, under the direction of the ACTU, they voluntarily undertook major structural change in an attempt to amalgamate into 20 large super unions (Fairbrother, 1991). Under the direction of the then Secretary of the ACTU, Bill Kelty, a strategy was embarked on to arrest the early signs of union decline by promoting union amalgamations through a series of publications and Congress papers, specifically Australia Reconstructed (Australian Council of Trade Unions and Trade Development Council Secretariat, 1987) and then Future Strategies for the Trade Union Movement in 1987 (ACTU, 1987), The Way Forward in 1989 (ACTU, 198) and, finally, Future Directions of the Trade Union Movement in 1991 (ACTU, 1991). The wisdom of the time was that “workplaces characterised by multiple occupational or craft unions … find it more difficult to realise their full productive potential than those possessing single union arrangements” (Deery, 1990, p. 12). The aim was to reduce the then 326 unions to ultimately less than 20 super unions including only one education union covering government and non-government schools and tertiary institutions (Alexander & Lewer, 2004). While significant progress was made the ultimate aim was not achieved (see Table 10).

Table 10
Number of unions 1986 to 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ABS (1999) Trade Union Statistics Australia, Catalogue No.6323.0

However, the perception was that the amalgamations made unions “cumbersome, more bureaucratic, centralised and remote institutions” (Easson, 1994, p. 162). Bodman (1998) and Hanley (1999) concur and the ABS (2002a) also stated that amalgamations resulted in disenchantment and loss of membership. However, the size of the union does not appear to be a factor in itself, so much as the perception of amalgamation. Japan, with thousands of small unions, has an effective union movement, as does Germany where there are only 19 unions (Short, 1992). Regardless, the perception existed amongst employees that unions were less effective by dint of amalgamation.
Therefore, the possible explanation derived from this literature review, to be tested against VIEU’s profile in the Exploratory Stage was

that the amalgamation of unions (resulting in members feeling disenfranchised) resulted in unions losing membership.

If VIEU’s profile reveals that it was not subject to the amalgamation of unions process, then this may form part of the explanation for VIEU’s density trend.

9 **The internal political structures of unions and democracy and the failure to modernise**

The decline in membership density has also been attributed to the failure of the Australian trade union movement to modernise by becoming more democratic institutions (Fairbrother, 1991). This issue was recognised by the ACTU and was a particular focus of concern for the Congresses of 1987, 1989 and 1991 and was reflected in the ensuing papers, Future Strategies for the Trade Union Movement (ACTU, 1987), The Way Forward (ACTU, 1989) and Future Directions of the Trade Union Movement (ACTU, 1991). These Congresses proposed the surprising twin strategies of amalgamation and democratisation to overcome union decline. The strategy of democratisation, to allow members more say in policy, and the amalgamation of unions into super unions were at odds with each other as workers were denied the right to choose their union (Easson, 1994).

As Martin (1992) observed in reporting on the ACTU Congress of 1991, while “the ostensible issue was union democracy” (p. 139), the reality was that most members gave this issue lip service only, with Congress delegates stating that “unions bring people together so that the individuals don’t choose on an individual basis; that is what unions are about” (pp. 139-140). The issue of the undemocratic nature of union structures and operation had been a long-standing issue. Matthews (1968) in the 1960s noted that “the working trade union member has little opportunity for playing a significant role in the making of the national policies of his union” (pp. 83-84) with professional full time union officials or small committees deciding policy. Macken (1996) reported that, in a Newspoll, members “stated their belief that union officials were more interested in their political careers than in the protection of members’ living standards”(p. 2).

The democratisation of unions involved putting in place structures to provide a voice for members in the workplace. Instead of a centralised, bureaucratic union structure where the leadership decided and initiated policy, the argument was for a structure with local workplace
meetings, locally elected delegates, two-way reporting and member involvement in policy formation and implementation (Fairbrother, 1991). The ACTU sought to do this by changing the *modus operandi* of unions from a ‘services’ to an ‘organising’ model (Stuart, 1993). The organising model shifted union resources into supporting local delegates to build workplace activism and a culture of collective identity. The previous services model involved full time central office union officials staying in their office and answering questions from members in the workplace (Cooper, 1998; Cooper & Patmore, 2002). Unions sought to have a trained and active delegate in every workplace. The ACTU’s (1999) research reinforced the value of workplace delegates, reporting that 72% of employees did not join unions because while “many would like to join (they were) never asked” (p. 3).

The Australian Workplace Industrial Relations Surveys (AWIRS) of 1990 (Callus, Morehead, Cully & Buchanan, 1991) and 1995 (Morehead et. al., 1997) indicated that having a union delegate at a workplace reduced the decline of the union. The area of greatest member loss between the 1990 and 1995 surveys were workplaces where there was no union delegate, whereas workplaces with a union delegate managed to remain relatively stable (Figure 35).

---

**Figure 35**

Union and delegate presence at the workplace 1990 to 1995

Source: (Morehead et. al., 1997, p. 17).

Wooden and Baker (1994) reported that having a delegate in the workplace increased union membership. Benson (1998) found that the rate of deunionisation was 2% in workplaces with workplace delegates and 21% where there were no workplace delegates. Despite the ACTU campaign, many unions continued with a servicing model and became mired in the never ending bargaining negotiations leaving fewer resources available for members (Lucio & Simpson, 1992) as they struggled with the disparate, non-centralised EBA processes.
Macken (1997) reported six years later that 57% of workplaces were still totally free of union members and even where the workplace was unionised there was no delegate, and even then, where there was a delegate, most were untrained and spent less than an hour a week on union activity. Bramble (1995) criticised unions that placed trained young organisers who were enthusiastic and had tertiary qualifications but no shop floor experience and claimed that this inhibited membership. More recently, Hanley and Holland (2003) reported that the organising model has had no effect on membership numbers. Lewis, writing ten years after the 1987, 1989 and 1991 Congresses that put the modernisation strategies in place, stated that “the leadership structures of unions have seemed incapable of adapting to smaller, more fragmented workplaces and the demands of more skilled, service-industry workers” (2000, p. 151).

Therefore, the possible explanation derived from this literature review, to be tested against VIEU’s profile in the Exploratory Stage was

that the internal political structures of unions (specifically their lack of democratic procedures) resulted in unions losing membership.

If VIEU’s profile reveals that its internal political processes were seen as democratic, then this may form part of the explanation for VIEU’s density trend.

4.3.3 Summary of the explanations cited from the literature to explain the decline in union density

This review of the literature revealed a raft of explanations for the growth and decline of union membership. Structural factors (e.g., gender, full time/part time status, age, public/private employment, and white collar/blue collar sectors) were linked to the decline in unionism in the 1980s and then, by the 1990s, changes in the sociolegal environment (e.g., public perception, legislative reform, trade union governance structures) were considered to be more significant (Peetz, 1998). However, the most recent literature (Deery et. al., 2005) still cites the full array as contributing factors. Moreover, none of them has been accepted as the predominant reason by writers in the field, leading to the inevitable conclusion that the decline is not the result of a single factor but rather a combination of a number of factors (ACIRRT, 2002b).

Consequently, this review of the literature at looked for models or conceptual frameworks of union membership and union density that presented a comprehensive understanding of this phenomenon. This is outlined in the fourth section, at 4.5.
4.4 REASONS CITED IN THE LITERATURE BY UNION MEMBERS IN GENERAL FOR JOINING UNIONS

4.4.1 An overview

Deery and Plowman (1991; 2005) outline the four main reasons given in the literature for employees joining unions in the Australian context, namely

- dissatisfaction with work related conditions, divided into two sub-groups, namely protection from the employer and improving pay and conditions
- direct services
- ideological beliefs
- compulsion

acknowledging that not only do these factors overlap but also, on many occasions employees are motivated by more than one reason.

4.4.2 Dissatisfaction with work related conditions

Most authors suggest that employees in Australia join unions for “protection and improvement of their pay and working conditions” (Martin, 1980, p. 104). It is important to delineate between the two factors. For many workers, the primary reason they join a union is for protection (Farber & Saks, 1980; Guest & Dewe, 1988; Kochan, 1979) from victimisation and from the threat of dismissal by ‘safety in numbers’. The union acts as a barrier between the employee and the employer and as an advocate on behalf of an employee or group of employees.

Rawson (1980), Dufty (1981) and Klandermans (1986) concur that a primary reason for Australian workers to join unions is dissatisfaction with their pay and working conditions and a desire to work through their union movement to improve them. Deery, Plowman and Walsh (2000) state that, traditionally, the unions’ most important function was to maximise the wages and conditions of its members. Not surprisingly, most research demonstrates that the effect of unions on job satisfaction is to reduce it by making workers more critical towards the workplace and more willing to complain about problems (Borjas, 1979; Freeman & Medoff, 1979; Schwochau, 1987), thereby ensuring that this dissatisfaction with work related conditions increases the density of union membership.
4.4.3 Direct services

The ACTU Congresses of 1987, 1989 and 1991 (ACTU 1987, 1989a, 1991) in the face of union density decline, attempted to broaden the appeal of trade unions by commencing to offer members and prospective members a more diverse package beyond the industrial agenda. Consequently, a range of incentives and services to attract members was introduced such as credit union facilities, everyday insurance (health, property, etc.), legal advice, discount purchasing arrangements, professional indemnity insurance and professional development (Stuart, 1993; Griffin & Svensen, 1996). As Deery and Plowman point out, unions were really returning to their roots because early unions were formed to “protect members against the adversities of illness and unemployment” (1991, p. 264).

These direct services, while advertised by unions as a reason to join (VIEU, 2000d, 2003d), are still seen as secondary functions. The shift to providing direct services in the Australian trade union movement has been regarded by many as half-hearted and a gimmick (Cook, 2000). Others argue that no amount of direct services will generate members’ satisfaction if members’ calls to union officials are not returned and the local industrial issues dealt with (Healey, 1995).

4.4.4 Ideological beliefs

For some employees the decision to join a union is ideological. They join because of their political beliefs or values such as solidarity (Deery & Plowman, 1991). In the case of political beliefs, the alignment of the ALP with trade unions provides an avenue for them to support and influence the ALP and the political agenda (Hagan, 1986; Jackson, 1992; Sheridan, 1994; Fairbrother & Griffin 2002). Others will refuse to join a union, irrespective of the benefits entailed in membership, because they hold separate political beliefs and values (Youngblood et. al., 1984; Ward & Stewart, 2005). In the case of values, particularly solidarity, there is a separation from the political agenda to embrace a broader social agenda. The fact that the ACTU recognised this issue as a reason why people join unions was illustrated in the title and opening statement of the ACTU 1999 report “unions @ work – the challenge for unions in creating a JUST and FAIR society” (ACTU, 1999). The opening statement commenced with

It is the unions that take the lead for better pay, improved living standards, employment security and safer workplaces … And it is the unions that argue – along with others – for more jobs, and better education, health, childcare and community services. (ACTU, 1999, p.ii)

106
It is significant that the title refers to improved living standards not improved working conditions, and that the opening statement again paints the union as a social force not just an industrial force.

This reason of solidarity is often ascribed as a more likely reason for joining a trade union to white collar workers, such as teachers, than to so-called blue collar workers. Reilly, the Federal President at the time of the ACSPA, the association to which teacher unions were affiliated at that time in 1977, on speaking to the members on the prospect of amalgamation into the predominantly blue collar ACTU, stated

Teachers are as much concerned with how they shall fill young minds as they are with filling their own pockets. They raise matters of conscious transcending traditional industrial relations ...While not suggesting that the hip-pocket nerve has been anaesthetized, it is nevertheless discernable that ‘quality of life’ issues – issues of basic logic and integrity – have entered the minds of white collar workers to a degree not recognized twenty years ago. They are catching up to blue-collar workers – on some issues they are passing them. (address in June 1977 as quoted by Hagan, 1986, p. 263)

4.4.5 Compulsion

Finally, some employees join unions because they have no choice; the workplace is a ‘closed shop’ or ‘no ticket, no start’ worksite (Stevens, Millward & Smart, 1989). Compulsory unionism cannot be legislated for under the Australian Constitution that supports freedom of association (McCallum, 2000) and industrial tribunals cannot compel employees to join unions. However, industrial tribunals were, until 1996 when the Workplace Relations Act 1996 was introduced, allowed to insert ‘preference clauses’ into awards that allow employers to give preference in employment to union members. The resultant ‘closed shops’ were ‘pre-entry closed shops’ where employees have to be union members before they are hired or ‘post-entry closed shops’ or ‘union shops’ where employees were hired on the condition that they subsequently join the union (Yerbury & Karlsson, 1992). However, as the previous section on this issue in the literature revealed, compulsion is a reason from the past.

4.4.6 Summary of reasons why employees join unions in Australia

This review demonstrates that there have been six main and unchanging reasons consistently given in the literature for employees joining unions in the Australian context, namely

- protection from the employer
- improving pay
- improving conditions
- direct services
and that the seventh reason, compulsion, while relevant up to the time of the commencement of this research, is no longer relevant in the Australian context.

4.5 SHISTER’S FRAMEWORK AS AN OVERVIEW OF THE FACTORS THAT AFFECT UNION DENSITY

To ensure that the literature review on the proffered factors for Australia’s union density decline has been comprehensive, a general model for union growth was sought against which to test the findings of the literature review and to form an initial conceptual framework for the Exploratory Stage of the research.

An extensive review of the literature revealed that there have been few comprehensive models developed to explain why unions grow and decline. No evidence could be found that any of these few general models had received broad acceptance by other writers, except one. Shister’s (1953) model of ‘the logic of union growth’. This seminal model has been cited as “one of the most influential” (Fox et. al., 1995, p. 170) of the general models of union density growth and decline because it has been regarded as comprehensive, being consistently cited over the decades that followed its publication in 1953 (Dalton, 1982; Fine, 1969; Goldfield, 1987; Poole 1986; Snowbarger, 1974; Waddington, 1995) and is still being cited as relevant by authors in the area of union density growth and decline (Blanchflower, 2006; Prowse & Prowse, 2006; Smith, 2001) including in the Australian context (Borland & Ouliaris, 1994; Griffin & Svensen, 1996) as a “framework valued by a generation of labour scholars” (Hince, 2000, p. 44).

Shister (1953) lists three interdependent factors necessary for growth, namely

- a favourable work environment
- a supportive sociolegal framework
- the quality of union leadership

and asserts that all three factors are interdependent. He contends that given a favourable work environment and a supportive sociolegal background, the union will still not grow if the quality of leadership is poor. Conversely, if the work environment and sociolegal background is unfavourable and unsupportive, even the most inspirational union leaders will not be able to grow the union. In his model, Shister also outlines a number of other factors that enhance union membership density. These are that smaller workplaces have lower membership than do larger
workplaces, that younger workers are more likely to join unions than older workers and that males are more likely than females to join unions.

Table 11 outlines synoptically the factors that Shister’s model covers and the explanations revealed by the literature review for the decline of union density as well as the reasons for joining unions. This table illustrates that Shister’s model is a comprehensive model for union growth and decline.

**Table 11**

The comprehensiveness of Shister’s model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shister’s factors</th>
<th>Explanations for the decline from the literature</th>
<th>Reasons for joining unions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A FAVOURABLE WORK ENVIRONMENT: when the work environment is poor, that is, working conditions are low standard, the employer is harsh or remote and job security is low, then union membership is likely to be higher than when the work environment is good. | • the primary concentration of trade unions on improving wages and conditions of workers as their raison d’être  
• a shift in the underlying philosophy from industrial relations to human resource management. | • dissatisfaction with work related conditions = protection  
• dissatisfaction with work related conditions = improving pay  
• dissatisfaction with work related conditions = improving conditions |
| A SUPPORTIVE SOCIO-LEGAL FRAMEWORK: this comprises two factors, public opinion and legislation. When public opinion is in favour of trade unions then favourable legislation will support the efforts of unions and obstacles to growth will be removed and/or union goals will be successfully achieved. | • part of an international trend  
• historical role of legislation in protecting and prescribing the role of the trade union movement in Australia  
• the political affiliation of the trade union movement  
• a change in the public perception of trade unions  
• the loss of union preference clauses  
• the introduction of EBAs & AWAs over award system.  
• the changes brought by the Accord process. | • ideological beliefs  
• compulsion. |
| THE QUALITY OF UNION LEADERSHIP: a union, once established, will grow only if the leaders are astute enough to recognise changing conditions and develop policies to take these conditions into account. | • the origins of the trade union movement in the British model and *modus operandi*  
• the reporting of false figures  
• the effects of amalgamation of unions.  
• the internal political structures of unions and democracy and the failure to modernise. | • the direct services offered by unions. |
| Other factors that enhance union membership density                               | • growth in white compared with blue collar workers  
• shift from public to private employment. |                                                                                                                                                                       |
Younger workers are more likely to join unions than older workers

- the age of the workforce
- growth in part time compared with full time workers.

Males are more likely than females to join unions.

- growth in female workers compared with male workers
- full time males replaced by part time females

The structural factors and the explanations for the union density decline in Australia both fit within Shister’s framework, as do the typical reasons given by members and potential members for joining unions. Only Shister’s assertion that younger workers are more likely to join unions than older workers is at odds with the explanations garnered to date for the Australian context (Blanchflower, 2006). Shister bases his observation on the data of the 1950s (when union density peaked) and states

younger workers have been nurtured in an era when unionism has become an integral part of our institutional framework. They look upon unionism, therefore, not as something new and exceptional but rather as the "natural" way of handling worker problems ... and this outlook will be reinforced by the fact that the younger workers are more likely to come from homes where the father is (or was) a union member. (Shister, 1953, p. 422)

By the time of the period of this research, 1994 to 2004, this ‘nurture’ effect would have had the opposite effect. The acculturated workers of the 1960s and 1970s would have maintained their propensity to join unions but the new entrants to the Australian workforce of the 1990s and 2000s would not see unions as an integral part of the institutional framework and, therefore, may have been be less likely to join unions as a result.

A number of writers, taken together, support the comprehensiveness of Shister’s model in the Australian context. With regard to the favourable work environment factor, Dabscheck, Griffen and Teicher (1992) and Davis (1972) support the view that an unfavourable work environment stimulates union growth, although Leijins (1996) argues that high unemployment levels assisted governments to oppose unions. However, Borland and Ouliaris’ (1994) refined econometric model included a time-series model for Australian union membership between 1913 and 1989. They concluded that the principal determinant of union membership was linked to the vicissitudes of economic prosperity, particularly to the level of employment/unemployment and that changes in real wage rates also negatively influenced growth rates.

With regard to the sociolegal factor, Dabschenk, (1995) and Peetz (1998) contend that the changes in the sociolegal framework have been a major determinant of union growth particularly in the 1990s when the enshrinement of unions’ role in legislation was dismantled.
With regard to the leadership factor, Freeman (1995) contends that much of the decline in US membership was as a result of poor leadership and Cooper (1998) in Australia argues that it was the unions’ poor strategies (their responses to the external forces) rather than external forces themselves that were the major factor in causing the decline.

Similarly with Shister’s other factors that enhance union growth, with the exception of the observation that younger workers are more likely to join unions than older workers, which has been reconciled above. In addition, Jackson (1992) contends that it is related to the employee’s subjective assessment of the relative costs and benefits of union membership at various stages of their working life; younger employees tend to be more mobile and willing to change employers and, therefore, have less regard for job security.

Jackson (1992) adds that the larger the unit the more likely that workers will recognise a common interest and the more likely it is that they will see themselves as separate and distinct from management. Grimes (1990) and Christie (1992) confirm that establishment size has a positive effect on the likelihood of union membership. In the Australian context, as they confirmed for size, Grimes and Christie confirm that females have a lower propensity to join unions than their male counterparts.

Shister’s model for explaining the vicissitudes of union growth is analogous to a three-legged stool

- the three legs of the stool are a favourable work environment, a supportive sociolegal framework and good union leadership
- if one leg is missing the stool cannot stand; union growth cannot occur
- if one leg is short the growth is limited and lopsided
- if one leg is weak the stability of the growth is limited and precarious
- the legs are strengthened when bound together; when the three factors work interdependently in a positive way, the strongest growth occurs.

In summary, Shister’s three interdependent factor model for general union growth comprehensively encapsulates, as Table 11 has shown, all of the existing literature on Australia’s union density decline. Therefore, it was used as the initial conceptual framework for the Exploratory Stage of this research.

Figure 36 (the determinants of union growth) draws together Shister’s model and the factors cited in the literature review for the decline of trade union density in Australia.
The work environment
- the rate and pattern of economic change (economic prosperity vs hard times)
- the primary concentration of trade unions on improving wages and conditions
- a shift in the underlying philosophy from IR to HRM

The sociolegal framework
- Climate of opinion (public perception)
- Government legislation (loss of privileged place & preference clauses & Accord & EBAs - AWAs)
- the political links of unions (Labor Party)
- part of an international trend

Trade union leadership
- All leaders do not react in the same way to changes in the work environment or the sociolegal framework
- the British origins of the trade union movement and its effect on modus operandi
- the reporting of false figures
- the effects of amalgamation of unions
- the internal political structures & failure to modernise

Optimal growth in union density occurs when all 3 interdependent factors are working in favour of the union:
- a favourable work environment
- a supportive socio-legal framework and
- good union leadership

Figure 36
The determinants of union growth
4.6 THE EXPLORATORY STAGE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

4.6.1 A caveat

With the caveat that this research project used a learning journey approach and, therefore, it was possible that further unexpected propositions might have presented themselves for examination during the Exploratory Stage, the following research questions were evolved from the literature review.

Additionally, a further set of guiding questions was framed for the conclusion of the Exploratory Stage to examine whether a revision of Shister’s model was required prior to the commencement of the Inspection Stage.

4.6.2 Exploratory Stage Phase 1

VIEU’S demographic and contextual profile

Guiding Question 1. Is the demographic and contextual profile of VIEU’s membership typical or atypical of union membership in Australia from 1994 to 2004?

The possible explanations derived from the literature review were

- that as males are replaced in the total Australian workforce and in the Australian education sector’s workforce by females, there is a negative impact on union density
- that as full time workers are replaced by part time workers in the total Australian workforce and in the Australian education sector’s workforce, there is a negative impact on union density
- that as full time males are replaced by part time females in the total Australian workforce and in its education sector’s workforce, there is a negative impact on union density
- that as blue collar workers are replaced by white collar workers in the total Australian workforce, there is a negative impact on union density
- that as public sector workers are replaced by private sector workers in the total Australian workforce, there is a negative impact on union density
- that as younger workers replace older workers in the total Australian workforce, there is a negative impact on union density.
4.6.3 Exploratory Stage Phase 2

The historical and contextual profile

Guiding Question 2. Are the general factors cited worldwide and the specific factors cited for Australia for the decline of trade union membership (arising from the parent literature review) present and have they impacted on VIEU from 1994 to 2004?

The possible explanations derived from the literature review of the general factors cited worldwide were that

1. unions should hold a narrow view of their proper functions and confine their activities to the direct and immediate matters of wages and working conditions to avoid membership decline.
2. the membership figures supplied by unions have been inflated, particularly in past years, and that the decline is a result of comparing previously inflated figures with current accurate figures.
3. the HRM shift from management–trade union relations to management–employee relations (addressing local concerns) has made unions (with centralised concerns) become increasingly irrelevant.
4. Australia is simply part of the international decline in the trade union movement.

The possible explanations derived from the literature review of the specific factors cited for Australia were that

1. trade unions in Australia, founded on the British trade union model, use a conflict-based model for dispute settlement that is now unattractive to many workers who prefer the agreement-based model of enterprise bargaining.
2. trade unions density suffered from the loss in the 1990s of the long standing legislation that protected and prescribed the role of the trade union movement in Australia.
3. the political affiliation of trade unions has caused them to lose membership.
4. poor public perception of trade unions has caused them to lose membership.
5. where trade unions lose preference clauses, this has resulted in them to losing membership.
6. the changes brought on by the Accord process (specifically the acceptance by unions of the need to support the Hawke and Keating governments’ social changes) resulted in them to losing membership.
7 the changes brought on by the EBA process (specifically the loss of the automatic right to be the bargaining agent for employees) resulted in unions losing membership
8 the amalgamation of unions (resulting in members feeling disenfranchised) resulted in unions losing membership
9 the internal political structures of unions (specifically their lack of democratic procedures) resulted in unions losing membership.

4.6.4 Exploratory Stage - Phase 3

Reasons given for joining trade unions

Guiding Question 3. Are the factors cited by teachers for joining VIEU typical of union membership in Australia from 1994 to 2004?

Sub question 1: are the factors cited by the general population also cited by teachers?

- A: protection from the employer
- B: improving pay
- C: improving teaching conditions (e.g., reduced workload)
- D: services such as credit facilities, insurance (health, property, etc.), discount purchasing, professional indemnity, professional development
- E: ideological belief in unions and/or politics
- F: solidarity with teachers in the school and the system.

Sub question 2: are there any different factors cited by teachers, specific to the sector?

Sub question 3: are the factors cited by teachers given the same priority as the general population?

Sub question 4: are there demographic group differences between the options cited by teachers?

4.6.5 The adequacy of the initial conceptual framework

Guiding Question 4. Is Shister’s model adequate in VIEU’s context?

Sub question 1: were there any different factors revealed in the Exploratory Stage that were specific to the sector?

Sub question 2: if so, does this indicate a revision of the conceptual framework?
4.7 CONCLUSION

This Review of the Literature revealed various explanations for the growth and decline of union membership. Here, there are consistent claims that employees join or do not join unions due to the levels of satisfaction with work related conditions (Deery, Plowman & Walsh, 2000), the provision of union direct services (Healey, 1995) and compatible ideological beliefs (Ward & Stewart, 2005) as well as the historical factor of compulsion (Steven, Millard & Smart, 1989). Moreover, it is argued that structural factors (e.g., gender, full time/part time status, age, public/private employment, and white collar/blue collar sectors) were considered to be the main reasons for the decline in unionism in the 1980s. However, by the 1990s, changes particularly in the Australian sociolegal environment (e.g., public perception, legislative reform, trade union governance structures) were considered to be more significant (Peetz, 1998). Beyond identifying these explanations for union membership, this review of the literature revealed that there have been few comprehensive models or conceptual frameworks of union growth. Indeed, only one conceptual framework has received broad acceptance within the literature. Shister (1953) lists three interdependent factors necessary for union growth, including a favourable work environment, supportive sociolegal framework and the quality of union leadership. As a framework for the factors that affect union growth, it demonstrated that this Exploratory Stage literature review comprehensively covered all factors. It was also found to be viable as an initial conceptual framework for this research.

This exploration of the literature confirmed the purpose of this research in terms of developing a more informed and sophisticated understanding of the factors that influence teachers in Victorian Catholic schools to associate or not associate within their trade union, VIEU. The literature to date offers a number of factors in support of (or against) union membership. These factors were used as a framework for disaggregating the overarching research question and for establishing four guiding questions for the Exploratory Stage which were presented in this chapter.
Chapter 5  Exploratory Stage

5.1  INTRODUCTION

Chapter Four presented the second step of the learning journey, a literature review that encompassed all of the explanations offered for the decline in union membership in Australia and worldwide, specifically, the demographic explanations, historical and contextual explanations and the reasons given by workers for joining unions. Chapter Five follows its outline and reports on the third, fourth and fifth steps of the learning journey, displaying the data gathered from the Exploratory Stage’s three phases (respectively examining the demographic explanations, historical and contextual explanations and the reasons given by workers for joining unions). The data are displayed ‘in situ’, embedded within the learning journey process. Each of the three phases of the Exploratory Stage had a particular sub question.

5.1.1  Exploratory Stage Phase 1 (Step 3)
VIEU’s demographic and contextual profile

The first phase examined VIEU’S demographic and contextual profile. Its sub question was

Is the demographic and contextual profile of VIEU’s membership typical or atypical of union membership in Australia from 1994 to 2004? The data displayed are statistical analyses of VIEU, CEOM and ABS data.

5.1.2  Exploratory Stage Phase 2 (Step 4)
VIEU’s historical and contextual profile

The second phase examined the historical and contextual profile. Its sub question was:

Are the general factors cited worldwide and the specific factors cited for Australia for the decline of trade union membership (arising from the parent literature review) present and have they impacted on VIEU from 1994 to 2004?

The data displayed are an eclectic mix of historical document analysis, legal document analysis, statistical analysis and other general document analysis, depending on the appropriate method. Quantitative data were analysed using statistical methods and the qualitative data were
analysed using contemporary documents, legislation (Acts and registered Agreements) and historical document analyses.

5.1.3 Exploratory Stage Phase 3 (Step 5)

The reasons given for joining trade unions

The third phase analysed the reasons given for joining trade unions as revealed by the parent literature review. Its sub question was

Are the factors cited by teachers for joining VIEU typical of union membership in Australia from 1994 to 2004? The data displayed were analyses of a survey completed by 3,555 teachers in Victorian Catholic schools.

5.1.4 Presentation of the data

The data from the Exploratory Stage are displayed ‘in situ’, embedded within the enquiry process itself. This occurs because the data revealed from one step in the process are used to inform subsequent steps and, on two occasions when the data revealed an expected result, to create new steps in the enquiry process. Those results extended the enquiry process and generated new data and, therefore, needed to be displayed in the order they unfolded.

In the first two phases of the Exploratory Stage a number of possible explanations (factors) gleaned from the literature review were examined. Each of these factors purport to explain, or partially explain, why trade union density was in decline globally or in Australia. In order to systematically test each one

- the possible explanation (as derived from the Exploratory Stage literature review) is stated; e.g., that as male workers are replaced in the total Australian workforce and in the Australian education sector’s workforce by female workers, there is a negative impact on union density
- the expected impact as it relates to VIEU’s profile or context is stated as a proposition so that a template is established for testing against the actual data recovered; e.g., if VIEU’s profile reveals that male teachers have not been replaced by female teachers from 1994 to 2004, then this may form part of the explanation for VIEU’s density trend.

Two possible outcomes resulted from the testing of the proposition for each factor

- first, the expected impact derived from the proposition was demonstrated to be true. If this was the case, the factor would be relatively unique to VIEU and,
therefore, it was a possible explanation that could have contributed to VIEU’s increasing union density. It was, therefore, retained for closer examination in the Inspection Stage.

- second, the expected impact derived from the proposition was demonstrated to be false. If this was the case, the factor was common to VIEU and Australia’s other unions and, therefore, it could be disregarded as a possible explanation that contributed to VIEU’s increasing union density. It was, therefore, not retained for closer examination in the Inspection Stage.

In short, during this Exploratory Stage, those factors that VIEU had that were found to be in common with Australia’s general union movement were eliminated and those factors that VIEU had that were found to be relatively unique were retained and used to inform the research focus in the subsequent Inspection Stage.

### 5.2 EXPLORATORY STAGE PHASE 1 (STEP 3)

#### VIEU’S DEMOGRAPHIC AND CONTEXTUAL PROFILE

#### 5.2.1 The growth in female workers compared with male workers and their respective density rates

The review of the literature (Deery et. al., 2001) revealed that as males were replaced by females in the total Australian workforce and in the Australian education sector’s workforce, there was a negative impact on union density.

The proposition to be tested here was that VIEU’s membership from 1994 to 2004 was atypical of union membership, in particular within the Australian education sector; i.e., it was and should have become less feminised. If this was so, then it could help explain why teachers in Victorian Catholic schools have gone against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union.

As shown in the literature review (Deery et. al., 2001), the main difference between teachers in the Australian education sector as well as in Victorian Catholic education and the total workforce was their relative male and female compositions. Males comprised the larger sector in the total Australian workforce while females comprised the larger sector in both the Australian education and the Victorian Catholic teaching workforces. The Victorian Catholic teaching workforce also had a slightly higher ratio of females to males than the general education sector.
teacher workforce. The total Australian workforce (44.4% to 46.8%), the Australian education sector workforce to (64.9% to 68.1%) and the Victorian Catholic teaching force (71.7% to 72.6%) have all had an increasingly stronger female composition since 1994 (Figures 37 & 38).

**Figure 37**
Male composition of the workforces

**Figure 38**
Female composition of the workforces


The male and female union density rates for the total Australian workforce, the Australian education sector workforce and the Victorian Catholic teacher workforce are shown in Figures 39 and 40.

**Figure 39**
Male union density rates of the workforces

**Figure 40**
Female union density rates of the workforces

Statistics compiled from ABS (1999, 2002a, 2004a) for the total workforce and for the education sector workforce. Statistics compiled from VIEU (2005c) for VIEU members.

VIEU started with a female ratio significantly higher than the total Australian workforce (71.7% compared with 44.4%) and the Australian education sector’s ratio (71.7% compared with 64.9%), as noted previously, and became increasingly feminised along with the Australian education sector and total workforce (72.6%, 68.1% and 46.8% respectively). According to the
proposition, VIEU’s density should have started lower and declined more. In fact, VIEU’s female density rate

- started at approximately the same density as the total Australian workforce (35.8% and 31.3% respectively) when it should have been lower and increased to 56.9% (when it should have declined) while the total workforce declined to 21.7% (Figure 39)
- started significantly lower than the education sector’s density rate (35.8% and 55.0% respectively) but increased to 56.9% (when it should have declined) while the education sector declined to 43.7% (Figure 40).

The Victorian Catholic teaching workforce started higher than the total Australian workforce and became increasingly feminised from 1994 to 2004 but this had the reverse impact on VIEU’s union density rates to that expected according to the proposition. Therefore, the male/female composition of the Victorian Catholic teaching workforce was not a factor that contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union.

As a result, this demographic characteristic was eliminated as a factor that could provide a possible explanation and was not retained to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.

5.2.2 The growth in part time workers compared with full time workers and their respective density rates

This section deals with the second demographic characteristic of the full time/part time ratio of VIEU’s union membership and whether it was a factor that contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union. The review of the literature (Deery et. al., 2001) revealed that as full time workers were replaced by part time workers in the total Australian workforce and in the Australian education sector’s workforce, there was a negative impact on union density.

The proposition to be tested here was that VIEU’s membership from 1994 to 2004 was atypical of union membership, in particular within the Australian education sector; i.e., it was, and should have become, less part time. If this was so, then it could help explain why teachers in Victorian Catholic schools have gone against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union.
Full time workers make up the largest sector in the total Australian workforce, the Australian education sector workforce and the Victorian Catholic teaching force. However, all three workforces have had an increasingly stronger part time composition since 1994: 25.3% to 29.5%, 29.3% to 34.9% and 24.8% to 31.4% respectively (Figures 41 & 42).

In terms of full time/part time ratios, there were no differences between Victorian Catholic teachers and the total Australian workforce. The Victorian Catholic teachers’ ratio, in fact, matched the total workforce’s ratio more closely than the general education workforce’s ratio. As the proposition states, the full time composition of the Victorian Catholic teaching workforce was higher than the Australian education sector’s ratio (Figures 41 & 42).

The full time and part time union density rates for the total Australian workforce, the Australian education sector workforce and the Victorian Catholic teacher workforce are shown in Figures 43 and 44.

VIEU started with a similar part time ratio to the total Australian workforce (24.8% compared with 25.3%) and lower than the education sector’s ratio (29.3%), as noted previously. Additionally, VIEU’s ratio became increasingly part time along with the education sector and total workforce (31.4%, 34.9% and 29.5% respectively) overtaking the total Australian workforce’s ratio and closing the gap on the Australian education sector’s ratio. According to the proposition, when applied to the education sector by comparison, VIEU’s density should have started lower and declined but to a lesser extent because of the higher full time ratio. In fact, VIEU’s part time density rate, while it did start lower than the education sector’s (27.1% and
33.2% respectively), increased to 42.2% (when it should have declined) while the education sector remained relatively stable with a small decline from 33.2% to 30.2% (Figure 44).

The Victorian Catholic teaching workforce’s part time ratio increased from 1994 to 2004 and this had the reverse impact on VIEU’s union density rates to that expected according to the proposition. Therefore, the growth in the number of part time employees in the Victorian Catholic teaching workforce was not a factor that contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union.

As a result, this demographic characteristic was eliminated as a factor that could provide a possible explanation and was not retained to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.

5.2.3 Structural changes (full time males being replaced by part time females) and their impact on union density

The two previous sections dealt with the separate impact of the two main individual factors (male v female and full time v part time) on VIEU’s union density rates and established that neither of these factors had the expected negative impact on VIEU’s union density and, accordingly, both were eliminated as factors that had contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union. This section deals with the combined effect of these two demographic factors and examines whether the same structural changes that occurred in the total Australian workforce and in the Australian education sector workforce (full time males were replaced by part time females) also occurred in the Victorian Catholic teachers’ workforce.
The literature review (Deery et. al., 2001) demonstrated that as full time males were replaced in the total Australian workforce and in the Australian education sector’s workforce by part time females, there was a negative impact on union density.

The proposition to be tested here was that VIEU’s membership from 1994 to 2004 was atypical of union membership, in particular within the Australian education sector; i.e., full time males were not replaced by part time females. If this was so, then it could help explain why teachers in Victorian Catholic schools have gone against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union.

Figures 45 and 46 demonstrate that the same structural change occurred in both the Australian education sector and Victorian Catholic teacher workforces (the same structural change occurred in the total Australian workforce. Refer to Figures 21 and 22).

As per the education sector, the relative make up of the Victorian Catholic teaching force changed between 1994 and 2004 (Figures 45 & 46).

- full time male teachers slipped from the 2\textsuperscript{nd} to the 3\textsuperscript{rd} largest group while
- part time females moved up from the 3\textsuperscript{rd} largest group to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} largest group.

In summary, the demographic profile of the Victorian Catholic teaching workforce mirrors, almost exactly, the Australian education workforce in that between 1994 and 2004.
it became even more atypical vis-à-vis the total workforce by becoming more feminised (Figure 38) and more part time (Figure 42), and
the largest decline in both workforces was in male full time teachers and the largest increase was in female part time teachers (Figure 46).

Consequently, there were no structural factors in VIEU’s membership from 1994 to 2004 that set it apart from the Australian education sector as a whole. Its demographic profile and the changes that occurred to it were typical of the Australian education sector’s demographic profile (full time males were replaced by part time females). Despite this, the overall trade union membership density rates diverged greatly between the Victorian Catholic teaching workforce and the total Australian workforce (Figure 48) and, in particular, the Australian education workforce (Figure 47).

VIEU started with a slightly higher female part time sector to the total Australian workforce (21.7% compared with 18.9%) and lower than the education sector’s ratio (21.7% compared with 25.3%), as noted previously and this proportion increased along with the education sector’s and total workforce’s proportions (27.4%, 29.3% and 21.7% respectively) widening the gap with the total Australian workforce’s ratio and closing the gap on the Australian education sector’s proportion (refer to Figures 21, 45 and 46). According to the proposition, when applied to the education sector by comparison, VIEU’s density should have started higher and declined but to a lesser extent because of its lower female part time ratio. In fact, VIEU’s density rate started lower than the education sector’s (36.2% compared with 56.1%)
and increased to 56.8% (when it should have declined) while the education sector’s declined to 44.2% (Figure 48).

The Victorian Catholic teaching workforce’s female part time ratio increased from 1994 to 2004, at the expense of its male full time ratio, and this had the reverse impact on VIEU’s union density rates than that expected according to the proposition. Therefore, the changes to the demographic profile of the Victorian Catholic teaching workforce (full time males were replaced by part time females) was not a factor that contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union.

As a result, this demographic characteristic was eliminated as a factor that could provide a possible explanation and was not retained to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage. Additionally, given that VIEU’s demographic profile was typical of the Australian education sector’s demographic profile, this meant that the issue that VIEU was a union in the education sector could also be eliminated as a factor that could inform the Inspection Stage. Further, given that the demographic profile of VIEU’s membership is typical of Australia’s education unions, the only difference between them is contextual. Both sectors are educational with the same profile of employees but the employer for Victorian Catholic teachers is the Catholic Church. This significant factor was retained to inform the Inspection Stage, as well as the later part seven of the Exploratory Stage.

In summary, the previous three sections (5.2.1, 5.2.2 and 5.2.3) dealt with the three major demographic factors that writers (Deery et. al., 2001) have attributed with the most impact on Australia’s trade union density decline; the growth in the female proportion of the workforce, the growth in the part time proportion of the workforce and the associated structural change that occurred in the Australian workforce as full time males were replaced by part time females. It was established that, while all three changes also occurred in the Victorian Catholic teachers’ workforce, none of these structural changes were associated with similar downturns or had the expected negative impact on VIEU’s union density.

The next three sections (5.2.4, 5.2.5 and 5.2.6) deal with the change in three further minor demographic factors that have also been attributed with a negative impact on Australia’s trade union density decline; the growth in the white collar proportion of the workforce, the growth in the private sector proportion of the workforce and the ageing of the Australian workforce.
5.2.4 The growth in white collar workers compared with blue collar workers

This section deals with the impact of the shift from blue collar workers to white collar workers in the Australian workforce and whether there was anything in this factor that might explain why teachers in Victorian Catholic schools have gone against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union. The literature review demonstrated (Deery & Plowman, 1991; Peetz, 1990; Western 1996; Yerbury & Karlsson, 1992) that as blue collar workers were replaced in the total Australian workforce by white collar workers, there was a negative impact on union density.

The proposition to be tested here was that VIEU’s membership from 1994 to 2004 was atypical of union membership, in particular within the Australian education sector (teachers go against the trend of most white collar workers). If this was so, then it could help explain why teachers in Victorian Catholic schools have gone against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union.

From 1994 to 2004 there was a consistent growth in white collar workers vis-à-vis blue collar workers with white collar service industry employees being less likely to join unions than blue collar. In Figures 49 and 50 below this is expressed as the shift from the manufacturing sector to the education sector in the Australian economy

- the manufacturing sector’s union numbers declined from 421,600 to 262,600 members while the education sector’s union numbers declined from 305,300 to 294,600 members (Figure 49); the manufacturing sector starting stronger than the education sector in terms of numbers but finishing weaker
- the manufacturing sector’s union density declined from 40.8% to 26.0% while the education sector’s union density declined from 56.1% to 44.2% (Figure 50)
- the manufacturing sector’s union density decline was relatively greater, declining to 63.7% of the 1994 figures compared with 78.9% in the education sector’s union density despite being significantly lower at 40.8% and 56.1% respectively at the beginning of the period (Figure 51).

In fact, these figures demonstrate that the education sector does not fit the normal white collar template because, unexpectedly

- its membership figures start lower (305,300 to 421,600) but finish higher (294,600 to 262,600) than the blue collar figures (Figure 49)
• its density rates start higher (56.1% to 40.8%) and finish higher than the blue collar manufacturing rates (44.2% to 26.0%) (Figure 50).

• its relative decline (to 78.9%) is less than the manufacturing sector’s (to 63.7%) (Figure 51).

Figure 49
Union membership numbers
manufacturing v education sectors

Figure 50
Union density rates
manufacturing v education sectors

Figure 51
Relative union density decline
manufacturing v Education sectors


However, even though the education sector declines less, it still declines, whereas VIEU’s density rates rose from 36.2% to 56.5% (a relative increase of 56.0%), as illustrated in Figure 6 (see Appendix A, Table A2 for details). If the white collar and blue collar factor was a factor, even given the education sector white collar anomaly, the white collar factor should have led to contributing to a decline in density rates.

As a result, this demographic characteristic was eliminated as a factor that could provide a possible explanation and was not retained to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.
5.2.5 The shift from public to private employment in the Australian economy

The previous section established that being a white collar union did not have the expected negative impact on VIEU’s union density and, accordingly, it was eliminated as a factor that contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union. It also demonstrated that the education sector was anomalous in terms of white collar unions because its membership rates were higher than the manufacturing sector and showed less density decline than blue collar unions. Part of this anomaly may be because the education sector is predominantly in the public sector of employment rather than the private sector of employment, with public sector employees being more likely to join unions than private sector employees.

This section deals with the demographic factor that VIEU was a union operating in the private rather than public sector of the Australian workforce and whether this factor has contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union.

The literature review (Deery & Plowman, 1991; Jackson, 1992; Peetz, 1990) demonstrated that as public sector workers were replaced in the total Australian workforce by private sector workers, there was a negative impact on union density.

The proposition to be tested here was that VIEU’s membership from 1994 to 2004 was atypical of union membership, in particular within the Australian education sector (Catholic school teachers are employed in the private sector). If this was so, then it could help explain why teachers in Victorian Catholic schools have gone against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union.

From 1994 to 2004 there was a consistent decline in both private sector union members and public sector union members with private sector service industry employees being less likely to join unions than public sector employees

- the public sector union members declined from 1,006,100 to 692,100, while the private sector declined from 1,277,200 to 1,150,000 members (Figure 52); the public sector starting stronger than the private sector in terms of numbers but finishing weaker. However, these figures mask the fact that there was considerable growth in the private sector workforce (4,912,300 to 6,609,200), compared with overall decline in the public sector workforce (1,614,900 to 1,491,600)
the public sector union density declined from 62.3% to 46.4% whereas the private sector declined 26.0% to just 17.4% (Figure 53).

- the decline in the private sector was relatively greater, declining to 66.9% of the 1994 figures as compared with a decline to 74.5% in the public sector (Figure 54).

![Figure 52](image1.png)  
**Figure 52**  
Union membership numbers public v private sectors  
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**Figure 53**  
Union density rates public v private sectors  
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**Figure 54**  
Relative union density decline public v private sectors  

Given this general trend, it would be expected that the membership density decline in the private (Catholic) teacher unions would be greater than that in the public (Government) teacher unions. However, VIEU increased its density (refer Figure 6 and Appendix A, Table A2). Therefore, the shift from public to private employment cannot be used as an explanation for VIEU resisting the decline in union membership density.

As a result, this demographic characteristic was eliminated as a factor that could provide a possible explanation and was not retained to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.
5.2.6 The average age of VIEU’s teacher membership

This section deals with the demographic factor of the ageing of the Australian workforce and its impact on VIEU’s density rates. The literature review (Lowe & Rastin, 2000; Norris, Kelly & Giles, 2005) demonstrated that as younger workers were replaced in the total Australian workforce by older workers, there was a negative impact on union density.

The proposition to be tested here was that VIEU’s membership from 1994 to 2004 was atypical of union membership, in particular within the Australian education sector (Catholic school teachers are older). If this was so, then it could help explain why teachers in Victorian Catholic schools have gone against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union.

In its standard publication, ‘Employee Earnings, Benefits and Trade Union Membership’ (Catalogue 6310.0), the ABS does not include age breakdowns for trade union membership as a whole or for teachers within the total workforce or for teachers who are members of trade unions. However, in a Research Note (7 March 2005) entitled ‘Australia’s ageing workforce’ (Kryger, 2005), the ABS provided to the Department of Parliamentary Services a number of salient points for the period 1984 to 2004 which are illustrated in Figure 55.

![Chart 1. Average age of full-time workers and civilian population aged 15-64 years](image)

**Figure 55**
Average age of full time workers and civilian population aged 15 to 64 years

(Kryger, 2005)

Kryger (2005) states that

- for the past two decades the workforce has been ageing at a faster rate than the general population (according to the proposition, union density should therefore increase)
• in 2004, when the average age for the total workforce was 38.6 years, the average age of teachers was 43.4 years, the oldest of any industry sector (according to the proposition, teacher union density should therefore increase)
• while the average age of the total workforce had increased by 2.8 years between 1984 and 2004, the average age of teachers increased by 5.2 years.

A second article by the ABS (2004a) analyses the impact of a number of demographic factors, including age, on trade union membership density over the period 1988 to 2003 and presents an analysis of the estimated proportion of the decline that can be explained by each factor in the composition as follows in Table 12.

Table 12
Factor standardised trade union membership rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time/part time</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(O’Rourke, 2004, p. 8)

In short, “the changes in the age and sex structure of employees accounted for little in the decline in the trade union membership rate. In fact, the ageing of the population had a positive effect on the unionization rate, with an increase in age groups with relatively higher rates” (O’Rourke, 2004, p. 6).

Consequently, while age cannot be eliminated in the same way as the previous demographic factors, due to the fact that no statistics are available from the ABS, the CEOM or VIEU on the ages of their respective teacher cohorts, a reasonable assumption can be made that
• given that age was not a significant factor overall in determining union membership during the period 1994 to 2004 (according to O’Rourke, 2004) and
• that the age of teachers in Victorian Catholic schools was not significantly different to other teaching workforces in Australia in that same time period then the factor of age can be eliminated on the balance of probabilities.

As a result, this demographic factor was eliminated as a factor that could inform the Inspection Stage.
In summary, the previous six sections (5.2.1, 5.2.2, 5.2.3, 5.2.4, 5.2.5, 5.2.6) dealt with the change in the six demographic factors that have been attributed with an impact on Australia’s trade union density decline. It demonstrated that the Victorian Catholic education sector’s demographic profile was essentially typical of the Australian workforce and, in particular, the Australian education workforce. It further demonstrated that some of the demographic factors should have had a more negative impact on the Victorian Catholic sector and led to an even greater decline rather than the counter trend of growth that was experienced by VIEU. As a result, all six of these demographic factors were eliminated as factors that could provide a possible explanation and were not retained to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.

However, two issues arose that required further exploration in the Inspection Stage:

- first, the one contextual factor that was not eliminated by this examination was the issue that the employer of VIEU’s members was the Catholic Church (and its approach to employment relations)
- second, the one anomaly that occurred regarding the demographic profile was that the education sector does not fit the normal white collar template because its density rates start higher than expected (i.e., higher than blue collar rates) and decline less than expected (i.e., decline less than blue collar rates).

Given the incremental design of this research, where one stage informs the focus of the next stage, both of these issues caused this first phase of the Exploratory Stage to be extended:

- first, to test the proposition that a possible factor could be that the employer of VIEU’s members was the Catholic Church. This could be tested by examining the density rates of the two components of VIEU’s membership, those employed by Catholic schools and those employed by Independent (non-Catholic) schools and
- second, to test the proposition that a possible factor could be that VIEU’s members were teachers. This could be tested by examining the density rates of the two components of VIEU’s membership, teachers and non-teachers.

5.2.7 VIEU’s Catholic school staff membership compared with its Independent (non-Catholic) school membership

There is no proposition to be tested in this section that is derived from the literature review because the enquiry arises from an earlier Exploratory Stage step (5.2.3. Structural changes [full time males being replaced by part time females] and their impact on union density).
The proposition to be tested here was that VIEU’s union density was a contextual factor associated with the employer being the Catholic Church. This section examines whether the increase in VIEU’s union density has been consistent across all of its membership categories or whether there has been differential growth in the Catholic school staff and non-Catholic school staff components of its membership.

VIEU is an ‘industry’ based union. Accordingly, under its federally registered rules during this period it was able to enrol the vast majority of employees employed in non-government schools in Victoria. This included Catholic schools and Independent (non-Catholic schools) with different religious affiliations, such as Anglican and Lutheran schools, as well as different educational philosophies such as Montessori and Steiner schools.

Figure 56 demonstrates that there was a significant difference between the density rates for Catholic and non-Catholic staff members in two areas:

- Catholic school staff density rates started significantly higher at almost twice the density rate (32.6% compared with 17.2% or relatively 189.5% in 1994) of the non-Catholic school staff rates and remained consistently higher (finishing at 50.7% compared with 27.2% or relatively 186.4% in 2004) throughout the period.
- Catholic school staff density rates consistently increased throughout the period starting from 32.6% in 1994 and finished at 50.7% in 2004 whereas non-Catholic school staff rates suffered a decline between the years 1997 and 2000.

Figure 56
VIEU density rates. All staff members. Catholic schools v Independent (non-Catholic) schools.
Statistics compiled from VIEU (2005c).
As a result, this contextual factor (the employer of VIEU’s members is the Catholic Church) was confirmed by this supplementary examination as a factor that could have contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union.

Consequently, this contextual factor was retained as a factor that could provide a possible explanation to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.

5.2.8 VIEU’s teacher membership compared with its non-teacher membership

The previous section dealt with the first issue that arose from the Exploratory Stage Phase 1 (the contextual factor of the Catholic Church being the employer) that needed supplementary exploration. This section deals with the second issue that needed supplementary exploration, the white collar/blue collar anomaly in the education sector’s density profile.

Since the parent literature did not reveal this factor but instead the enquiry arose from the earlier Exploratory Stage Step 5.2.4 (the growth in white collar workers compared with blue collar workers), there was no proposition derived from the literature review. Section 5.2.3 found that the one anomaly in the education sector’s density profile was that it did not fit the normal white collar template because its density rates started higher than expected (i.e., higher than blue collar rates) and declined less than expected (i.e., declined less than blue collar rates).

The proposition to be tested here was that VIEU’s union density was a contextual factor, associated with VIEU’s members being teachers. This section examines whether the increase in VIEU’s union density has been consistent across all its membership categories or whether there has been differential growth in the teacher and non-teacher components of its membership.

As stated previously, during this period of 1994 to 2004 VIEU was an ‘industry’ based union and not a single occupation or classification industry. Under its federally registered rules VIEU was able to enrol the vast majority of employees employed in non-government schools in Victoria including teachers and most non-teachers employed in these schools.

Figure 57 demonstrates that there was a significant difference between the density rates for teaching and non-teaching staff employed in Victorian Catholic schools in two areas.
- Teaching staff density rates started significantly higher at more than twice the density rate (36.2% compared with 15.5% or relatively 233.5% in 1994) of the non-teaching school staff rates and remained consistently higher (finishing at 56.5% compared with 28.7% or relatively 196.9% in 2004) throughout the period.

- Teaching staff density rates consistently increased throughout the period starting from 36.2% in 1994 and finished at 56.5% in 2004 whereas non-teaching staff rates suffered a decline between the years 1996 and 2001.

Figure 57
VIEU density rates.
Catholic school teachers v Catholic school non-teachers.
Statistics compiled from VIEU (2005c).

Consequently, this occupational contextual factor (teachers and non-teachers in the same workplace) was confirmed by this supplementary examination as a factor that could have contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union.

As a result, this contextual factor was retained as a factor that could provide a possible explanation to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.
5.2.9 VIEU’s membership categories (Catholic school staff v Independent school staff and teacher v non-teacher membership) in concert

Given the incremental design of this research, where one stage informs the focus of the next stage, an examination of the data from Section 5.2.7 (VIEU’s Catholic school staff membership compared with its Independent (non-Catholic) school membership) in conjunction with Section 5.2.8 (VIEU’s teacher membership compared with its non-teacher membership) revealed a further pattern and that was examined before finalising this first phase of the Exploratory Stage.

The pattern common to both sections (5.2.7 and 5.2.8) was that

- all categories, Catholic school staff and non-Catholic school staff, teaching and non-teaching staff increased their density rates over the period 1994 to 2004. (see Table 13 below). This suggested that it was not the influence of
  - the Catholic schools having the Church as an employer nor
  - the members being teachers rather than non-teachers
  
but rather the fact that VIEU’s modus operandi itself was the factor that was common and contributed to teachers in Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union.

### Table 13
VIEU membership: all categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1994</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-teachers</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics compiled from VIEU (2005c).

- However, the decline in membership density (see Figure 58) that occurred
  - for Independent (non-Catholic) schools from 1997 to 2000 (but not in Catholic schools) and
  - for non-teaching staff in Catholic schools from 1996 and 2001 (but not for teaching staff)
belied this explanation and demonstrated that it was not VIEU’s *modus operandi* alone that was the factor that contributed to teachers in Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union.

![Figure 58](image)

**Figure 58**

*VIEU membership category densities 1996 to 2001*

Statistics compiled from VIEU (2005c).

The only consistent increase in membership density was in teachers employed in Catholic schools. However, VIEU’s *modus operandi* must have contributed in some way to staff choosing to go against the trend by choosing to associate in their union because the density rates for staff in Independent (non-Catholic) schools increased from 1994 to 2004 when the density rates in the Australian education sector declined in general over the same time period (Table 14).

**Table 14**

*Union densities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIEU non-Catholic sector v Australian education sector</th>
<th>1994</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIEU Independent schools membership density</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian education sector membership density</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Therefore, the fact that the Catholic Church is the employer in Catholic schools cannot be the factor acting alone because this factor is missing in Independent schools and yet the counter density rate trend was still present (albeit to a lesser degree and not in all years).
Similarly, VIEU’s *modus operandi* must have contributed in some way to staff choosing to go against the trend by choosing to associate in their union because the density rates for non-teaching staff in Catholic schools increased from 1994 to 2004 when the density rates in the Australian blue collar sector declined in general over the same time period (see Table 15).

### Table 15
Union densities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIEU non-teacher sector v Australian education sector</th>
<th>1994</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIEU Catholic non-teacher density</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian blue collar density</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Therefore the fact that the members are teachers cannot be the factor acting alone because this factor is missing in the non-teacher membership category and yet the counter density rate trend was still present (albeit to a lesser degree and not in all years).

In summary, the increase in the Independent (non-Catholic) school density rates and the increase in the non-teaching staff in Catholic schools’ density rates indicated that VIEU’s *modus operandi* could be a contributing factor to the increase in the density rates of teachers in Victorian Catholic schools along with the two previously identified factors, namely, that the Catholic Church was the employer and that the members were teachers.

### 5.2.10 A summary of the Exploratory Stage Phase 1 data

In conclusion, the collective data of this Exploratory Stage Phase 1 resolved the answer to the first sub question of guiding question one, namely

is the demographic and contextual profile of VIEU’s membership typical or atypical of union membership in Australia from 1994 to 2004?

The data demonstrated that VIEU’s demographic profile was typical of union membership in Australia (particularly the education sector’s) from 1994 to 2004. It demonstrated that

- there was no demographic factor examined that was the source of the counter trend growth
in fact, some of these demographic factors should have had a more negative impact on the Victorian Catholic sector and led to a greater decline rather than the counter trend growth.

Two issues arose that required further exploration and the exploration of these two issues provided a third possible factor. These two extensions to the first phase of the Exploratory Stage demonstrated that

- the contextual factor that the Catholic Church was the employer (and its approach to employment relations)
- the fact that members are teachers and
- VIEU’s *modus operandi*

were all possible explanations and, therefore, were all retained as factors to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.

Figure 59 summarises the position reached at this stage of the examination of data.
Exploratory Stage
a broad ranging exploration of possible explanations to the issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Phase 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploring the context</td>
<td>Literature review reasons</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inspection Stage
Examination of factors from the Exploratory Stage Phases 1, 2 & 3.

**Issue**

What factors have contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general Australian and worldwide trend by choosing to associate in their union?

**Profile**

VIEU’s demographic & contextual profile.

- Catholic Church is the employer
- VIEU’s members are teachers
- VIEU’s modus operandi

**Literature review explanations**

- Reasons cited for the worldwide and Australian decline in union density
- Reasons cited by Victorian Catholic teachers for joining VIEU.

**Reasons**

- These factors are the same as other unions in Australia
- These factors that are not part of the solution because they are present in unions experiencing density decline

**Profile**

VIEU’s demographic & contextual profile.

- Increasing female % of the workforce (WF)
- Increasing part time % of WF
- PT females replacing FT males in WF
- An education industry union
- Increasing white collar % of WF
- Increasing private % of WF

**Solution**

Those factors, acting both independently and/or in concert, that emerged in the Exploratory Stage and have been tested in the Inspection Stage.

**Interviews**

With focus groups and a follow up survey on the issues that surfaced in the Exploratory phases 1, 2 and 3.

**Figure 59**

Progress Chart: Exploratory Stage Phase 1
5.3 EXPLORATORY STAGE PHASE 2 (STEP 4)

THE HISTORICAL, CONTEXTUAL PROFILE AS REVEALED IN THE REASONS OFFERED BY THE LITERATURE REVIEW

5.3.1 Overview

This second part of the Exploratory Stage examined the factors cited in the parent literature review for the decline of union density and whether they impacted on VIEU from 1994 to 2004. The data displayed are an eclectic mix of historical document analyses, statistical analyses and document analyses, depending on the appropriate method.

This Exploratory Stage Phase 2 has two parts. It is an exposition of data concerning
1 the general factors cited for the decline of trade union membership worldwide arising from the parent literature review
2 the specific factors cited for the decline of trade union membership in Australia arising from the parent literature review.

5.3.2 General factors cited worldwide

1 The primary concentration of trade unions on improving wages and conditions of workers as their raison d’être

The literature review raised a possible explanation for union density decline in the terms that unions should hold a “narrow view of their proper functions … (and) … confine their activities to the direct and immediate matters of wages and working conditions” (Deery et. al., 2001, p. 204) rather than offer “all kinds of incentives and gimmicks, including access to a range of discounted retail goods and cheap holidays” (Cook, 2000, p. 1) because, by being distracted from their ‘proper’ purpose, they have lost the support of workers.

The proposition to be tested here was that there was no broadening of the role of unions in the case of VIEU; that VIEU remained focused on a ‘proper’ and ‘narrow’ view of the purpose of trade unions and, by doing so, protected itself from this possible explanation for union density decline.

An examination of VIEU’s website demonstrated that it had taken the broader and not the narrower view of the role of trade unions. Direct services are part of its recruitment strategy for members, but in a secondary not a primary role.
On its ‘member services’ page, VIEU states its primary purpose membership of the Victorian Independent Education Union unites thousands of colleagues in independent education workplaces in Melbourne and across Victoria. Your VIEU membership helps to protect your job, improve your wages and conditions, and ensures a better teaching and learning environment for our students. (VIEU, 2003d)

It goes on to state underneath in the same section of its website, its secondary purposes

Your union membership also entitles you to many other benefits including free legal advice, professional indemnity insurance, discounts on many goods and services, financial advice and other privileges that can provide great savings for you and your family.

The various benefits available to union members are outlined here

- Union assist (WorkCover Conciliation Support for Union Members)
- Legal support (professional indemnity and legal liability insurance)
- VIEU training (e.g., consultative committee training)
- Teacher exchange
- Consumer benefits (shopping discounts, travel, car purchase and rental discounts, etc.)
- Members Equity (Super Members Home Loan)
- Health fund (not-for-profit health fund).

(VIEU, 2003d)

The evidence from VIEU’s website recruitment literature demonstrated that VIEU had adopted the broader and not the narrower view on the purpose of trade unions. Consequently, the proposition that there has been no broadening of the role of unions in the case of VIEU and that by remaining focused on a ‘proper’ and ‘narrow’ view of the purpose of trade unions, VIEU has been protected from this factor, can be rejected.

The proposition that VIEU remained focused on a ‘proper’ and ‘narrow’ view of the purpose of trade unions and, by doing so, protected itself from this possible explanation for union density decline has been shown to be incorrect. As a result, this reason offered by the literature review was eliminated as a factor that could provide a possible explanation and was not retained to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.
2 The reporting of false figures by trade unions

The literature review raised a second possible explanation worldwide for union density decline in the terms that the membership figures supplied by unions have been inflated, particularly in past years, and that the decline is a result of a comparison of previously inflated figures with current accurate figures.

The proposition to be tested here was that the baseline comparative data from the ABS was inaccurate and that, in addition, VIEU is simply reporting membership figures that were false.

An examination of the ABS data collection procedures for its trade union reports revealed that until 1981, trade union membership figures reported in the ABS publication ‘Trade Union Statistics’ (ABS Cat. No.6323.0) were compiled from questionnaires completed by individual trade unions with respect to their membership (Visser, Martin & Tergeist, 2003) and, therefore, were subject to misreporting. However, since that time the ABS publications, ‘Employee Earnings, Benefits and Trade Union Membership and Trade Union Members, Australia’ (ABS Cat. No.6310.0 and 6325.0, respectively) have used data that were collected through a demographic procedure that did not rely on union reports (Deery et. al., 1997). Consequently the data used in this research from 1994 to 2004 for trade union membership of the total Australian workforce and the education sector are free from possible misreporting.

In terms of the validity of the data supplied from VIEU’s records, this research was set just in Victoria from 1994 to the present because reliable figures on membership could be obtained from this period that commenced when VIEU’s first membership registrar, Paul Garner, was appointed. In 1993, VIEU was formed as an amalgam of four pre-existing unions and became a federally registered union, making it subject to the A IRC audit processes. The Workplace Relations Act (1996) under Section 919 (Enforcement) includes a Schedule 1 (Registration and Accountability of Organisations) that requires under its Section 231 that an organisation must keep a copy of its register of members as it stood on 31 December in each year and then, under Section 233, lodge that information, including a statutory or solemn declaration with the Australian Industrial Registry as follows

(1) An organisation must lodge in the Industrial Registry once in each year, at such time as is prescribed:
   (a) a declaration signed by the secretary or other prescribed officer of the organisation certifying that the register of its members has, during the immediately preceding calendar
year, been kept and maintained as required by paragraph 230(1)(a) and subsection 230(2); and

(b) a copy of the records required to be kept under paragraphs 230(1)(b), (c) and (d), certified by declaration by the secretary or other prescribed officer of the organisation to be a correct statement of the information contained in those records.

(2) An organisation must, within the prescribed period, lodge in the Industrial Registry notification of any change made to the records required to be kept under paragraphs 230(1)(b), (c) and (d), certified by declaration signed by the secretary or other prescribed officer of the organisation to be a correct statement of the changes made.

(3) A person must not, in a declaration for the purposes of this section, make a statement if the person knows, or is reckless as to whether, the statement is false or misleading.

Note: This section is a civil penalty provision (see section 305).

Workplace Relations Act (1996)

Section 230 lists the records that must be kept and lodged by organisations as follows

(1) An organisation must keep the following records:

(a) a register of its members, showing the name and postal address of each member and showing whether the member became a member under an agreement entered into under rules made under subsection 151(1);

(b) a list of the offices in the organisation and each branch of the organisation;

(c) a list of the names, postal addresses and occupations of the persons holding the offices;

(d) such other records as are prescribed.

Note: This subsection is a civil penalty provision (see section 305).

Workplace Relations Act (1996)

(2) An organisation must:

(a) enter in the register of its members the name and postal address of each person who becomes a member, within 28 days after the person becomes a member;

(b) remove from that register the name and postal address of each person who ceases to be a member under the rules of the organisation, within 28 days after the person ceases to be a member; and

(c) enter in that register any change in the particulars shown on the register, within 28 days after the matters necessitating the change become known to the organisation.

Note 1: This subsection is a civil penalty provision (see section 305).

Workplace Relations Act (1996)

Failure to comply with the Act results in prescribed penalties including the cancellation of the registration of the union, the ultimate sanction. Additionally, as a federally registered
union, VIEU is also subject to an audit by the AEC. The Workplace Relations Act (1996) Schedule 1, Section 182, requires that each election for an office bearer must be conducted by the AEC. Part 2 sets out the rules for elections and under Schedule 1, Section 189 (1), an organisation must lodge with the AIRC’s Industrial Registry prescribed information in relation to an election that is to be conducted by the AEC, including the number of members eligible to vote in the election.

The evidence from the Workplace Relations Act (1996) demonstrated that VIEU was subject to two rigorous audit processes on its reported membership figures conducted by the Australian Industrial Registry and the AEC.

The proposition that, during the period 1994 to 2004, the baseline comparative data from the ABS was inaccurate and that, in addition, VIEU was simply reporting membership figures that were false has been shown to be incorrect. As a result, this reason offered by the literature review was eliminated as a factor that could provide a possible explanation and was not retained to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.

3 A shift in the underlying philosophy: IR to HRM

The literature review raised a third possible explanation worldwide for union density decline in the terms that since the 1980s there has been a shift from a philosophy based on IR management techniques to HRM techniques and that “HRM contains a number of essential elements … (which) include … a shift from management – trade union relations to management – employee relations” (Deery et. al., 1997, p. 39) so that as employers have increasingly learned to deal directly with their employees (and vice versa) on issues of local concern and, consequently, unions (with centralised concerns) have become increasingly irrelevant to employees.

The proposition to be tested here was that there has been no such shift in the underlying philosophy underpinning Victoria Catholic education; that the HRM philosophy was not present in Victorian Catholic education and, therefore, VIEU was protected from this factor.

An examination of the VCSA’s historical data revealed a strong philosophical as well as a formalised commitment to a key plank of the HRM philosophy, that of local consultation with employees (in addition to a commitment to centralised collective bargaining). For example,
Terry Synan, the President of the VCSA from 1992 to 1996, in his first message to employers stated that “collaboration and not confrontation is the way forward” (VCSA, 1992a, p. 2) and that Catholic schools … have rich traditions to draw upon when industrial relations are in consideration… These traditions invite us to be, at times, radically different in philosophical perspectives, ethos and practice from what passes for industrial relations in the wider community. (VCSA, 1992b, p. 2)

Synan went on to quote from Quadragesimo Anno (Pope Pius XI, 1931/1960) on the principle of subsidiarity and Mater et Magistra (Pope John XXIII, 1961) on the principles of collaboration and consultation. This commitment to local level consultation was reflected in two unregistered agreements (one Primary and one Secondary) between the VCSA and VIEU titled the Conditions of Service Agreement (Primary) and the Teachers (Catholic Schools) Staffing & Conditions of Service Agreement (Secondary) which operated from 22 July 1991 until 30 January 1995 when they were amalgamated into a single unregistered agreement titled Consultative Procedures class sizes, scheduled class time (Positions of Leadership were added from 1 July 1995) from 31 January 1995 to 12 December 1997. Under this Consultative Procedures Agreement re Class Sizes, Workload and Positions of Responsibility agreement each school was required to have a local committee called a ‘Consultative Committee’, comprised of ex officio (e.g., the Principal), management nominated and staff elected representatives (including compulsory VIEU representatives). The Principal was required to provide the committee with certain school financial and demographic data and the committee then made recommendations on specified school operational matters. From 1998, this unregistered agreement was amalgamated into the AIRC registered agreements, the Victorian Catholic Schools and Catholic Education Offices Certified Agreement (1998) and the three subsequent Victorian Catholic Schools and Catholic Education Offices Certified Agreements (1999-2000), (2001-2003) and (2004-2007) as the Consultative procedures Re: Class sizes, release time/scheduled class time POL schedule to each Certified Agreement. This demonstrates that, for the whole of the period of this research, formal procedures were in place to allow local level decision-making by, and direct dealing with, employees in line with the philosophy of HRM.

Deery et. al. (2001) state that there have been three broad responses to HRM from unions as outlined in Table 16.
Table 16
Trade union responses to HRM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>WHEN IT OCCURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conciliatory and concessionary approach</td>
<td>Unions are confronted with a hostile climate and are forced to make concessions to management demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural approach</td>
<td>A pro-active approach that is based on an extension of collective bargaining. Bargaining extends to new areas such as product and service quality, productivity and cost-competitiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active localised approach</td>
<td>Development of autonomous initiatives at the workplace level. Can involve both resistance and accommodation to HRM practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Deery et. al. (2001, p. 48).

Lucio and Simpson (1992) state that a procedural approach was more likely to emerge when unions were confronted by a hostile economic and political climate. Deery et. al. (2001) state that option two (procedural) led to unions looking for “agreements on more flexible production arrangements (that) may also provide access to company information on future planning and production issues” (p. 48) and this was demonstrated by VIEU’s early adoption of the approach to the use of consultative committees in schools. In short, the evidence demonstrates that VIEU recognised the shift to HRM and adopted a pro-active approach to deal with it.

Consequently, the proposition that there has been no such shift in the underlying philosophy underpinning Victoria Catholic education; that HRM has not been present in Victorian Catholic education and, therefore, VIEU has been protected from this factor can be rejected. As a result, this reason offered by the literature review was eliminated as a factor that could provide a possible explanation and was not retained to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.

4 An international trend

The literature review raised a fourth possible explanation worldwide for union density decline in terms of the impact of the international decline in the trade union movement; i.e., that Australia was simply part of an international decline in the trade union movement. The proposition to be tested in this section was that VIEU avoided the factors that have been ascribed to this international trend.
As revealed by the literature review (Norris, Kelly & Giles, 2005; Plowman, 1981), the decline in trade union membership is not just an Australian phenomenon. Between 1980 and 1994, union membership rates dropped in most OECD countries as demonstrated by Table 17.

Table 17
Membership decline internationally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


However, as Table 17 demonstrates, the trend was not uniform even for OECD countries, nor for countries such as Sweden, New Zealand and the United Kingdom that, like Australia, adopted a more decentralised industrial bargaining system between 1980 and 1994. In many countries the degree of centralisation did not change (Canada, the United States, Germany, Japan and Spain) while in others (Italy, Norway and Portugal), bargaining became more centralised and yet the change in density rates differed for these countries (ABS, 2002a). Therefore the decline was not international, nor was it always present in those countries with a similar economic and industrial profile to Australia.

Several writers (Gephart 1999; Henley 1997; James 1997; Thomas 1999) attribute this decline to the fact that trade unions did not cope with the shift from modernism to postmodernism. In the postmodern world there is a tendency to globalisation that mitigates against traditional (locally organised) unionism as well as a tendency to individualism instead of collectivism (increasing self actualisation and self employment, working at home, working over the ‘net’ rather than together in a defined physical environment), which again mitigates against traditional (collective) unionism (Wright, 1997). Given their analysis is correct, then this factor
can be eliminated because VIEU exists in the same postmodern world as all other unions, particularly their Australian counterparts.

Consequently, the proposition that VIEU has avoided the characteristics of the postmodern world that have been ascribed as the cause of the international decline of trade unions, can be rejected. As a result, this reason offered by the literature review was eliminated as a factor that could provide a possible explanation and was not retained to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.

5 Summary of the general worldwide explanations

In summary, the data from this first part of the Exploratory Stage Phase 2 has resolved the answer to the first sub question of guiding question two

whether the worldwide factors cited for joining trade union in Australia are present in the Catholic sector of the education industry.

The data demonstrated that all of the factors can be eliminated, namely

- the primary concentration of trade unions on improving wages and conditions of workers as their raison d’être
- the reporting of false figures by trade unions
- a shift in the underlying philosophy: IR to HRM
- an international trend.

The second part of the Exploratory Stage Phase 2, that follows, deals with the possible explanations raised by the literature review for the decline of trade union membership that were specific to Australia.

Figure 60 summarises the position reached at this stage of the examination of data.
Solution
Those factors, acting both independently and/or in concert, that emerged in the Exploratory Stage and have been tested in the Inspection Stage.

Issue
What factors have contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general Australian and worldwide trend by choosing to associate in their union?

Explanation
Those factors, acting both independently and/or in concert, that emerged in the Exploratory Stage and have been tested in the Inspection Stage.

Progress Chart: Exploratory Stage Phase 2 Part 1.
5.3.3 Specific factors cited for Australia

1 The origins of the trade union movement in the British model (upon which the Australian model is based) with its concomitant modus operandi

The literature review raised a possible explanation for union density decline in the terms that trade unions in Australia have been founded on the British trade union model that was based on a conflict model for progressing the cause of workers. This conflict-based model is now unattractive to many workers who prefer the agreement-based model of Enterprise Bargaining (Bray et. al., 2005) and, therefore, trade unions have lost these members.

The proposition to be tested here was that VIEU was not founded under this model and, therefore, was protected from this factor. VIEU was formed in 1993, as a result of the amalgamation of the four non-government education unions (including the three Catholic unions), the VCPSA, the Victorian Catholic Primary Principals Association (VCPPA), SACSS and VATIS.

![Diagram of precursor organisations to VIEU]

**Figure 61**
The precursor organisations to VIEU
The two Catholic teacher unions, the VCPTA, the precursor to the VCPSA, and the ATVCSS, the precursor to SACSS, were both formed in 1974 (Cahill, 1992; Feenan, 1993). VATIS was formed in 1975 from the amalgamation of the Assistant Mistresses’ Association of Victoria (AMAV) and the Victorian Assistant Masters’ Association (VAMA which changed its name to ATIS, the Association of Teachers in Independent Schools in 1973) (Spence, 1997). In 1984 the VCPTA changed its name to the VCPSA, as did the ATVCSS to SACSS. These changes reflected a change of their membership bases from teachers only to all staff employed in Catholic schools in Victoria (Feenan, 1993; Spence, 1997) (refer Chart 24 above for summary), hence the substitution of the word ‘staff’ in both titles in lieu of ‘teachers’.

The early teachers’ associations that were the precursors to the VCPTA and the ATVCSS were based on male and female membership rather than Primary and Secondary level membership. The male associations were the Catholic Lay Teachers’ Association (CLTA) and the Catholic Male Lay Teachers’ Guild (CMLTG) (Eggleston, 1979) and the female association was AMAV (Spence, 1997).

Eggleston (1979) states that the CLTA was “neither a union nor a professional association. It was concerned with salaries and conditions only because these were so hopelessly inadequate” (p. 13). Similarly, the members of the short-lived CMLTG “saw their role as a teacher in a Catholic school as a vocation” (Eggleston, 1979, p. 23) and used Guild in its title to ensure it was not associated with the trade union movement. Spence (1997) states that “especially in the early days the records of the AMAV Council … demonstrate that the predominant interest of the Association from 1921 onwards was the professional one’ (p. 15). However, Spence goes on to record the campaign by AMAV to establish the first Wages Board in Victoria for teachers in non-government schools, the Teachers’ (Girls’ School) Board in 1946 and the commencement of the first award from 1 January 1947. However, this award mainly impacted on Independent (non-Catholic) schools given that Catholic schools were predominantly staffed by members of Religious Orders up until the 1970s (Spence, 1997).

The situation did not change with the formation of the VCPTA and ATVCSS in 1974. Eggleston (1980) states that in the early days of the VCPTA, “industrial aims do not figure largely in the constitution” (p. 33) although this assertion is challenged by Cahill (1992) as the association developed. Eggleston (1980) states, “Catholic teachers have a sense of mission that they share with their employer. For this reason they are loath to become involved in any employer-employee conflict in which collective bargaining or strike action would be involved” (p. 21). This sense of professionalism is also cited by Bessant and Spaull (1972) as a reason why teachers preferred to be members of ‘associations’ rather than ‘unions’.
In the name of ‘professionalism’ teachers have been induced to accept poor working conditions (‘professional people do not strike’); they have failed to be honest about what happens in schools (‘professional people do not engage in politics’); they have accepted limitations … and refused to take strong action on the grounds that ‘the children will suffer’. (p. 89)

To this sense of professionalism, Cahill (1992) adds the sense of ‘vocation’ amongst Catholic teachers as a further reason why teachers preferred to be members of ‘associations’ rather than ‘unions’

Catholic Primary teachers have doubly faced … challenges that they work ‘for the love of God’ or that they are ‘called to the vocation of teaching’, and that a commitment to ‘Gospel values’ and ‘social justice’ precludes ‘personal interest’. The legacy of the commitment of nuns and brothers who worked for love not money is not one faced by teachers in government schools. (p. 12)

Part of this ambivalence of teachers regarding whether they were members of ‘associations’ rather than ‘unions’ was also drawn out of the reasons for the formation of the VCPTA and ATVCSS in 1974. Interestingly, Rogan’s history of Catholic education in the Archdiocese of Melbourne from 1839 to 1980 makes no mention of any teachers’ unions or associations but does credit the founding of the Melbourne Catholic Education Board in 1969 with the decision to “bring salaries of lay teachers to those in the Education Department” (Rogan, 2000, p. 108). The establishment of an in-house Salary Review Board (Primary) in 1971 (Sexton, 1982) and later the Salary Review Board (Secondary) in 1978 by the Catholic Education Commission of Victoria (Spence, 1997) followed as a consequence. This Committee and Board required teacher representation and from them developed the need for an association to nominate the teacher representative. “The VCPTA and ATVCSS had, to a considerable extent, been nurtured into existence by the Melbourne Catholic Education Office” (Feenan, 1993, p. 5) in order to ensure that Catholic associations existed rather than independent (non-government) or whole of industry (government and non-government) associations representing teachers in Victorian Catholic schools. This is exemplified by the positive encouragement given by Sexton in 1982 in his address to the Annual Conference of the Victorian Primary Principals’ Association in which he stated that

for whatever reason, be it a degree of disinterestedness, contentment with the status quo, unawareness of the importance, or a dislike of unionism, teachers have stayed away from their associations in droves. Teachers and principals should give close consideration to redressing this situation. (Sexton, 1982, p. 14)

However, as Cutting (1994) reports, this collaboration with the CEO mitigated against the VCPTA being regarded as a genuine union. Cutting notes that the VCPTA from 1974 to 1984 operated as a non-union oriented professional support association for teachers with the
CEO Melbourne Director as a member (or his representative) on their Executive. Consequently, numbers were low because “the Executive was far too removed from their (the teachers’) work situation … (and) … many teachers were suspicious of the close affiliation with the CEO” (Cutting, 1994, pp. 12-13).

The evidence of these writers, Eggleston (1979; 1980), Cahill (1992), Feenan (1993), Cutting (1994) and Spence (1997) clearly demonstrates that VIEU’s predecessors saw themselves as professional associations first and, at best, industrial unions second. This was at least until 1983 when the VCPTA and ATVCSS applied successfully to become recognised ‘bona fide’ associations of employees before the IRCV in order to provide the employee representatives on the initial Teachers (Catholic Schools) Conciliation and Arbitration Board (IRCV, 1983). The formation of this Board also forced the formation of the VCSA as the equivalent ‘bona fide’ employer organisation so as to sit on this Board opposite the two teacher unions (Sexton, 1986). The VCSA commenced on 31 May 1983 and made an immediate and ultimately successful application to be recognised as a “bona fides association of employers, that … uniquely represents employers in Catholic education in Victoria” (VCSA, 1983a, p. 2).

Additionally, the point about whether the CLTA, CMLTG, AMAV, VAMA, VCPTA and ATVCSS were unions or professional associations prior to 1983 is somewhat moot. Under the federal industrial relations system, and up until the early 1980s, teacher associations were not able to be registered as trade unions as a result of the 1929 High Court decision, ‘The State School Teachers’ Decision’ (High Court of Australia, 1929). This decision found that education was not regarded as an 'industry' within the meaning of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904 (Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1904). Under this Act, the term 'industrial' was interpreted in a narrow, literal sense to mean disputes between employers and employees in 'productive sectors' supplying goods and services for the purpose of profit thereby excluding groups such as teachers, nurses and many white collar workers including the majority of public servants from ‘industrial’ representation through a registered union (Spaull, 1987).

This definition of ‘industry’ was reversed by ‘The Social Welfare Case’ of 1983 (High Court of Australia, 1983). In this case, the High Court reverted to the earlier approach of Justice Higgins in the ‘Municipalities Case’ where he found that 'the words are not a technical or legal expression' (High Court of Australia, 1919). This led in 1983 to the Victorian government teacher unions establishing the initial Victorian Teaching Service Conciliation and Arbitration Board in 1983 in the IRCV (Spaull & Hince, 1986) and then the quick flow on to the VCPTA and ATVCSS filing for the Catholic school equivalent, the Teachers (Catholic Schools) Conciliation and Arbitration Board in the IRCV.
Thus, 1983 was the beginning of a change in the balance for VIEU’s predecessors seeing themselves as professional associations first and, at best, industrial unions second. This change of perspective was paralleled in the Victorian government education sector in the early 1980s as its unions began to see themselves as trade unions, not professional associations (Nash & Spaull, 1986). McLeod’s (1994) study of the first teachers’ strike (by Primary and Secondary teachers) in Victorian Catholic schools in 1990 and Willcox-McGinnes’ (2000) study of the role of women in negotiating and establishing conditions of work for teachers in Victorian Catholic Primary schools demonstrate that the VCPSA and SACSS had developed into industrial unions first and professional associations second by the 1990s.

As the following excerpts from contemporaneous sources demonstrate, VIEU moved to being an industrial organisation in the 1990s with positive effect on its union density

- as a result of the first strike by Primary and secondary teachers in 1990 “union membership increased during this period by one thousand members” (Cutting, 1994, p. 36)
- after the election of the Kennett Government a rally of teachers was held on 1 March 1993. This rally did not call for a strike and “for the first time in the union’s (VCPSA) history it was criticised by a number of its members for not supporting ... industrial action strongly enough and that the union’s position had been weak” (Cutting, 1994, p. 39)
- following the stopwork action in May of 1997, Flinn in his editorial stated, “just a few days ago thousands of staff in Catholic schools took part in industrial action ... For many this was the first time they have ever engaged in industrial action. During the last six weeks, more than 600 new members have joined VIEU” (VIEU, 1997b, p. 3).

However, the dual roles of being an industrial union as well as a professional association were still present up to the time of the formation of VIEU. In his first address as General Secretary of the newly formed VIEU, Palmer introduced the new VIEUPOINT publication, the official journal of the new union and stated “VIEUPOINT … will be produced once a month to keep members informed of both industrial and educational issues confronting our sector” (VIEU, 1994a, p. 1).

Consequently, the proposition that VIEU was a trade union founded on the British trade union model with a *modus operandi* based on a conflict for progressing the cause of workers can be rejected, but only in part. The evidence demonstrated that VIEU had its foundation in a mixed
heritage of being an industrial organisation (as witnessed as early as AMAV and the Girls’ School Award) as well as a professional organisation with VIEU’s precursor organisations predominantly regarding themselves as professional associations at least up until 1983.

As a result, this reason offered by the literature review was confirmed as a factor that could provide a possible explanation and was retained to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.

2 The historical role of legislation in protecting and prescribing the role of the trade union movement in Australia and the complementary role of the Australian arbitral system

The literature review raised a second possible Australian specific explanation for union density decline in the terms that trade unions suffered from the loss in the 1990s of the long standing legislation that protected and prescribed the role of the trade union movement in Australia.

The proposition to be tested here was that VIEU did not lose this legislative protection and, therefore, was protected from this factor.

The literature review showed that, since the beginning of Federation and the enshrinement of trade unions in the Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904 (Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1904), unions have had an automatic (protected) role granted to them in legislation. The employer was forced to recognise unions (Deery & Plowman, 1991) and negotiate with them, whether they wanted to or not, under federal legislation in Australia (Bull, 1998).

Initially, a review of available historical literature was undertaken to ascertain whether VIEU (or its immediate precursors the VCPTA-VCPSA and ATVCSS-SACSS) did enjoy the full legislative protection afforded to Australian unions particularly through the period 1994 to 2004. This examination of the literature, historical documents and contemporaneous legislation demonstrated that VIEU’s immediate precursors (the VCPTA-VCPSA and ATVCSS-SACSS) did enjoy the legislative protection afforded to Australian unions, at least since 1983 when the Teachers’ (Catholic Schools) Conciliation and Arbitration Board was established by a decision of the IRCV in Full Session on 27 May of that year (IRCV, 1983). This Board commenced meeting in September 1983 and established the first industrial award for Catholic teachers, the ‘Teachers (Catholic Schools) Award No 1 of 1984’ on 12 April 1984 (IRCV, 1984). This led to
an immediate boost in numbers for the VCPSA (Cutting, 1994). This Board continued to operate up until 1993, with a name change to the Education Services (Catholic Schools) Conciliation and Arbitration Board in 1985 to recognise the incorporation of non-teachers as well as teachers under this Board.

The Kennett government’s (elected October, 1992) Employee Relations Act (1992) abolished the IRCV and brought an end to all state awards including the Education Services (Catholic Schools) Award with effect from 1 March 1993. The new Employee Relations Commission of Victoria (ERCV) provided for individual and collective employment agreements and for future awards to be made if, and only if, the parties agreed to arbitration by the new ERCV. Subsequently, following its failure to get its proposed industrial relations reforms through Victoria’s upper house, the Kennett government handed the state's industrial relations powers to the Commonwealth government from 1 January 1997 through the Commonwealth Powers (Industrial Relations) Act (1996) pursuant to Section 51 (xxxvii) of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act (1996) and the ERCV ceased to operate (Zeitz, 2000).

The reaction of most of the unions in Victoria in 1993 that were subject to the Employee Relations Act (1992) was to apply for federal awards (Tracey, 1993). VIEU immediately and successfully sought to move the old award provisions to the federal jurisdiction and in 1995 ‘The Victorian Catholic Schools and Catholic Education Offices Certified Agreement (1995)’ was registered in the AIRC.

Of note was the cooperation received from the VCSA to facilitate this shift from the ERCV to the AIRC. In his VCSA President’s report for 1993/1994, Synan stated that

the Executive Director of the CECV and the President of the VCSA had already issued a joint statement reassuring all involved in Catholic education that salaries and conditions currently existing would be maintained until replaced by new regulation. (VCSA, 1994a, enclosure 2, p. 1)

Synan (VCSA, 1994a) also subsequently reported that VIEU and the VCSA had worked cooperatively towards transitioning the old Victorian award (the Education Services (Catholic Schools) Award) across to the federal jurisdiction, and as a result, VIEU had withdrawn their application for an interim federal award based on this old Victorian award.

In summary, this examination of the literature, historical documents and contemporaneous legislation demonstrated that VIEU (or its immediate precursors the VCPTA-VCPSA and ATVCSS-SACSS) did enjoy the full legislative protection afforded to Australian unions, particularly through the period 1994 to 2004.
Consequently, the proposition that VIEU did not lose this legislative protection and, therefore, was protected from this factor can be rejected. The evidence demonstrates that it had legislative protection under the ERCV and the AIRC throughout the period 1994 to 2004.

As a result, this reason offered by the literature review was rejected as a factor that could provide a possible explanation and was not retained to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.

However, the fact that the VCSA worked in conjunction with VIEU to move to the federal jurisdiction reinforces an earlier finding that the fact that the employer for teachers in Victorian Catholic schools was the Catholic Church may be a factor. Without the VCSA’s approach, VIEU could have lost the protection of the federal jurisdiction, as happened to a number of employees in independent (non-Catholic) schools in Victoria (Shearman, 2004). This contextual factor was retained as a factor that could provide a possible explanation to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.

3 The political affiliation of the trade union movement

The literature review raised a third possible Australian specific explanation for union density decline in the terms that the political affiliation of trade unions has caused them to lose membership.

The proposition to be tested here was that VIEU did not have any political affiliations (to political parties or to union peak bodies) and, therefore, was protected from this factor.

Initially, an examination of the historical and legal documents was undertaken to ascertain whether VIEU (or its immediate precursors the VCPTA-VCPSA and ATVCSS-SACSS) were formally affiliated to their relevant trade union peak organisations from the mid-1980s. As previously examined legal documentation has demonstrated, under the federal industrial relations system and up until 1983, teacher associations were not able to be registered as trade unions as a result of ‘The State School Teachers’ Decision’ (High Court of Australia, 1929). Consequently, VIEU and its precursors VCPTA-VCPSA and ATVCSS-SACSS could not be trade unions nor could they, therefore, be affiliated with the VTHC or through it with the ALP.
However, following ‘The Social Welfare Case’ of 1983 (High Court of Australia, 1983) the VCPSA became affiliated with the VTHC in 1985 and moved its offices into the Victorian Trades Hall building in 1986.

This move was seen at this time to be practical and symbolic in that the union gained access to resources previously not available to them. They were now seen to be on equal footing with other state education unions and therefore taken more seriously in their endeavours. This move enabled the union to be seen as fair dinkum about being a union, not just a CEO appendage. (Cutting, 1994, p. 28)

The VCPSA (then the VCPTA) became an associate member of the Independent Teachers Federation of Australia (ITF or ITFA) in December 1982 following SACSS (then the ATVCSS) becoming an associate member in May of 1982. Then in 1983 both unions became affiliated with the ITFA and acted as state branches of the ITFA from that date. The ITFA was affiliated as a federal union with the ACTU from 1981 following a vote at its 13th Meeting of the Federal Executive in May 1981(Feenan, 1993). The ITFA became a federally registered union in 1987 after a long drawn out battle in the AIRC, including appeals through to the High Court of Australia (‘The TAA Case’), to decide whether

an association of employees whose membership largely comprises school teachers is entitled to be registered as an organization under s.132 of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904 (Cth), as amended ("the Act"). The three associations … (included) … the Independent Teachers Federation. (High Court of Australia, 1986)

Consequently, VIEU’s precursors from the mid-1980s became formal trade unions affiliated with their relevant trade union peak organisations, the VTHC and the ITFA, and the latter to the ACTU.

However, while there was no formal affiliation with the ALP at any stage, VIEUPOINT editorials and its calls to protest against IR legislation tend to be critical of the Conservative Coalition Parties (the Liberal Party and the National Party) and to back the ALP. Examples of such editorials include organising a rally of teachers on 1 March 1993 at Treasury Garden to protest the Kennett Government’s Employee Relations Act (1992) (Cutting, 1994) and editorials that were either critical of the Howard government at federal level

- “Alarm bells ring over new IR laws” (VIEU, 1996d)
- “What kind of Australia do you want” (VIEU, 1998)
- “Reith’s second wave will dump on workers” (VIEU, 1999)
or that were complimentary of the state’s Labor government: “The Bracks Government has honoured its election promise” (VIEU, 2000).

However, only in two editorials was a direct statement made to influence voting intentions of members

- the first being prior to the March 1996 federal election:

  If the ‘real’ industrial decision making is left in the hand of states, governments like Kennett’s and Court’s, we can be assured it will not be worker friendly … If you are concerned … you must answer the question: can I afford to vote for the Coalition. (VIEU, 1996a, p. 2)

  The Kennett government was the Conservative Coalition government in Victoria and the Court government was the Conservative Coalition government in Western Australia at the time

- the second being prior to the October 1998 federal election in “What kind of Australia do you want” (VIEU, 1998).

A scan of all VIEUPOINT editions in the period 1994 to 2004 found no editorials or articles supporting a vote for Coalition Parties at state or federal level.

In summary, this examination of the historical and legal documents demonstrated that VIEU (or its immediate precursors the VCPTA-VCPSA and ATVCSS-SACSS) were formally affiliated to their relevant trade union peak organisations from the mid-1980s. Additionally, although there was no formal political affiliation to the ALP, VIEUPOINT articles supported the Labor Party’s IR legislation and opposed the various Conservative Coalition Governments’ IR legislation during this period. Therefore, it is not protected from this factor.

As a result, this reason offered by the literature review was rejected as a factor that could provide a possible explanation and was not retained to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.
A change in the Australian public perception of trade unions

The literature review raised a fourth possible Australian specific explanation for union density decline in the terms that the decline in the public perception of trade unions has caused them to lose membership.

The proposition to be tested here was that VIEU was not associated with any decline in the public decline of unions, therefore was protected from this factor.

The literature review showed that in Australia in the 1990s, public opinion polls indicated that unions were seen as being too powerful as well as unethical when they were seen to use illegitimate means, especially strikes to achieve their aims (Deery et. al., 2000). Strikes, especially in essential services, angered most people, particularly where the unions caused ‘innocent’ public to suffer so as to put pressure on the employer (Short, 1992).

There was no direct data that could be examined on the public perception of VIEU over this period, given that there were no public opinion polls conducted that were specific to VIEU. However, by the same measure, there was no evidence to suggest that VIEU would have been exempt from the general public’s perception and there were two pieces of indirect evidence to support the fact that, as a union, VIEU was subject to, and sensitive to, public perception

• first, VIEU was subject to the issue that Peetz (2002) ascribes as the main reason why the perception of unions declined; i.e., VIEU did engage in strikes during the 1990s where labour was withdrawn and schools closed. As a result, a contention can be put, and in the balance of probabilities supported, that VIEU would have been perceived by parents and students to have caused the ‘innocent’ public (parents and students) to suffer to put pressure on the employer

• second, VIEU demonstrated that they have been aware of the impact of negative public perception of their industrial campaigns by preparing literature for their school based representatives to give to parents and students including
  o alliances with parents to support the action taken (VIEU, 1997a, p. 2)
  o appeals to parents that action will be “supported by all fair minded people” (VIEU, 1997c, p. 2)
  o publicising to parents that stop work industrial action was ‘the last resort’ (VIEU, 1996b, p. 2), and
indicating that the improvements gained would assist student educational outcomes as well as teachers’ industrial outcomes (VIEU, 1996c, p. 2).

In summary, an examination of the documentary evidence available demonstrated that, in the absence of direct evidence by way of public opinion polls on VIEU, the indirect evidence in the balance of probabilities would support the view that this factor was present inasmuch as VIEU’s leaders felt that the issue needed to be dealt with and that in doing so, they perceived that they were not protected from this factor.

As a result, this reason offered by the literature review was rejected as a factor that could provide a possible explanation and was not retained to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.

5 The loss of union preference clauses

The literature review raised a fifth possible Australian specific explanation for union density decline in the terms that, where trade unions lost ‘preference clauses’, this resulted in these unions losing membership.

The proposition to be tested here was that VIEU was not associated with any loss of preference clauses and, therefore, was protected from this factor.

The literature review revealed that in Australia ‘absolute’ preference clauses were only allowed in the federal, New South Wales, Queensland and South Australian jurisdictions (Yerbury & Karlsson, 1992) and, therefore, VIEU and its precursors were never the beneficiaries of such clauses. Additionally, ‘qualified’ preference clauses (i.e., giving preference to union members in hiring practices, all other things being equal) were also not available to VIEU or its precursors in the Victorian industrial relations system when VIEU was in this jurisdiction up to 1995. Consequently, the first industrial award for Catholic teachers, the ‘Teachers (Catholic Schools) Award’ in April of 1984 and subsequent awards contained no form of absolute or qualified preference clause.

From its inception the federal Workplace Relations Act (1996) banned preference clauses under section 298Y. The Office of the Employment Advocate (OEA) had the function of enforcing these provisions and “during 1998 and 1999, the OEA made 735 successful
applications to the AIRC for the removal of preference clauses from certified agreements” (Deery et. al., 2001, p. 155). However, this was not necessary with the then current ‘Victorian Catholic Schools and Catholic Education Offices Certified Agreement (1998)’ because it contained no absolute or qualified preference clause.

The closest arrangement to preferential treatment for union members was a formal written, but unregistered, agreement between the VCSA and the VCPTA / ATVCSS made on 6 February 1985 for payroll deduction of union fees (VCSA, 1985). The purpose of the agreement was to assist union membership in Catholic schools by removing the financial barrier of paying union fees in an annual lump sum. Under this scheme, participating union members had their annual union fee deducted on a fortnightly basis from their pay and it was sent directly to the union by the employer. The unions and its members had shown a preference for this amortised method of payment. However, in June of 1997, as part of the industrial dispute occurring in that year, the VCSA advised its members to no longer continue with the service, although the decision to revoke it or not was left to each individual school (VCSA, 1997a). However, as Morris and Willman (1994) point out, salary deduction was of diminishing value once banks introduced direct debit arrangements.

In summary, the proposition that VIEU was not associated with any loss of preference clauses cannot be a factor in their context because VIEU did not have the benefit to lose in the first place. Additionally, the closest arrangement to preferential treatment (payroll deduction of fees) was removed in 1997. The proposition that the lack of the loss of preference clauses was a factor in mitigating density decline can be rejected.

As a result, this reason offered by the literature review was rejected as a factor that could provide a possible explanation and was not retained to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.

6 The changes brought by the Accord process

The literature review raised a sixth possible Australian specific explanation for union density decline in the terms that the changes brought on by the Accord process (specifically the acceptance by unions of the need to support the Hawke and Keating governments’ social changes) resulted in them losing membership.
The proposition to be tested here was that the Accord process and the embracing of a bigger social picture view was not embraced by VIEU and, therefore, was VIEU protected from this factor.

Easson (1994) sums up the proposition forwarded here when he argues that the trade union movement’s close alliance to the Hawke and Keating governments from 1983 to 1996 through the ‘Prices and Income Accords’, known more simply as the ‘Accords’ (Mark I through to Mark VII) resulted in the union movement becoming more responsive to the “economic realities by joining with the federal government to tackle some of the difficult economic and social issues” (p. 156) but that the irony of supporting the Labor governments and being more responsible was a “decline in the union movement not only in membership … but also in the confidence of its own officials, activists and members” (p. 158).

The Accord process introduced social reforms with direct benefit to all workers but at the cost of a decline in real wages (Sheridan, 1994). Table 18 summarises these social reforms.

### Table 18
A summary of the Accords Mark I to VII’s social reforms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Accord Mark</th>
<th>Social Reforms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Mark I</td>
<td>Occupational Health and Safety (OH&amp;S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Mark II</td>
<td>Wage – tax – superannuation trade-off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Mark III</td>
<td>Efficiency offsets in exchange for wage increases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Mark IV</td>
<td>Award restructuring – multi-skilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Mark V</td>
<td>Award restructuring continued – less prescriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Mark VI</td>
<td>Reform of awards – application at enterprise level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Mark VII</td>
<td>Enterprise Bargaining approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Each of these measures impacted on VIEU. The reality was that all of these reforms either became part of separate binding legislation (e.g., OH&S in Accord Mark I; superannuation initially through awards in Accord Mark II and then by separate legislation) or became part of the compulsory wage fixing principles of the day adopted by the AIRC or IRCV, e.g., award restructuring through productivity offsets in the National Wage Cases of the day (flown on automatically to State Wage Cases in Victoria).

Table 19 details how each of the Accords Marks III to VI impacted on VIEU’s state based award for teachers, the ‘Education Service (Catholic Schools) Award’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Accord Mark</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Mark III</td>
<td>The Restructuring and Efficiency Principle in the 1987 National Wage Case was introduced into the ‘Teachers (Catholic Schools) Award’ via a two-tiered wage increase that required cost offsets (e.g., timed heaters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Mark IV</td>
<td>The Structural Efficiency Principle in the 1988 National Wage Case was introduced into the ‘Education Service (Catholic Schools) Award’ via multi-skilling (e.g., broadbanding of work by non-teaching classifications)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Mark V</td>
<td>The Structural Efficiency Principle continued through 1989 and 1990 and impacted on the ‘Education Service (Catholic Schools) Award’ via award modernisation changes and a simplification and extension of the teacher salary scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Mark VI</td>
<td>The Structural Efficiency Principle continued and impacted on the ‘Education Service (Catholic Schools) Award’ via the introduction of skill-related career paths (e.g., the Advanced Skills Teacher classification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Mark VII</td>
<td>The Enterprise Bargaining Principle was introduced but did not impact on the ‘Education Service (Catholic Schools) Award’ because of the election of the Kennett Government and the abolition of that award in March of 1993 prior to the national wage case decision in October of 1993.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 demonstrates that VIEU was directly impacted on by the Accord process up to the time of the election of the Howard Government in March 1996, that saw the end of the Accord process. It is worth noting that the period of this research, 1994 to 2004, is also outside the period of the Accord era from 1983 to 1993 although the fundamental adjustment to the Enterprise Bargaining Principle continued on throughout the period of this research and forms the proposition of the next section of this phase of the Exploratory Stage.

Consequently, the proposition that the Accord process and the embracing of a bigger social picture view was not embraced by VIEU and, therefore, it was protected from this factor, can be rejected.

As a result, this reason offered by the literature review was rejected as a factor that could provide a possible explanation and was not retained to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.
7 The introduction of enterprise bargaining over the award system

The literature review raised a seventh possible Australian specific explanation for union density decline in the terms that the changes brought on by the EBA process (specifically the loss of the automatic right to be the bargaining agent for employees) resulted in unions losing membership.

The proposition to be tested here was that the EBA process and the loss of the automatic right to be the bargaining agent for employees did not impact on VIEU and, therefore, it was protected from this factor.

As the literature review showed, since the beginning of Federation and the enshrinement of trade unions in the Conciliation and Arbitration Act (1904), unions have had an automatic (protected) role granted to them in Australian industrial legislation. The employer was forced to recognise unions (Deery & Plowman, 1991) and negotiate with them under federal legislation in Australia (Bull, 1998) up until the introduction of enterprise bargaining which provided a framework for the acceleration of the de-unionisation of the Australian labour force (Nomchong & Nolan 1995) by allowing employees and employers to directly reach local enterprise based bargains that suited their local needs (Ross, 1995) without recourse to a third party in negotiations, specifically the union.

The Enterprise Bargaining principle was invoked by Accord Mark VII and the National Wage Fixing Principles of the October 1993 National Wage Case (AIRC Dec 1300/93 M Print K9700) and allowed non-union agreements, that is, direct agreements between employees and employers. This capacity to sideline unions was extended by the introduction of Australian Workplace Agreements (AWAs) in 1996 when the Workplace Relations Act (1996) was introduced by the newly elected conservative, Howard government. However, this opportunity to sideline VIEU and introduce non-union EBAs and AWAs was not taken up by the VCSA. The VCSA’s approach to Enterprise Bargaining was a published preference for collective agreements over individual agreements (VCSA, 1993b).

In 1992, in a ‘statement of intent’ about the changing industrial relations legislation of the time, the VCSA stated that

the VCSA is conscious of the emerging debate on Enterprise Bargaining … and wishes to indicate its attitude to future employer-employee relations, making it one based on the Church’s social teaching, specifically from Sollicitudo Rei Socialis on the principle of the common good, Quadragesimo
Soon after, in 1992, this ‘statement of intent’ was put to the test when all Victorian based unions were challenged by the Kennett (state) government’s industrial reforms. Unions fled en masse to the federal system following the election of the Kennett government (Teicher and Svensen, 1998). The VCSA cited *Laborem Exercens* on the right of freedom of association...

... all of these rights, together with the need of workers themselves to secure them, give rise to yet another right; the right of association, that is to form associations for the purpose of defending the vital interests of those employed in the various professions. These associations are called labour or trade unions. (VCSA, 1992c, p. 4)

Subsequently, the VCSA stated that “Individual Employment Contracts are not being considered as a sole means of industrial regulation” (VCSA, 1993a, p. 5) and later that “our preference is … to continue with the situation where we have an Award that covers all Victorian Catholic schools” (VCSA, 1993c, p. 3).

A major test of this resolve to commit to a system-wide collective agreement, negotiated with VIEU, in preference to individual agreements came in 1993, during the formation of VIEU when the new Employee Relations Act (1992) abolished the IRCV and awards from 1 March 1993. In response, a statement was issued stating that

in the interests of stability in schools for staff and students, the Directors of the CEOs, the VCSA and the Catholic Education Commission of Victoria have agreed that the present salaries and conditions of service for staff will be maintained until the new structure and arrangements are in place. (VCSA, 1993a, p. 3)

This bulletin outlined the options open under the new Act and stated that the first principle for deciding between the options was the right of employees to engage in collective bargaining, conciliation and, ultimately, arbitration. VIEU applied to the AIRC for an interim federal award (Matter C.No.21069 of 1993) to replace the abolished IRCV ‘Education Services (Catholic Schools) Award’. By the year’s end, the VCSA President was able to report

I am pleased … that the year has been an industrially successful one … when uncertainty could have led to great unrest. … the industrial harmony of 1993 is due in no small way to the level of cooperation and trust the VCSA has built up … with the VCPSA and SACSS. (VCSA, 1993e, p. 2)
What followed in early 1994 was a joint statement by the VCSA and VIEU to negotiate, by agreement, a new federal award (a collective agreement) by 1 August 1994 rather than to rely on the AIRC to arbitrate one for them or to impose an interim federal award.

This collective bargaining approach, using VIEU as the sole bargaining agent on behalf of teachers, was replicated in 1998 when the federal award was varied to remove some clauses as part of the award simplification process due to legislative requirements. The VCSA in cooperation with VIEU, moved those clauses to a Certified Agreement to ensure that “no employee (would be) disadvantaged in respect to employment conditions” (VCSA, 2005, p. 2).

In summary, the historical and legal documentation demonstrates that the VCSA did not take up the opportunities presented by the introduction of the EBAs and AWAs but continued to operate to reach system-wide collective agreements using VIEU as the sole bargaining agent for teachers throughout the 1994 to 2004 period. Whilst VIEU lost the legal right to be the bargaining agent for teachers, they maintained this right by dint of VCSA’s attitude.

As a result, the proposition that the EBA process and the loss of the automatic right to be the bargaining agent for employees did not impact on VIEU and, therefore, VIEU was protected from this factor, was supported by the evidence.

As a result, this reason offered by the literature review was confirmed as a factor that could provide a possible explanation and was retained to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.

8 The effects of the amalgamation of unions

The literature review raised an eighth possible Australian specific explanation for union density decline in the terms that the amalgamation of unions (resulting in members feeling disenfranchised) resulted in unions losing membership.

The proposition to be tested here was that the process of the amalgamation of unions, did not impact on VIEU and, therefore, VIEU was protected from this factor.

The literature review (Bodman, 1998; Easson, 1994; Fairbrother, 1991; Hanley, 1999) revealed that under the direction of the ACTU, unions voluntarily undertook major structural change, amalgamating into 20 large super unions in the name of structural efficiency but these
innovations made them “cumbersome, more bureaucratic, centralised and remote institutions” (Easson, 1994, p. 162). The amalgamation process was outlined in the ACTU’s (1987) ‘Future Strategies for the Trade Union Movement’ and strongly reinforced through the ACTU’s ‘Can unions survive’; “the union movement will be made redundant unless we immediately re-organise” (ACTU, 1989b, p. 6).

An examination of the historical documentation demonstrates that VIEU was an amalgamated union but only managed to achieve this at its second attempt to do so. The first attempt was at the time of the making of the initial award for Victorian Catholic schools (Feenan, 1993). The second and successful attempt occurred in 1993, when the four non-government education unions (including the three Catholic unions), the VCPSA, SACSS, the Victorian Catholic Primary Principals Association (VCPPA) and VATIS amalgamated to form VIEU. VIEU commenced operations on 1 January 1994 and it is this date that provided the beginning point for this research. Accordingly, the proposition that the process of the amalgamation of unions did not impact VIEU and, therefore, it was protected from this factor, can be rejected.

As a result, this reason offered by the literature review was confirmed as a factor that could provide a possible explanation and was retained to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.

9 The internal political structures of unions and democracy

The literature review raised a ninth possible Australian specific explanation for union density decline in the terms that the internal political structures of unions (specifically, their lack of democratic procedures) resulted in unions losing membership.

The proposition to be tested here was that the issue of the internal political structures of unions (specifically their lack of democratic procedures) did not impact VIEU and, therefore, it was protected from this factor.

The literature review (Easson, 1994; Fairbrother, 1991; Lewis, 2000; Martin, 1992) revealed that the decline in membership density has been attributed to the failure of the Australian trade union movement to modernise by becoming more democratic institutions.

In his first address as General Secretary of the newly formed VIEU, Palmer through VIEUPOINT, demonstrated a commitment to a consultative process with members through
active local branches when he stated that “the most effective way staff can protect their conditions … is through an active local union sub-branch” (VIEU, 1994a, p. 1). This general approach has been reiterated on a number of occasions through VIEUPOINT: “VIEU has extremely democratic structures and we consult widely with members on industrial and professional issues” (VIEU, 1994c, p. 2).

In a practical sense, VIEU’s commitment to consultative, democratic processes has been shown in five particular ways

• a commitment to policy formation from the grass roots membership. On its website, VIEU states

How VIEU works
The supreme governing body of the union is the VIEU Conference. It comprises delegates from each sector of the membership who are elected as delegates for three-year terms. Conference meets once per year, usually in November. It sets the membership fee and adopts policy. (VIEU, 2003d)

• a commitment to supporting elected local branch delegates. Each school was always encouraged to have a delegate. These delegates were trained in their role as a delegate and as VIEU’s representative on the school’s ‘Consultative Committee’. Delegates were expected to keep an up-to-date list of members at a school and to distribute literature and seek feedback from school members. On its website, VIEU states

How VIEU works
The sub-branch is the basic unit of the union. At every workplace, the members make up one sub-branch. At some multi-campus schools there is a separate sub-branch at each campus… VIEU rules require that sub-branch reps are elected every three years. The rep then represents the sub-branch at meetings of Council. Reps are also eligible to be elected as delegates to Conference. (VIEU, 2003d)

On the issue of election of delegates, the website states

Election
• A union representative must be elected from the eligible members at the workplace …
• The election is important as a democratic process and also to meet the requirements of the Australian Electoral Commission.
• The elected representative is the only person entitled to vote at Council and be elected as a Conference delegate. (VIEU, 2003d)

• a commitment to monitoring feedback from members. Besides the formal mechanisms of Council and local delegates, VIEU had a practice of ongoing monitoring of members’ incidental call enquiries. Tony Keenan in his editorial
in the May 2002 VIEUPOINT stated “one of the best ways to gauge hot issues in schools is to monitor the themes of the 1,000 calls from members received at the VIEU office each month” (VIEU, 2002a, p. 2). All incoming calls from members were systematically coded so that ‘hot issues’ at the local school level were identified

- promoting consultation as a benefit of membership. The home page of VIEU’s website states “Only VIEU members can participate in the consultation, recommendations and endorsement around the (new) Catholic Agreement” (VIEU, 2003d)

- using outside agencies to consult on members’ views so that the process was seen as genuine and not a ‘rubber stamping’ of an already pre-determined course of action set by VIEU’s Committee of Management. In the November 2002 issue of VIEUPOINT, under the heading ‘Survey’s hot issues’, it stated VIEU is getting ready for a busy 2003 negotiating the next Certified Agreement for Catholic schools. The current Agreement expires in January 2004, so we have already commenced consultations with members to help us develop our claim for the next agreement. (VIEU, 2002b, p. 4)

The survey was conducted by the outside agency URCOT (Union Research Centre in Organising and Training).

Consequently, the proposition that the internal political structures of unions (specifically their lack of democratic procedures), did not impact VIEU because it did have genuine consultative and democratic structures and, therefore, was protected from this factor, is supported by the evidence.

As a result, this reason offered by the literature review was confirmed as a factor that could provide a possible explanation and was retained to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.

10 A further consideration

The final finding from the possible Australian specific explanations for union density decline raises a further issue for consideration at this stage of the Exploratory Stage. The literature review revealed only one comprehensive model to explain why unions grow and decline, by Shister (1953).
Shister (1953) lists the three interdependent factors necessary for union growth as

- a ‘favourable’ work environment
- a supportive sociolegal framework
- the quality of union leadership.

The Exploratory Stage to date has revealed that, the socio-economic framework was not supportive and the work environment was largely ‘unfavourable’ except that the employer continued to work with the union and not take advantage of the prevailing socio-economic framework. Consequently, the quality of the union leadership becomes critical if the union is to overcome these negative influences and achieve union growth. Shister postulates that a union, once established, will grow only if the leaders are astute enough to recognise changing conditions and develop policies to take these conditions into account but cannot do so if both of the other factors are working against it. The data from the ‘internal political structures of unions and democracy’ factor demonstrated that VIEU’s internal political structures and its commitment to democracy and consultation are different to the general union approach. This highlighted that VIEU’s leadership (and its approach to employment relations) was at odds to the general union approach. Consequently, the approach adopted by VIEU’s leadership over the period 1994 to 2004 was retained to be used as a factor to inform the Inspection Stage.

11 In summary

The data from this second part of the Exploratory Stage Phase 2 has now resolved the answer to the second part of guiding question two, namely,

are the specific factors cited for Australia for the decline of trade union membership (arising from the parent literature review) present and have they impacted on VIEU from 1994 to 2004?

The data demonstrated that the following factors could all be eliminated

- the historical role of legislation in protecting and prescribing the role of the trade union movement in Australia and the complementary role of the Australian arbitral system
- the political affiliation of the trade union movement
- a change in the Australian public perception of trade unions
- the loss of union preference clauses
- the changes brought by the Accord process
• the effects of amalgamation of unions.

Given that all four factors were also eliminated in the first part of the Exploratory Stage Phase 2, the only factors that separated VIEU’s membership from other Australian unions’ memberships were

• the foundations of VIEU as a professional association rather than a trade union
• that VIEU did not lose its monopoly as a bargaining agent for teachers in Victorian Catholic schools when the EBA system and AWAs were introduced over the award system, given the philosophical position adopted by the VCSA and
• that VIEU’s internal political structures and its commitment to democracy and consultation were different to the general union approach. This highlighted that VIEU’s leadership (and its approach to employment relations) was at odds to the general union approach.

These three issues were confirmed as factors that could provide possible explanations (that have contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union between 1994 and 2004) and were retained to inform the focus of the Inspection Stage.

Figure 62 summarises the position reached at the end of this stage of the examination of data.
Those factors, acting both independently and/or in concert, that emerged in the Exploratory Stage and have been tested in the Inspection Stage.

**Issue**
What factors have contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general Australian and worldwide trend by choosing to associate in their union?

**Profile**
VIEU’s demographic & contextual profile

**Exploratory Stage**
a broad ranging exploration of possible explanations to the issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2 – Part 2</th>
<th>Phase 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examining the context</td>
<td>Literature review reasons – Specific to Australia</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reasons**
Reasons cited by Victorian Catholic teachers for joining VIEU.

**Literature review explanations**
Reasons cited for the worldwide and Australian decline in union density

- Role of legislation
- Political affiliations
- Changing public perception
- Impact of the Accords
- Loss of preference clauses
- Amalgamation of unions

These factors that are not part of the solution because they are present in unions experiencing density decline

**Interviews**
with focus groups and a follow up survey on the issues that surfaced in the Exploratory phases 1, 2 and 3

**Solution**
Those factors, acting both independently and/or in concert, that emerged in the Exploratory Stage and have been tested in the Inspection Stage.

**Figure 62**
Progress Chart: Exploratory Stage Phase 2 Part 2
5.4 EXPLORATORY STAGE PHASE 3 (STEP 5) REASONS GIVEN FOR JOINING TRADE UNIONS

5.4.1 Overview

This third part of the Exploratory Stage displays the results of a survey of teachers in Victorian Catholic schools and the analysis of this survey’s data to ascertain whether the factors cited by teachers in Victorian Catholic schools for joining VIEU were typical of union membership in Australia from 1994 to 2004.

5.4.2 The survey’s purpose

A survey (copy attached in Appendix C) was used to gather the data required to answer guiding question 3:

Are the factors cited by teachers for joining VIEU typical of union membership in Australia from 1994 to 2004?

and its three sub questions

- are the factors cited by the general population also cited by teachers
- are there any different factors cited by teachers, specific to the sector
- are the factors cited by teachers, given the same priority as the general population?

5.4.3 The survey returns

13,668 survey forms were distributed to 482 Catholic schools in Victoria. The response rate was 26.01% i.e., 3,555 respondents. An additional 42 responses were rejected because they were incomplete in terms of the demographic data and personal background section (e.g., male or female, Melbourne or country). Of the 3,555 respondents, 2,625 were from VIEU members (33.8% of a possible 7,763 returns) and 930 from non-members of VIEU (15.7% of a possible 5,905 returns).

A copy of the statistical analyses conducted on the survey items is included as Appendix D. Notes on how the data were recorded where respondents did not follow the instructions (e.g., where respondents answered Yes to question 1 and then responded Yes to question 6 (If you have answered No to question one) are contained in Appendix E (Notes on data recoding).
5.4.4 The survey as a sample of the population

Table 20 summarises the demographic characteristics of VIEU’s respondents, the sample (i.e., all of the survey respondents) and the population (i.e., all teachers in Victorian Catholic schools).

Table 20
VIEU respondents v sample v population
Demographic background characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>9 or less years</th>
<th>Full time</th>
<th>Metropolitan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>1,814</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>2,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>7,042</td>
<td>3,748</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>9,376</td>
<td>10,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIEU respondents</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>2,029</td>
<td>1,915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>10 or more yrs</th>
<th>Part time</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>2,584</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>6,626</td>
<td>9,920</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>4,292</td>
<td>3,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIEU respondents</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>1,898</td>
<td>2,086</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test whether the full sample of respondents and the sub-sample of VIEU members were significantly different from the population from which they were drawn, a one-way Chi\(^2\) test for 'goodness-of-fit' test was applied for each combination. The results demonstrated that there was no significant difference between the demographic characteristics of

- the population as a whole and the sample of teachers in the survey. \( \text{Chi}^2 = 2.6963 \) with a significance level of 0.9116 (Appendix D, Table D1)
- the population as a whole and VIEU’s members in the sample. \( \text{Chi}^2 = 3.6679 \) with a significance level of 0.8171 (Appendix D, Table D2)
- VIEU’s members in the sample and the sample of teachers in the survey. \( \text{Chi}^2 = 0.2036 \) with a significance level of 0.9999 (Appendix D, Table D3).

Given there were no significant differences (at the 0.01 level of significance), generalisations can be extrapolated from the respondent samples to the general population.
5.4.5 Sub question 1: are the factors cited by the general population also cited by teachers?

The survey in question 3 listed the six reasons as identified by the literature review:

- A: protection from the employer
- B: improving pay
- C: improving teaching conditions (e.g., reduced workload)
- D: services such as credit facilities, insurance (health, property, etc.), discount purchasing, professional indemnity, professional development
- E: ideological belief in unions and/or politics
- F: solidarity with teachers in the school and the system.

The overall results (total frequency for each response and the percentage of VIEU members who listed the response) for this question are summarised in Table 21 as follows:

**Table 21**

**Question 3**

**Overall responses to Options A to F**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes and No and Null</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses for relevant 2,625 VIEU members who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: protection from the employer</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Improving pay</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: improving teaching conditions (e.g., workload)</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: services such as credit facilities, insurance, etc.</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: ideological belief in unions and/or politics</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: solidarity with teachers in school/system</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data demonstrated that all six factors cited by the general population, were also cited by teachers:

- 5 of the 6 reasons received more than a 50% Yes response from the 2,625 respondents who were VIEU members, with only ‘D: Direct Services’ receiving less than 50% (32.5%). However, this is consistent with the literature review that showed that this reason was the least popular reason for employees being motivated to join unions.
- all six reasons received more Yes responses than No responses, even option ‘D: Direct services’.

In summary, the data revealed that all of the six factors that were cited by the general population were also cited by teachers. Sub question 1 of guiding question 3 are the factors cited by the general population also cited by teachers was, therefore, resolved in the affirmative.

5.4.6 Sub question 2: are there any different factors cited by teachers specific to the sector?

The survey also provided the opportunity through option ‘G’ (Any other reason) for respondents to list a different reason that was specific to the Victorian Catholic teaching area.

The results for this question are shown in Table 22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 22</th>
<th>Question 3</th>
<th>Option ‘G’ ‘Any other reason’ responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>% of responses for relevant 2,625 VIEU members who responded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: any other reason (if other than A to F)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data demonstrated that there was no different factor, cited by teachers, specific to the sector

- only 123 or 4.7% of respondents provided their own reason. This is significantly below the lowest of the provided options ‘D: Direct Services’ with 853 Yes responses comprising 32.5% of VIEU members. The next lowest of the provided options ‘A: Protection from the employer’ had 10 times the Yes responses with 1,356 comprising 51.7% of VIEU members
- only 84 of the 123 respondents listed it as the 1st ranked answers
- 63 of these 84 responses (over half of the total responses) were, in fact, associated with one of the Reasons A to F but expressed in a parallel way
  (a) 11 were related to Reason A – Protection from the employer, with seven specifically related to the WorkChoices legislation
  (b) one was related to Reason B – Improving pay
  (c) four were related to Reason C – Improving teaching conditions
  (d) 36 were related to Reason D – Direct services (36 were associated with protection from parents and students or general litigation and would, therefore, be covered by VIEU’s professional indemnity service
  (e) two were related to Reason E – Ideological belief in unions and/or politics
  (f) nine were related to Reason F – solidarity with teachers in the school and the system.
  (See Appendix F for the full analysis.)

In summary, the data revealed that there were no different factors cited by teachers, specific to the sector. Sub question 2 of guiding question 3 are there any different factors cited by teachers, specific to the sector was, therefore, resolved in the affirmative.
5.4.7 Sub question 3: are the factors cited by teachers given the same priority as the general population?

The literature review revealed there were three main reasons for employees in the general population joining their union: protection from the employer, improving pay and improving teaching conditions (e.g., reduced workload).

Two measures were used to rank the priority assigned by VIEU members to the six reasons in the survey:

1. descriptive statistics using frequency distribution tables (the mode)
2. tests of statistical difference between the average ranks (medians and means) of the options using Wilcoxon rank order tests and student t tests.

1 The rank for each of the six options using frequency distribution tables

A THE MOST POPULAR REASON ON THE BASIS OF TOTAL YES RESPONSES

The frequency of each response was tallied, with option F ‘solidarity with teachers in school/system’ being the most popular with 1,896 or 72.2% of VIEU members selecting it. The results for this question are shown in Table 23 (for details see Appendix D, Tables D4 to D11).

Table 23
Question 3
Rank for reason chosen by frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Reason option</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses for relevant 2,625 VIEU members who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F: solidarity with teachers in school/system</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>C: improving teaching conditions (e.g., workload)</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B: Improving pay</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E: ideological belief in unions and/or politics</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A: protection from the employer</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>D: services such as credit facilities, insurance, etc.</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>G: any other reason (if other than A to F)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B  THE MOST POPULAR REASON ON THE BASIS OF RANK 1 YES RESPONSES

Respondents were asked as part of Question 3 “If you have answered ‘Yes’ more than once in this question, please rank your ‘Yes’ replies with 1 being the most significant for you”. The frequency of each rank was tallied and option F ‘solidarity with teachers in school/system’ was once again the most popular with 1,896 or 72.2% of VIEU members selecting it. The results are shown in Table 24.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>C: improving teaching conditions (e.g., workload)</td>
<td>rank 1: 463, rank 2: 530, rank 3: 574, rank 4: 198, rank 5: 46, rank 6: 4, No: 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>E: ideological belief in unions and/or politics</td>
<td>rank 1: 454, rank 2: 320, rank 3: 213, rank 4: 186, rank 5: 116, rank 6: 72, No: 466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B: improving pay</td>
<td>rank 1: 149, rank 2: 469, rank 3: 479, rank 4: 299, rank 5: 105, rank 6: 24, No: 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>D: services such as credit facilities, insurance, etc.</td>
<td>rank 1: 98, rank 2: 86, rank 3: 180, rank 4: 198, rank 5: 146, rank 6: 145, No: 709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>G: any other reason (if other than A to F)</td>
<td>rank 1: 84, rank 2: 17, rank 3: 9, rank 4: 8, rank 5: 3, rank 6: 2, No: n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: Rank 1 2,209 2,118 2,116 1,418 713 355 2,125
Unallocated Rank 1 416
Overall total 2,625

In addition to the 2,209 ‘rank 1’ responses there were 416 ‘non-rank 1’ responses making up the 2,625 VIEU members’ responses (see Appendix D, notes after Table 11, for full details).
C THE MOST POPULAR REASON ON THE BASIS OF A SOLITARY YES RESPONSE

On 356 out of 2,209 occasions (16.1% of these responses), VIEU members gave a solitary reason for joining VIEU, indicating a strong preference for that reason. The results are summarised in Table 25.

Table 25
Question 3
Rank for reason chosen by frequency
where the option (A to G) was the only one chosen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Reason option</th>
<th>Frequency where option was the solitary reason given</th>
<th>Frequency of the Yes rank 1 choices for that option</th>
<th>% of solitary choices in the Yes rank 1 choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F: solidarity with teachers in school/system</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>E: ideological belief in unions and/or politics</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>G: any other reason (if other than A to F)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A: protection from the employer</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>D: services such as credit facilities, insurance, etc.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>C: improving teaching conditions (e.g., workload)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>B: Improving pay</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option ‘F: solidarity with teachers in the school and the system’ was by far the highest scoring solitary reason given response with 195 responses in this category. This represented

- 10.2% of the 1,896 responses for this option, and
- 34.8% of the 560 ‘Yes rank 1’ responses for this option. Only the idiosyncratic option ‘G: any other reason (if other than A to F)’ understandably had a higher percentage than option F on this criteria.

In summary, as shown in Table 26, Option ‘F: solidarity with teachers in school/system’ was the most popular reason (the mode) cited for choosing to join VIEU by way of frequency tables.
Table 26
Question 3
Summary of frequency tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason option</th>
<th>Rank of the total Yes responses for the option</th>
<th>Rank of the Yes rank 1 choices for the option</th>
<th>Rank where option was the solitary reason given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: protection from the employer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: improving pay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: improving teaching conditions (e.g., workload)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: services such as credit facilities, insurance, etc.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: ideological belief in unions and/or politics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: solidarity with teachers in school/system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: any other reason (if other than A to F)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 The ranks of the option using measures of central tendency for options A to F

In calculating all the measures of central tendency, option ‘G: Any other reason’ was eliminated from consideration because

- as the frequency distributions demonstrated, it did not reveal any new reason why teachers had joined VIEU
- the very small sample size (n = 123) and there was a tendency to rank this idiosyncratic reason as number 1 (84 or 68.3% of the overall responses)
- many of the reasons (63 of the 84) were in fact one of reasons A to F but stated in the respondent’s own language.

Given that the data were ordinal, the most appropriate measure of central tendency was the mode and the median (Siegel and Castellan, 1988). The mode, as demonstrated by the frequency tables in Section 5.4.7 1 above (the rank for each of the six options using frequency distribution tables) was F (solidarity with teachers in school/system). The next section examines the mean, median and grouped median score for the six options.
A  THE MEDIAN AND GROUP MEDIAN FOR EACH OPTION USING YES RESPONSES ONLY

The median and grouped median rank for each option was calculated using the ranks assigned by respondents their Yes responses only. The overall ranks for each option, according to the median and grouped median for each option, are summarised in Table 27 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Reason option</th>
<th>Median Rank Score</th>
<th>Grouped Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E: ideological belief in unions and/or politics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>C: improving teaching conditions (e.g., workload)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F: solidarity with teachers in school/system</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A: protection from the employer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B: improving pay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>D: services such as credit facilities, insurance, etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B  THE MEAN FOR EACH OPTION USING YES RESPONSES ONLY AND THEN USING YES, NO AND NULL RESPONSES

As stated previously, the data from the survey was ordinal and not interval so the median measures were the most appropriate. However, to throw some comparative, certainly not definitive, light on the data, means were calculated. To do these tests, the six options (A to F) were assigned interval scores (1 to 6 respectively). The mean and standard for each option was then calculated using

- the Yes responses only
- the Yes, No and Null responses. Under this system each response was regarded as a deliberate choice, with a Yes response being regarded as the most positive and a Null response being regarded as a deliberate choice that was more positive than a No response. Accordingly, a Yes response scored 3, a Null response scored 2 and a No response scored 1.
The overall rank for each option, using the mean of the ranks assigned by respondents to the Yes responses only, are summarised in Table 28 as follows:

**Table 28**
**Question 3**
**Means for each option in rank order**
**Yes responses only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Reason option</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>C: improving teaching conditions (e.g., workload)</td>
<td>2.362</td>
<td>1.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>E: ideological belief in unions and/or politics</td>
<td>2.564</td>
<td>1.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F: solidarity with teachers in school/system</td>
<td>2.585</td>
<td>1.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A: protection from the employer</td>
<td>2.717</td>
<td>1.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B: improving pay</td>
<td>2.878</td>
<td>1.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>D: services such as credit facilities, insurance, etc.</td>
<td>3.754</td>
<td>1.563</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rank for each response using the Yes, No and Null responses are summarised in Table 29 as follows:

**Table 29**
**Question 3**
**Mean for each option in rank order**
**Using Yes = 3, Null = 2 and No = 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F: solidarity with teachers in school/system</td>
<td>2.644</td>
<td>0.7266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>C: improving teaching conditions (e.g., workload)</td>
<td>2.641</td>
<td>0.6493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B: improving pay</td>
<td>2.495</td>
<td>0.5751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A: protection from the employer</td>
<td>2.369</td>
<td>0.7696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E: ideological belief in unions and/or politics</td>
<td>2.341</td>
<td>0.7616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>D: services such as credit facilities, insurance, etc.</td>
<td>2.055</td>
<td>0.6216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The small range of the means and standard deviations between each option for both the Yes only and also the Yes, No and Null responses indicates that the population from which the samples were drawn can be assumed to be normally distributed and have similar variances, further indicating that the risk in transforming the ordinal to an interval scale was minimal.
A different rank order was achieved using Yes only responses (taking account of the respondents’ rankings) than by using Yes = 3, Null = 2 and No = 1 method because

1. in Table 17, all Yes responses were allocated an interval score of 3. No account was taken of the rankings within the Yes responses. In this analysis, the mean is the average rank given to each of the Yes responses
2. a Null response (in Table 17) is regarded as a more positive response than a No response
3. a No response (in Table 17) is the least positive response.

The significant changes in the ranks of option F (Solidarity - moving up from 3\textsuperscript{rd} to 1\textsuperscript{st}) and in option E (ideological belief – moving down from 2\textsuperscript{nd} to 5\textsuperscript{th}) occasioned by the inclusion of the No and Null responses, indicated that some issues (options) divided respondents while others did not. Option F (Solidarity) had the second least number of No responses (206 or 7.8\%) and the least number of Null responses (523 or 19.9\%) indicating that teachers had a definite positive view on this option and that it was not a likely barrier to them joining a union (see Table 9 for details). By contrast, option E (ideological belief in unions and/or politics) drops significantly from a rank of 2\textsuperscript{nd} (mean using Yes responses only) to 5\textsuperscript{th} (mean using Yes, Null and No responses) because it has the 2\textsuperscript{nd} highest No response (466 or 17.8\%) indicating that teachers did not have the same definite positive view on this option but rather that they were divided on the issue and that it may be a barrier to them joining a union.

C A COMPARISON OF ALL MEASURES OF CENTRAL TENDENCY

A number of observations can be made with respect to this synoptic view of the measures of central tendency (see Table 30).

Option by option, they are that

- option A always received the 4\textsuperscript{th} rank
- option B generally ranked poorly as the 4\textsuperscript{th} or 5\textsuperscript{th} rank (Yes rank 2\textsuperscript{nd} lowest) except when Null and No responses were considered because many respondents gave it a Null vote (2\textsuperscript{nd} highest)
- option C consistently ranks highly as the 1\textsuperscript{st} or 2\textsuperscript{nd} rank
- option D always received the lowest, 6\textsuperscript{th} rank
- option E ranked highly (1 or 2) when only the Yes ranks were considered. However, this option divided the sample so that when Null and No responses were included, it ranked poorly; in short, if respondents responded Yes (3rd
almost 2nd lowest Yes rank) then it ranked highly for them but if respondents did not rank it Yes, then they tended to rank it No (2nd highest No rank)

- option F consistently ranked highly as the 1st or 3rd rank.

<p>| Table 30 | Question 3 |
| All measures of central tendency | for the main options (A to F) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean using Yes, Null and No responses</th>
<th>Mean using Yes responses only</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Grouped Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: protection from the employer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>equal 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Improving pay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>equal 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: improving teaching conditions (e.g., workload)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>equal 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: services such as credit facilities, insurance, etc.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: ideological belief in unions and/or politics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>equal 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: solidarity with teachers in school/system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>equal 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the ranks of the options using the measures of central tendency reinforce the data obtained from the ranks of options using frequency distribution tables in that

- options F and C consistently ranked highly
- option D consistently ranked poorly
- the ranks of Options A, B and E varied depending on the measure used.

In the next section, an analysis of the means for each option was undertaken to test to see whether there were any statistically significant differences between these means and, therefore, the rankings of the six provided options.
Tests of statistical significance to determine whether the ranks of the provided options have a hierarchy

As stated previously, the initial tests of significance conducted were non-parametric (Wilcoxon signed rank tests) on the basis that the data were ordinal. The data were then transformed to interval data (as per the process for the means) and parametric tests (t tests) were conducted to cross check the results.

A WILCOXON SIGNED RANK TEST

Using a Wilcoxon signed rank test (a non-parametric alternative) for the difference between means, each of the options was compared with each other to test if the means for that pair were significantly different. The Yes responses were given a value of 3, the Null responses a value of 2 and the No responses a value of 1. Given that option G, ‘any other reason’, could only return Yes and Null responses, it was initially eliminated from the comparisons and then a one-off comparison was completed for it with the pair of Option D: ‘Services’ (See Table 31 for results).

The null hypothesis was that the difference between the median values of each pair would be zero. If a respondent responded Yes to option A, ‘Protection’ then, if there was no difference, they should respond Yes to option B, ‘Improving pay’ $(3 - 3 = 0)$ or a tied response.

The hypothesis was that there was a difference between the median values of each pair. The value was not zero but either positive or negative:

- A positive value (Yes and Null $[3-2=1]$, Yes and No $[3-1=2]$ or Null and No $[2-1=1]$) means that respondents are more positive regarding the $1^{st}$ option than the $2^{nd}$ option in the pair, and
- A negative value (Null and Yes $[2-3=-1]$, No and Yes $[1-3=-2]$ or No and Null $[1-2=-1]$) means that respondents are less positive regarding the $1^{st}$ option than the $2^{nd}$ option in the pair.

Several pairs had significant differences between their means. It was more efficient to list those pairs where there was not a significant difference between their means, namely:

- pair 4 = option A: ‘protection’ from the employer and option E: ‘ideological belief’
- pair 12 = option C: ‘improving conditions’ and option F: ‘solidarity’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Rank (lowest sum of ranks is greater)</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>Protection from the employer &amp; Improving pay</td>
<td>Reject Ho: Pay &gt; Protection</td>
<td>-8.440</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>Protection from the employer &amp; Improving teaching conditions</td>
<td>Reject Ho: Conditions &gt; Protection</td>
<td>-16.152</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td>Protection from the employer &amp; Services such as credit facilities</td>
<td>Reject Ho: Protection &gt; Services</td>
<td>-14.434</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4</td>
<td>Protection from the employer &amp; Ideological belief in unions and/or politics</td>
<td>Accept Ho: Protection = Belief</td>
<td>-2.076</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5</td>
<td>Protection from the employer &amp; Solidarity with teachers in the school / system</td>
<td>Reject Ho: Solidarity &gt; Protection</td>
<td>-13.805</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6</td>
<td>Improving pay &amp; Improving teaching conditions</td>
<td>Reject Ho: Conditions &gt; Pay</td>
<td>-12.322</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 7</td>
<td>Improving pay &amp; Services such as credit facilities</td>
<td>Reject Ho: Pay &gt; Services</td>
<td>-20.879</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 8</td>
<td>Improving pay &amp; Ideological belief in unions and/or politics</td>
<td>Reject Ho: Pay &gt; Belief</td>
<td>-9.145</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 9</td>
<td>Improving pay &amp; Solidarity with teachers in the school / system</td>
<td>Reject Ho: Solidarity &gt; Pay</td>
<td>-7.981</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 10</td>
<td>Improving teaching conditions &amp; Services such as credit facilities</td>
<td>Reject Ho: Conditions &gt; Services</td>
<td>-26.669</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 11</td>
<td>Improving teaching conditions &amp; Ideological belief in unions and/or politics</td>
<td>Reject Ho: Conditions &gt; Belief</td>
<td>-16.556</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 12</td>
<td>Improving teaching conditions &amp; Solidarity with teachers in the school / system</td>
<td>Accept Ho: Conditions = Solidarity</td>
<td>-0.475</td>
<td>0.635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 31 continued
Question 3
Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test
Each option, A to F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Rank (lowest sum of ranks is greater)</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 13</td>
<td>Services such as credit facilities &amp; Ideological belief in unions and/or politics</td>
<td>Reject Ho: Belief &gt; Services</td>
<td>-13.014</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 14</td>
<td>Services such as credit facilities &amp; Solidarity with teachers in the school / system</td>
<td>Reject Ho: Solidarity &gt; Services</td>
<td>-25.473</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 15</td>
<td>Ideological belief in unions and/or politics &amp; Solidarity with teachers in the school / system</td>
<td>Reject Ho: Solidarity &gt; Belief</td>
<td>-17.270</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As stated previously option G, ‘any other reason’, could only return Yes and Null responses and, therefore, it was initially eliminated from the comparisons. A one-off comparison was completed for it with the pair of Option D: ‘Services’ (See Table 32 for results).

Table 32
Question 3
Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test on options D and G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option Pair</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services such as credit facilities &amp; Any other reason</td>
<td>Accept Ho:</td>
<td>-0.525</td>
<td>0.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity = any other reason</td>
<td>Services= any other reason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of Tables 31 and 32, it was possible to group the options so that

- options F (solidarity) and C (improving conditions) were the most popular reasons why teachers joined VIEU with a statistically significant gap to
- option B (improving pay) with a further statistically significant gap to
- options A (protection) and E (ideological belief) with a further statistically significant gap to
- options D (services) and G (any other reason) with those being the least popular reason why teachers joined VIEU

as summarised in Table 33 below.
Table 33
Question 3
Options in rank order
using Wilcoxon signed rank test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>F: solidarity with teachers in school/system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C: improving teaching conditions (e.g., workload)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>B: Improving pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>A: protection from the employer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E: ideological belief in unions and/or politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>D: services such as credit facilities, insurance, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G: any other reason.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B STUDENT T TESTS

As a way of cross checking the result obtained by using the Wilcoxon signed rank test (a non-parametric test) the more robust t test (a parametric alternative) was used. As previously, the Yes responses were given a value of 3, the Null responses a value of 2 and the No responses a value of 1. Option G: ‘Any other reason’ was left in for comparative purposes. The results are summarised in Table 34 below.

Table 34
Question 3
t tests
Paired differences between the means for each option, A to F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>Protection from the employer</td>
<td>2.3691</td>
<td>-0.1261</td>
<td>2624</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>2.4952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>Protection from the employer</td>
<td>2.3691</td>
<td>-0.2720</td>
<td>2624</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving teaching conditions</td>
<td>2.6411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td>Protection from the employer</td>
<td>2.3691</td>
<td>0.3143</td>
<td>2624</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services such as credit facilities</td>
<td>2.0549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 34 continued
Question 3
*t* tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4</td>
<td>Protection from the employer</td>
<td>2.3691</td>
<td>0.0282</td>
<td>2624</td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological belief in unions</td>
<td>2.3410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5</td>
<td>Protection from the employer</td>
<td>2.3691</td>
<td>-0.2747</td>
<td>2624</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>2.6438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6</td>
<td>Protection from the employer</td>
<td>2.3691</td>
<td>0.3230</td>
<td>2624</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>2.0461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 7</td>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>2.4952</td>
<td>-0.1459</td>
<td>2624</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving teaching conditions</td>
<td>2.6411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 8</td>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>2.4952</td>
<td>0.4404</td>
<td>2624</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services such as credit facilities</td>
<td>2.0549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 9</td>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>2.4952</td>
<td>0.1543</td>
<td>2624</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological belief in unions</td>
<td>2.3410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 10</td>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>2.4952</td>
<td>-0.1486</td>
<td>2624</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>2.6438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 11</td>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>2.4952</td>
<td>0.4491</td>
<td>2624</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>2.0461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 12</td>
<td>Improving teaching conditions</td>
<td>2.6411</td>
<td>0.5863</td>
<td>2624</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services such as credit facilities</td>
<td>2.0549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 13</td>
<td>Improving teaching conditions</td>
<td>2.6411</td>
<td>0.3002</td>
<td>2624</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological belief in unions</td>
<td>2.3410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 14</td>
<td>Improving teaching conditions</td>
<td>2.6411</td>
<td>-0.0027</td>
<td>2624</td>
<td>0.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>2.6438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 15</td>
<td>Improving teaching conditions</td>
<td>2.6411</td>
<td>0.5950</td>
<td>2624</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>2.0461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 16</td>
<td>Services such as credit facilities</td>
<td>2.0549</td>
<td>-0.2861</td>
<td>2624</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological belief in unions</td>
<td>2.3410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 17</td>
<td>Services such as credit facilities</td>
<td>2.0549</td>
<td>-0.5890</td>
<td>2624</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>2.6438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several pairs have significant differences between their means. It is more efficient to list those pairs where there is not a significant difference between their means (these pairs can then be grouped as a unit), namely:

- pair 4 = option A: protection and option E: ideological belief
- pair 14 = option C: improving conditions and option F: solidarity
- pair 18 = option D: services and option G: any other reason.

These three pairs were the same three pairs revealed by Wilcoxon signed rank tests.

On the basis of Table 34, it was possible to group the options so that

- options F (solidarity) and C (improving conditions) were the most popular reasons why teachers joined VIEU with a statistically significant gap to
- option B (improving pay) with a further statistically significant gap to
- options A (protection) and E (ideological belief) with a further statistically significant gap to
- options D (services) and G (any other reason) with those being the least popular reason why teachers joined VIEU.

This is summarised in Table 35 below.
### Table 35
**Question 3**
**Options in rank order**
**Using the t tests’ significant differences between the mean**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Most popular</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F: solidarity with teachers in school/system</td>
<td>2.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>C: improving teaching conditions (e.g., workload)</td>
<td>2.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B: improving pay</td>
<td>2.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A: protection from the employer</td>
<td>2.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>E: ideological belief in unions and/or politics</td>
<td>2.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Least popular</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D: services such as credit facilities, insurance, etc.</td>
<td>2.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>G: any other reason (if other than A to F)</td>
<td>2.047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C  **COALESCING THE MEASURES OF CENTRAL TENDENCY RESULTS WITH THE WILCOXON SIGNED RANK AND STUDENT T TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE RESULTS**

These results (the rankings resulting from both the Wilcoxon Signed Rank test and the Student t test) coalesce with observations made previously regarding the measures of central tendency (with option G removed)

- options C and F ranked consistently high
  - option C consistently ranked highly as the 1st or 2nd rank
  - option F consistently ranked highly as the 1st or 3rd rank
- option A is middle of the range in rank and options B and E are inconsistent.
  - option A always received the 4th rank
  - option B generally ranked poorly as the 4th or 5th rank (Yes rank 2nd lowest) except when Null and No responses were considered because many respondents gave it a Null vote (2nd highest)
  - option E ranked highly (1 or 2) when only the Yes ranks were considered. However, this option divided the sample so that when Null and No responses were included, it ranked poorly; in short, those who responded Yes (3rd and almost 2nd lowest Yes rank) ranked highly but those who did not rank it Yes tended to rank it No (2nd highest No rank)
- option D always received the lowest, 6th rank.
D QUESTION 4. THE REASONS GIVEN FOR NOT JOINING VIEU

Finally, Question 4 provided some corroborating evidence on the issue of ‘solidarity’. It asked, “If you have answered No to question one (i.e., you are not a member of VIEU), please indicate whether any of the suggestions (A to G) was a reason not to join”.

The mean for each option was calculated and then Student t tests and Wilcoxon signed rank tests run to determine if there were any significant differences between the means (i.e., if any reason was significantly different to the others) with the following results. The large percentage of respondents who added their own reason (51.8% or 482 of 930 respondents) indicated that the six options provided were not sufficiently broad to cover the main reasons for not joining VIEU. Additionally, the fact that all of the six options (A to F) provided returned higher No responses than Yes responses, indicated that none of these options were regarded as strong reasons for not joining VIEU.

However, option F (‘no need for solidarity with other teachers in the school or system’) was, by far, significantly the least reason stopping members joining VIEU.

The results are summarised in Table 36 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses for the 930 non-VIEU members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E: belief</td>
<td>1.9806</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A: protection</td>
<td>1.9871</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D: services</td>
<td>1.9882</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C: conditions</td>
<td>1.9925</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B: pay</td>
<td>1.9183</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F: solidarity</td>
<td>1.7226</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The details for each survey question are included in Appendix D, Tables D41 to D48 and the statistical analyses used to produce Table 36 are included in Appendix D, Tables D49 to D60.
In conclusion, the literature review revealed the main reasons, cited in Australia, that motivate employees to join their union were

- A: protection from the employer
- B: improving pay
- C: improving teaching conditions (e.g., reduced workload).

Whereas, the statistical analysis for this section revealed that the main reasons, cited by teachers, that motivated them to join VIEU were

- F: solidarity with teachers in school/system
- C: improving teaching conditions (e.g., workload).

In summary, the data revealed that there was a discernable hierarchy of reasons given by teachers for joining VIEU and that this hierarchy was different to the general trade union population. This part of sub question 2 of guiding question 3 are the factors cited by teachers, given the same priority as the general population was, therefore, resolved in the affirmative.

Given that a different motivation for teachers to join VIEU was revealed, vis-à-vis the general population, then this factor was used to inform the Inspection Stage.

5.4.8 Demographic group differences between the options cited by teachers

Given that the first part of the answer to sub question was resolved with option F (‘solidarity with teachers in school/system’) outranking all of the general trade union population reasons, a further examination was undertaken of the data to examine whether there were any differences between the demographic groups, namely

1. Primary and Secondary respondents
2. Male and female respondents
3. Respondents with 9 or less or 10 or more years of experience
4. Full time and part time respondents
5. Metropolitan and country respondents

and the reasons given for joining VIEU.
A CHI^2 TESTS

Chi^2 tests (a non-parametric alternative) were used given that the data were nominal (Yes-Null-No) and ordinal (ranks for the Yes only). Chi^2 tests of significance were applied for any differences

- within the overall rankings for Yes and No
- within the Yes rankings only
- in the total of Yes v No responses

for each of the demographic characteristics. The full details of the tests are included in Appendix D, Tables D12 to D24. A summary table of the results of all 105 Chi^2 tests (displaying the significant and non-significant results) are included in Appendix D, Tables D25 to D27:

- D25: on the differences within the overall rankings for Yes and No
- D26: on the differences within the Yes rankings only
- D27: on the differences in the total of Yes v No responses.

(a) Chi^2 tests on the differences within the overall rankings for Yes and No

11 of the 35 Chi^2 tests on the differences within the overall rankings for Yes and No returned significant results. The significant results are listed in Table 37. The full tests of significance for each of the 11 results are included in Appendix D, Tables D13, D15, D16, D18, D17, D19, D20, D21, D22, D23 and D24.

Table 37
Summary of Chi^2 tests of significance between demographic factors
Difference within the rankings: Yes and No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Demographic factor</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>Pearson Chi^2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving teaching conditions</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving teaching conditions</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving teaching conditions</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) Chi² tests on the differences within the Yes rankings only

10 of the 35 Chi² tests on the differences within the Yes rankings only returned significant results. The significant results are listed in Table 38. The full tests of significance for each of the 10 results are included in Appendix D, Tables D13, D14, D15, D16, D17, D19, D21, D22, D23 and D24.

Table 38
Summary of Chi² tests of significance between demographic factors
Difference within the Yes rankings only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Demographic factor</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving teaching conditions</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving teaching conditions</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Chi² tests on the differences in the total of Yes v No responses

5 of the 35 Chi² tests on the differences in the total of Yes v No responses returned significant results. The significant results are listed in Table 39. The full tests of significance for each of the five results are included in Appendix D, Tables D12, D18, D20, D21 and D23.

Table 39
Summary of Chi² tests of significance between demographic factors
Difference in the total of Yes v No responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Demographic factor</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving teaching conditions</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B  ANOVA TESTS

As a way of cross checking the result obtained by using the Chi$^2$ tests (a non-parametric test) the more robust ANOVA tests of significance (parametric) on the means (for Yes responses only given that ANOVAs require ordinal data) were applied to each of the options. The full details of the tests are included in Appendix D, Tables D28 to D39.

12 of the 35 ANOVA tests on the differences between the means returned significant results (see Table 40). A full summary of tests is included in Appendix D, Table D40.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Demographic factor</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving teaching conditions</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving teaching conditions</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C  A COMPARISON OF CHI$^2$ TESTS AND ANOVA TESTS

The results of the Chi$^2$ and ANOVA tests were compatible on 11 but not on 3 occasions.

1  Respondents with 9 or less years of experience were more likely than respondents with 10 or more years of experience to join VIEU for the reason

   a:  ‘Protection from the employer’

      • ranked 1 (in particular), 2 and 3 higher and 4, 5 and 6 lower than expected

      • ($\bar{X} = 2.351$ compared with $2.839$)

   b:  ‘Improving pay’

      • ranked 1, 3, (in particular) 4 and 5 lower, 2 higher, rank 6 as expected and the No option lower and Yes option higher than expected

      • ($\bar{X} = 2.720$ compared with $2.926$)
c: ‘Direct Services’
   • ranked 1 and 2 (both high variance) higher and 3, 4, 5 and 6 (all low variance) lower than expected
   • ( $\bar{X} = 3.361$ compared with 3.859)

whereas respondents with 10 or more years of experience were more likely than respondents with 9 or less years of experience to join VIEU for the reason

a: ‘Ideological belief in unions and/or politics’
   • ranked 1, 2 and 6 (particularly 1 and 2) higher, 3 and (in particular) 5 lower with rank 4 as expected and the Yes option higher and No option lower than expected
   • ( $\bar{X} = 2.845$ compared with 2.500)

b: ‘Solidarity with teachers in the school and the system’
   • ranked (in particular) 1 and 2 higher, 3, 4, 5 and 6 (particularly 5 and 6) lower and the Yes option higher and No option lower than expected.
   • ( $\bar{X} = 3.042$ compared with 2.495).

2) Primary were more likely than Secondary respondents to join VIEU for the reason

a: ‘Improving pay’
   • ranked 1, (in particular) 2 and 3 higher and (in particular) 4, 5 and 6 lower than expected
   • $\bar{X} = 2.721$ compared with $= 3.051$

b: ‘Improving teaching conditions’
   • ranked (in particular) 1 and 2 higher and 3, 4, 5 and 6 (particularly 4, 5 and 6) lower than expected
   • $\bar{X} = 2.260$ compared with $= 2.475$

c: ‘Solidarity with teachers in the school and the system’
   • ranked 1 higher and 5 and 6 lower than expected (ranks 2, 3 and 4 were as expected)
   • $\bar{X} = 2.479$ compared with $= 2.691$

whereas Secondary respondents were more likely than Primary respondents to join VIEU for the reason ‘Ideological belief in unions and/or politics’

• ranked (in particular) 1, 2 and 3 lower, 4, 5 and 6 (all low variance) higher and placed the No option higher and Yes option lower than expected
• $\bar{X} = 2.417$ compared with 2.731.
The results for the reason ‘Protection from the employer’ were not consistent over the two tests, suggesting a random result. Primary respondents placed the No option higher and Yes option lower than expected but this was not supported by any significant difference in the ANOVA test.

3 Female were more likely than male respondents to join VIEU for the reason ‘Improving teaching conditions’

- ranked 1 and 2 (particularly 1) higher, 3, 4, 5 and 6 (particularly 4 and 5) lower and the No option higher and Yes option lower than expected
- $\bar{X} = 2.289$ compared with 2.565.

4 Part time were more likely than full time respondents to join VIEU for the reason ‘Solidarity with teachers’

- ranked 1 higher and 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6 lower than expected
- $\bar{X} = 2.397$ compared with 2.643.

5 The results for Metropolitan and Country respondents were not consistent over the two tests, suggesting a random result. Metropolitan respondents

a. assigned a higher rank ($\bar{X} = 2.823$) to the option, ‘Improving pay’, than Country respondents ($\bar{X} = 3.035$) but this was not supported by any significant difference in the Chi$^2$ tests

b. for the option ‘Protection from the employer’, ranked 1, 2, 4 and 5 lower and 3 and 6 (particularly 3) higher than expected but this was not supported by any significant difference in the ANOVA means test.

In summary, the demographic groups that had the greatest difference in their reasons for joining VIEU were

- respondents with 9 or less years of experience and respondents with 10 or more years of experience who differed on 5 of the 6 options
- Primary and secondary respondents who differed on 4 of the 6 options.

Male and female respondents differed once, full time and part time respondents differed once and metropolitan and country respondents differed on no options.
D DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES AND OPTION F: SOLIDARITY

With regard to choosing option F (‘Solidarity’) as the reason for joining VIEU, there were three demographic groups that were significantly different

- respondents with 10 or more years of experience were more likely than respondents with 9 or less years of experience (in all three of the Chi\(^2\) tests and the most divergent group in the ANOVA)
- Primary were more likely than Secondary respondents (2 of the 3 Chi\(^2\) tests and lower significance levels than ‘experience’ and supported by the ANOVA)
- part time were more likely than full time respondents (2 of the 3 Chi\(^2\) tests and lower significance levels than ‘experience’ and supported by the ANOVA)

to cite it as a reason for joining VIEU.

Given the demographic sub-group data, that is, the fact that the most divergent groups on the issue of solidarity were respondents with 10 or more or 9 or less years’ experience, this factor was used to inform the Inspection Stage enquiry.

E DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES AND THE OTHER OPTIONS A TO E

With regard to choosing options A to E as the reason for joining VIEU, while there were eight significant differences recorded (‘Protection’ = 1, ‘Improving pay’ = 2, ‘Improving conditions’ = 2, ‘Direct Services’ = 1 and ‘Ideological belief’ = 2) these results were not explored further in the Inspection Stage because none of these options differed from the general population as a reason why teachers chose to join their union.

5.4.9 Summary

The data from this Exploratory Stage Phase 3 (Sections 5.4.1 through to 5.4.8 above) have now resolved the answer to the guiding question two, namely

are the factors cited by teachers given the same priority as the general population?

The data demonstrated the following

- there was a discernable hierarchy of reasons given by teachers for joining VIEU and this hierarchy is different to the general trade union population with option F (‘Solidarity with teachers in school/system’) outranking all of the general trade union population reasons
• the most demographic divergent groups on the issue of solidarity were respondents with 10 or more or 9 years’ experience or less.

Accordingly, these two factors were used to inform the research focus in the subsequent Inspection Stage. Figure 63 summarises the position reached at the end of this stage of the examination of data.

5.5 CONCLUSION

The Exploratory Stage revealed eight factors as possible explanations that have contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union. These factors were used to inform the research approach in the subsequent Inspection Stage.

Factors identified from

• Phase 1 (Step Three)

1 the Catholic Church is the employer and the VCSA’s approach to employment relations
2 VIEU’s members are teachers
3 VIEU’s modus operandi.

• Phase 2 (Step Four)

4 the foundations of VIEU as a professional association rather than a trade union (linked to VIEU’s members are teachers from Phase 1)
5 the maintenance of its role as the sole bargaining agent in EBAs (linked to VCSA’s leadership and its approach to employment relations from Phase 1)
6 VIEU’s use of democratic structures in its operations (linked to VIEU’s leadership and its approach to employment relations or modus operandi from Phase 1).

• Phase 3 (Step Five)

7 Solidarity as a reason for joining VIEU (linked to VIEU’s members are teachers (from Phase 1)
8 the length of time spent in VIEU as a member.
**Issue**
What factors have contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general Australian and worldwide trend by choosing to associate in their union?

**Profile**
VIEU’s demographic and contextual profile.

**Literature review explanations**
Reasons cited for the worldwide and Australian decline in union density

**Reasons**
Reasons cited by Victorian Catholic teachers for joining VIEU

- Protection
- Improved pay
- Improved conditions
- Direct service
- Ideological belief
- Any other reason

**Factor is unique to VIEU**
- Solidarity
- Time in VIEU

**Solution**
Those factors, acting both independently and/or in concert, that emerged in the Exploratory Stage and have been tested in the Inspection Stage.

**Inspection Stage**
Examination of factors from the Exploratory Stage Phases 1, 2 & 3.

**Interviews**
With focus groups and a follow up survey on the issues that surfaced in the Exploratory phases 1, 2 and 3.

**These factors that are not part of the solution because they are present in unions experiencing density decline**

---

**Figure 63**
Progress Chart: Exploratory Stage Phase 3
Chapter 6  Transition from the Exploratory to the Inspection Stage

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter Six reports on the sixth and seventh steps of the learning journey. Step 6 reviews the adequacy of Shister’s model as the initial conceptual framework. Step 7 is a subsequent literature review based on the emergent issues from the Exploratory Stage and the review of Shister’s model. It establishes the framework for the Inspection Stage research questions.

In Chapter Three Shister’s (1953) model for the general growth and decline in union density was outlined. Shister’s model was found to be a comprehensive framework for the wide-ranging explanations revealed in the Exploratory Stage literature review, namely the

- structural factors associated for the decline in union density in Australia
- array of historical and contextual reasons offered for the decline
- reasons given by employees in Australia as to why join unions.

Accordingly, Shister’s model was adopted as an initial conceptual framework for the research. Chapter Five concluded with a final guiding question to ascertain whether, as a result of the collection of data in the Exploratory Stage, any new and/or unexpected factors had emerged that should cause a revision of Shister’s model prior to the commencement of the Inspection Stage. That guiding question and its sub questions are the stepping off point for the second section of this chapter.

Chapter Five displayed the data that was obtained from the three phases of the Exploratory Stage of the research. Using the ‘funnel’ approach (Sprinthall, Schmutte & Sirois, 1991) six possible explanations from VIEU’s demographic and contextual profile, 10 possible explanations cited from worldwide and Australian literature to explain union density decline, and six possible explanations derived from the reasons cited by members for joining unions were eliminated as potential explanations for VIEU’s growth in union density. More significantly, it revealed eight factors as possible sources that have contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union.
This chapter reviews those eight factors. In its first two sections, a modified analytical approach (Wiersma, 1995) was used to reconcile these eight different factors to form the beginning of a universal explanation.

1. The first section coalesces the eight factors revealed in the Exploratory Stage into two themes.

2. The second section reviews Shister’s model in terms of its adequacy as a conceptual framework in the light of the eight factors (two themes) that emerged from the data gathered in the Exploratory Stage. It outlines a new conceptual framework based on a modification of Shister’s model for union growth.

3. The third section is a review of the literature on the two unexpected factors that emerged from the data gathered in the Exploratory Stage and that shaped the review of Shister’s model, those being:
   a. the motivational factors for teachers vis-à-vis other workers and
   b. the active requirement imposed on the Catholic Church as an employer within the Church’s social teaching on the employment relationship.

4. The fourth section is a review of the literature on leadership arising from the fact that when the eight factors revealed in the Exploratory Stage were coalesced, a unifying theme was the leadership influence of VIEU as well as the VCSA.

5. As a result of this pre-Inspection Stage literature review, the fifth and final section frames the guiding questions for the Inspection Stage that follows.

### 6.2 COALESCLING THE DATA FROM THE EXPLORATORY STAGE

The Exploratory Stage revealed eight factors that were unique to the Victorian Catholic education context and, therefore, could singly or collectively form the basis of an explanation for why teachers in Victorian Catholic schools had gone against the trend by choosing to become members of their union. However, these eight factors are not independent of each other but rather, associated with each other inasmuch as the one factor on occasions appears to be the result or the generating source of another factor, for example, the VCSA’s *modus operandi* is the direct cause of another factor, namely that VIEU remained the sole collective bargaining agent for teachers in Victorian Catholic schools.

Other linkages can be made between the eight remaining factors and the supporting evidence from some of the 22 factors that were eliminated.
a The factor that the cohort being investigated were teachers can be linked to the evidence of

i solidarity being given as a more important factor for joining a union than pay. The traditionally high priorities for the general worker (pay, protection from the employer and ideology) rate poorly with teachers

ii the other traditionally high factor for joining a union (conditions – as revealed in the literature review) is not expressed solely in terms of employee benefits (e.g., worksite conditions). It is also expressed in terms of improving student learning outcomes (smaller classes, release time for preparation and correction, professional development opportunities). This in turn can be linked to VIEU’s precursors being professional associations

iii the issue that 5 of the 6 demographic factors (only the ageing workforce produced the predicted result) were expected to have had a more negative impact on the Victorian Catholic sector. Consequently they were expected to have led to greater decline rather than to the unexpected growth. Those demographic factors were that

- the percentage of part time female teachers increased at the expense of full time male teachers
- the percentage of female teachers increased at the expense of male teachers
- the percentage of part time workers increased at the expense of full time workers
- education is in the white collar sector
- Catholic education is in the private sector

b The factor that VIEU’s leadership adopted a different modus operandi can be linked to the evidence that

i a primary concentration on wages and conditions was not used as the reason for joining VIEU but rather a broad based agenda was adopted. In the same vein, VIEU’s precursors supported the Accord process in line with this adoption of a broader agenda

ii rather than rejecting or ignoring the HRM approach, VIEU embraced it. A local school delegate approach was fostered so that local issues were addressed as well as system issues

iii there has been no historical reliance on a legislative role or preference clauses. As a new union, VIEU did not seek compulsory unionism but relied on building a voluntary union base
iv VIEU has avoided formal political affiliation with the ALP while still remaining a mainstream union

v although VIEU was formed as a result of the ACTU sponsored amalgamation of unions process, it adopted strong democratic structures to ensure that members were, and felt that they were, listened to rather than being perceived as a more remote bureaucratic structure

c The factor that the employer is the Catholic Church can be linked to

i VIEU remaining the sole bargaining agent in the EBA process

ii AWAs not being adopted but a collective approach being maintained

iii the VCSA adopting a HRM approach and not an IR personnel management approach.

Accordingly, it is possible to group the eight remaining factors under two leading themes with associated factors, namely

1. Leadership influence

   a. VIEU leadership’s *modus operandi* (factor three from the Exploratory Stage Phase 1)
      - its awareness of the Catholic Church’s social teaching and its effect on its approach to industrial relations (factor one from the Exploratory Stage Phase 1)
      - the foundations of VIEU as an association of professionals (factor four from the Exploratory Stage Phase 2)
      - the conscious use of strategies (e.g., the use of democratic structures) to grow union membership (factor six from the Exploratory Stage Phase 2)

   b. VCSA leadership’s *modus operandi* (factor one from the Exploratory Stage Phase 1)
      - its awareness of the Catholic Church’s social teaching and the effect on its approach to industrial relations (e.g., maintaining VIEU’s role as the sole bargaining agent) (factor five from the Exploratory Stage Phase 2)

2. The different mindset of teachers vis-à-vis other workers

   o VIEU’s members are teachers (factor two from the Exploratory Stage Phase 1)
solidarity as a reason for joining VIEU (linked to VIEU’s members being teachers) (factor seven from the Exploratory Stage Phase 3)

- the length of time spent in VIEU as a member (factor eight from the Exploratory Stage Phase 3).

These two themes challenged the comprehensiveness of Shister’s model.

### 6.3 A REVISION OF SHISTER’S MODEL (STEP 6)

As stated in Chapter Four, the only generally accepted comprehensive model for union growth and decline is Shister’s (1953) model (see Figure 64 that follows). Shister listed three interdependent factors necessary for growth and the influences within those factors as follows:

- **A favourable work environment.** Under this heading, the following factors were included:
  - the rate and pattern of economic change (the rate of upward occupational mobility and cyclical variations in the level of employment)
  - the structure of the relevant industry (the technical and marketing contours of the industry and the composition of the labor force) and
  - the proximity influence (growth in one sector promotes growth in a related sector)

- **A supportive sociolegal framework.** Under this heading, the following factors were included:
  - the climate of opinion and
  - the resultant legal framework, both legislative and judicial

- **The quality of union leadership.** Under this heading, he states that the ability of leadership can be gauged by their
  - organising techniques
  - the structural and administrative framework of the institution
  - the internal operation of the union and
  - the collective bargaining relationships with the relevant employing or governmental unit

and that leadership aptness encompasses:
  - recognising new conditions
  - the elaboration of policies to meet these conditions and
  - the persuasion of the rank and file to pursue such policies.
The work environment
- the rate and pattern of economic change (economic prosperity v hard times)
- the primary concentration of trade unions on improving wages and conditions
- a shift in the underlying philosophy from IR to HRM

The sociolegal framework
- Climate of opinion (public perception)
- Government legislation (loss of privileged place & preference clauses & Accord & EBAs - AWAs)
- the political links of unions (Labor Party)
- part of an international trend

Trade union leadership
- All leaders do not react in the same way to changes in the work environment or the sociolegal framework
- the British origins of the trade union movement and its effect on modus operandi
- the reporting of false figures
- the effects of amalgamation of unions
- the internal political structures & failure to modernise

Figure 64
Shister’s model
Shister asserted that all three factors were interdependent, so that even with a favourable (to the union) work environment (one where labour is in demand, the industry’s demographic structure favours unionisation, and proximate unions in the sector are already unionised) and a supportive (to the union) sociolegal background (one where the legal framework supports union rights and unions are popular in the society’s opinion), the union will not grow if the quality of leadership is poor. Shister (1953) asserts while it is true that ... the ‘work environment’ and the ‘sociolegal framework’ set the limits to the relevant patterns of union growth, the actual patterns will fall somewhere within these limits; just where they fall will be determined in no small measure by the nature of union leadership. (p. 429)

More importantly, he asserted that if the work environment and sociolegal background were unfavourable and unsupportive, then even the most inspirational union leaders could not grow the union. This contention of Shister’s is not supported by the Exploratory Stage data. The initial literature review for the Exploratory Stage demonstrated that, by and large, the first two factors of an unfavourable work environment and an unsupportive sociolegal framework were present. However, the Exploratory Stage data revealed that there had been growth in VIEU’s density despite this fact and that one of the contextually unique factors warranting further investigation was VIEU leadership’s modus operandi. It directly challenged Shister’s (1953) statement that “no matter how ingenious the leadership, unionism will not emerge in the ... sector if the work environment and the sociolegal framework together are sufficiently unfavorable to organization” (p. 431).

Additionally, Shister’s framework comprehensively covered all of the factors cited in the Exploratory Stage literature review for the decline of trade unions in Australia so that no factor raised in the literature review could not be fitted into Shister’s schema. All factors eliminated by the Exploratory Stage could be reconciled to Shister’s framework. However, and more significantly, the Exploratory Stage data also revealed that two factors have been associated with VIEU that are not covered in Shister’s model, namely the VCSA leadership’s *modus operandi* and the different mindset of teachers vis-à-vis other workers.

In Shister’s schema there is no role for the employees or the employer to influence union growth, particularly in an active way. In Shister’s framework, employers and employees are ‘dependent’ variables, not ‘independent’ variables; factors that are acted upon by determining forces rather than factors that can contribute to growth and act as ‘independent’ variables in their own right and influence union growth in a positive way.
On the issue of the employees, Shister (1953) specifically states one important point must be cleared up. Worker “dissatisfaction,” whether in the absolute or in the relative context, has always been emphasized as a significant variable in inducing unionization; yet in our analysis no separate classification is provided for such dissatisfaction. The reason is this: while worker dissatisfaction is undeniably an important influence in union growth, it is not an independent variable. Rather, the dissatisfaction is in most instances derived from one or more of the variables to be analyzed. (p. 413)

The only area in Shister’s model where employees are seen to have any influence in affecting union density is their impact on the work environment structure of the relevant industry, specifically through the composition of the labour force. Shister contends that young, male, educated workers are seen to be more likely to join unions rather than older, female and less educated workers. Additionally, in Shister’s model, employees are only the putty in the hands of effective union leaders; the rank and file to be persuaded to pursue such policies. If they are not indoctrinated, educated or persuaded by the union leadership to join, they will make no effort of their own volition, let alone being a factor that has an effect on the way that the union leadership itself operates.

In a similar way, Shister’s model does not provide an active role for employers. He ascribes only a negative role for employers with regard to unionisation. While employers are not dealt with as a separate factor in his model, they are referred to sic passim in his model but always with the assumption that there is ‘managerial resistance’ to unions. The only exception to employer overt resistance to unionisation in his model is in those situations where the union helps the productivity of the business by acting as a stabilising influence on the mobility of the workforce or as a de facto employment agency in certain industries. On this role the employer then adopts a neutral or non-resistant approach to unionisation and allows unions to form and grow without any interference whatsoever.

However, the Exploratory Stage data revealed that there had been growth in VIEU’s density associated with two of the contextually unique factors warranting further investigation namely the VCSA’s leadership’s modus operandi and the different mindset of teachers vis-à-vis other workers. In order to frame appropriate guiding questions for the Inspection Stage for these two factors, a pre-Inspection Stage literature review was undertaken on these two areas, specifically on the issues of

- the motivational factors for teachers vis-à-vis other workers and how this affects their approach to unionisation or their tendency to associate in their union and
• the active requirement imposed on the Catholic Church as an employer within
the Church’s social teaching on the employment relationship and how this
affects their approach to employees wanting to associate in their union.

If the data from the Inspection Stage confirmed that these two factors were additional
factors to the three interdependent factors cited by Shister, and they could be reconciled with
Shister’s model, then a new conceptual framework could be developed.

6.4 A SUBSEQUENT REVIEW OF LITERATURE (STEP 7)

6.4.1 The motivational factors for teachers vis-à-vis other workers

Shister’s model did not provide an active role for employees in determining union
growth. For Shister, employees were regarded solely as dependent variables to be worked on by
the union leaders, the work environment and the sociolegal framework. As Turnbull (2003)
states

union membership is typically regarded as the dependent variable in economic
studies of trade unionism, rather than an independent variable. In practice,
however, membership itself helps to explain membership (Bain and Elsheikh,
1976), shaping both the patterns and parameters of unions’ organization and
reshaping both the determinants and relative weights of the different factors at
play, whether economic, social, institutional, or political. (p. 503)

However, as the Exploratory Stage data revealed, the teacher members of VIEU had a
different union density to non-teachers, suggesting that the character of teachers might influence
the modus operandi of VIEU and that it was not VIEU’s modus operandi alone that has
increased union density; otherwise the union density of non-teachers would have been as high as
teachers. That is, the employees were not solely a dependent variable worked on by the union
but that teacher members of VIEU also acted upon the union’s leadership in determining VIEU’s
modus operandi. Consequently, a literature review was undertaken to ascertain whether the
character of teachers, specifically the motivational factors for teachers were the same as for other
workers.

The theory of human motivation has been dominated by Maslow’s hierarchical needs
model (Beck, 1990; Roberts, 1994). Maslow’s (1943) theory of human motivation states that
there is a hierarchy of needs, from lowest to highest, as follows

• physiological needs
• safety or security needs
• belongingness or friendship needs
• esteem and recognition needs
• the need for self-actualisation or self-fulfillment.

Once satisfied, a need is said to be no longer a motivator. As one set of needs is satisfied, the individual focuses on the next higher set of needs as illustrated in Figure 65 below.

Figure 65
Maslow’s hierarchy of needs

Maslow (1943) further divided this hierarchy of needs into two groups of lower order needs (physiological, safety, belongingness) and higher order needs (esteem and self actualisation). Locke (1976) states that

Maslow did not develop a specific theory of work motivation as such, but the implications of his theory for the design of incentive systems by management are obvious. The optimal job environment for a given employee would be the one that correlates most closely to his position on the hierarchy of needs. (pp. 1307-1308)

Maslow’s lower and higher order needs approach influenced McGregor’s (1960) Theory X and Theory Y model of motivation and Herzberg’s theory of motivation in the area of employment (Herzberg, 1987; Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959). Under McGregor’s Theory X the average person, operating at a lower order need level, is assumed to dislike work and must be coerced, controlled and directed to achieve the employer’s objective. Under Theory Y the average worker, operating at a higher order needs level, is a willing participant exercising self-direction and responsibility to achieve objectives to which he or she is committed. McGregor believed that management could use either set of needs to motivate employees and it is this
uncritical aspect of his theory that has led to Herzberg’s more critical theory dominating the literature in the area of work motivation (Roberts, 1994).

Herzberg’s theory states that the motivation of employees is influenced principally by two factors, those being intrinsic rewards (motivators), such as recognition, achievement, the chance of growth, advancement and added responsibility and to a lesser extent by extrinsic rewards (referred to as hygiene factors) such as job security, pay and working conditions. The second set of factors (hygiene) do not act as motivators but are dissatisfiers when not present. Addressing hygiene factors will eliminate dissatisfaction but will not in itself be sufficient to actively motivate employees.

Sergiovanni (1967) applied Herzberg’s theory of motivation (tested on engineers and accountants) in an educational setting and concurred that there is one set of factors that relates to job satisfaction (intrinsic rewards), and a different set of factors with job dissatisfaction (absence of extrinsic rewards). Sergiovanni found that teachers receive their greatest satisfaction from a sense of achievement in reaching and affecting students, recognition and feeling responsible.

There is no agreed definition of job satisfaction in the literature although most contain similar terms and commonly link job satisfaction to intrinsic rather than extrinsic motivation. For the purpose of this research, given its setting within industrial relations, the CCH Macquarie Dictionary of Employment and Industrial Relations’ definition was used, namely that job satisfaction is “the sense of gratification that a person derives from the job he/she is employed to perform. It usually arises from his/her relationship to his/her work, the work environment or both” (Yerbury & Karlsson, 1992, p. 190).

Deci (1975) found that as employees’ intrinsic motivators (e.g., a feeling of self-determination) increased, their job satisfaction increased. He also found that injudicious use of extrinsic rewards undermined intrinsic motivation. He found, when interested (motivated), unpaid volunteers were paid for doing the same job, their motivation to return as an unpaid volunteer was lessened once they had been paid. Applying this to the motivators of teachers, Deci and Ryan (1985) subsequently reported an experiment that found that “when administrators impose restrictions and allow little space for self determination, they are likely to undermine the teachers’ intrinsic motivation” (p. 266). Many studies have replicated these findings with regard to teacher satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Farber, 1991; Kyriacou, 1987; Mykletun, 1984) with teacher satisfaction being related to intrinsic factors (success in working with children, autonomy and independence whereas job dissatisfaction was associated with extrinsic factors such as poor pay and working conditions, particularly heavy workloads. Franken (1994) summarises the
findings here by stating that “people who enjoy high esteem ... (are) ... intrinsically motivated people who not only tend to be competent but have a positive attitude to themselves” (p. 433) and enjoy high job satisfaction.

According to Locke (1976; 1984), teacher job satisfaction is determined by whether the job delivers what the teacher believes the job should deliver. Dissatisfaction occurs when there is a discrepancy between what is expected and what is delivered. He argues that a teacher’s job satisfaction is determined, not by meeting the teacher’s base needs (e.g., pay) but by meeting the teacher’s perception that the job fulfils important values for them; “satisfaction results from value attainment” (Locke 1976, p. 1304). In a similar way, Weaver (1977) reported that a regression analysis on a representative sample of United States workers revealed that status (supervisor/non-supervisor) was the only factor that made an independent contribution to job satisfaction and that pay did not. Holdaway (1978) also identified that pay was not an important factor but that two features that were important for teachers’ job satisfaction were teaching conditions such as time schedules, class size and also status related items such as recognition by peers as professionals and freedom to make professional decisions. Holdaway (1978) also reported that lack of participation in decision-making was the greatest source of teachers’ dissatisfaction.

Ianni and Reuss-Ianni (1991) associated teacher burnout and loss of motivation to feelings of loss of self esteem ... when what was once a comprehensive professional family of educators ... became divided into management and workers. What was once a family is now a factory. Workers and bosses (were) pitted against one another. (p. 93)

Supporting this finding, Sakharov and Farber (1991) reported that overcoming burnout in teachers could be achieved by “the establishment of strong institutional support systems. Support systems can take several forms; for example, teachers’ unions” (p. 79) so that the sense of community engendered by unions improved the job satisfaction. Fibkins (1991) supported this finding and found that the collegial nature of schools meant that teachers formed support groups and ‘survival groups’ such as unions to help them through the day in challenging environments; “for teachers, ‘caring’ schools can be a nourishing, supportive environment that creates a sense of belonging and recognition of unique contributions” (p. 175). Locke (1976) adds further support in summing up the research finding on job satisfaction by stating that job satisfaction is enhanced by “agents in the workplace who help the employee to attain job values such as interesting work, pay and promotions, whose basic values are similar to his own” (p. 1328).
Schepers, DeGieter, Pepermans, Du Bois, Caer and Jegers (2005) writing in the not-for-profit sector of work state that

Teachers express a preference for working with and for people (for example, they enjoy working with pupils). Important motives for teaching are affiliation, altruism, and personal growth. Also, teachers experience student achievement as uniformly satisfying. Furthermore, the studies revealed that it is not high salary but professional efficacy that is very important to teachers, a conclusion in line with studies revealing differences in motivation between for-profit and non-profit employees. (p. 199)

In summary, Crowther (1994) writing in an Australian context states that “meaningful work is shaped, indeed formed, by those who perform it ... Such ideals are consistent with the needs-based theories of Maslow and other humanistic psychologists” (p. 64).

Other research on teacher motivators, as reported by Jiang (2005), has found that certain demographic factors consistently affect teachers’ job satisfaction. Older, female, primary teachers in private and metropolitan schools tend to have higher job satisfaction than younger (less than 40 years old), male, middle school (Years 5 to 8) teachers in public and rural schools. Additionally, he reports on research that found that teachers’ years of experience were positively correlated with intrinsic rewards conceptualised by the importance attached to ‘reaching students’. Consequently, any examination of the motivators of teachers needs to take into account these demographic components. The Exploratory Stage data, as detailed previously, highlighted that there were differences in the reasons given for joining the unions, particularly between older and younger teachers as well as between primary and secondary teachers.

In the Australian context, the defining work on teacher job satisfaction has been done by Dinham and Scott (1997; 1998; 2000) and their research found the same motivators that affected teachers generally also affected Australian teachers.

Respondents showed that they were most satisfied by matters ‘intrinsic’ to the role of teaching. Self growth and facilitating student achievement are clearly powerful sources of satisfaction ... The major sources of respondent dissatisfaction were matters more ‘extrinsic’ to the task of teaching pupils. The dissatisfiers were largely out of the control of teachers … the State Government, the employer. (Dinham & Scott, 1997, p. 43)

However they argue that, in Australia, teachers’ job satisfaction is being significantly lowered by external factors (government demands) that are largely out of their control (Dinham & Scott, 1998) and that models of teacher satisfaction have not taken sufficient notice of these external influences that significantly impact teacher job satisfaction (Dinham & Scott, 2000).
In summary, this first part of the pre-Inspection Stage literature review on the theory of human motivation has demonstrated that the character of teachers is different; specifically that the motivational factors that influence job satisfaction for teachers are not the same as for other workers. External factors to teaching can act as significant ‘dissatisfiers’ to teacher job satisfaction.

If VIEU’s leadership *modus operandi* is affected by the leadership’s recognition that teachers’ motivational needs are different and the leadership adjusted its recruitment strategies to meet those needs, then VIEU’s leadership is not treating teachers solely as dependent variables. VIEU’s leadership is being influenced or acted upon by teachers, thereby affording teachers an active role in determining union growth. This issue was examined in the Inspection Stage and, if it was shown to be true, then Shister’s model would be shown to be deficient in this situation by providing no active role for employees.

The second area for examination in this pre-Inspection Stage literature review was the role of the employer in influencing union growth.

6.4.2 The role of the employer and the active requirement imposed on the Catholic Church as an employer within the Church’s social teaching on the employment relationship

Shister’s model provides no active role for employers in determining union growth. They, like employees, are dependent variables worked on by the union leaders, the work environment and the sociolegal framework. However, as the Exploratory Stage data revealed, the members of VIEU employed by the Catholic Church have a different union density to those members not employed by the Catholic Church, suggesting that the employer of the members may influence the *modus operandi* of VIEU and that it is not VIEU’s *modus operandi* alone that has increased union density; otherwise, the union density of Catholic Church employees would be as high as non-Catholic Church employees.

In Chapter Three (setting the context for this research), there was outlined a history of the development of the Western Christian civilisation’s views on work and its purpose. It concluded by providing a brief summary of the Catholic Church’s view of work, demonstrating that it is radically different from the prevailing secular views on work and pointing out that this view has had a strong influence on its approach to trade unionism. In summary, the classical
Greco Roman view of work, something fit only for slaves, still influences people today (Lipset, 1990) as does the Hebrew (Old Testament) influence that it was a punishment or a curse (Rose, 1985) particularly through the social obligation imposed by the protestant work ethic (Lipset, 1990) as expressed in capitalism’s use of labour as a mere commodity (Henley, 1997). However, the opposite (New Testament) view that it is good and part of “God’s creative work” (May, 1994, p. 992), that there was dignity in work when contributed to God’s work was kept alive throughout the Church’s history by a series of influential writers such as St Augustine of Hippo, St John Chrysostom and St Thomas Aquinas (Gillett, 2003). The clash of these opposing views culminated when capitalism was born and work was given a mercenary or utilitarian value (Mackenzie, 2001) setting the scene for a separation between a world and Church view of work. It prompted Pope Leo XIII in 1891 to write his landmark encyclical on work, The Condition of Labour (Rerum Novarum) and return the Church’s view on work to a nobler and higher level; work exists for people, not people for work; “Workers are not to be treated as slaves; justice demands that the dignity of human personality be respected in them … It is shameful and inhuman …to use men as things for gain” (Pope Leo XIII, 1891/1960, n. 20).

Since Rerum Novarum (Pope Leo XIII, 1891/1960), this radically different view has been championed through further encyclicals, apostolic letters and Vatican II documents, particularly Quadragesimo Anno (Pope Pius XI, 1931/1960), Mater et Magistra (Pope John XXIII, 1961), Gaudium et Spes (Second Vatican Council, 1965), Populorum Progressio (Pope Paul VI, 1967), Octogesima Adveniens (Pope Paul VI, 1971), Laborem Exercens (Pope John Paul II, 1981), Sollicitudo Rei Socialis (Pope John Paul II, 1987) and Centisimus Annus (Pope John Paul II, 1991) as the Catholic Church continued to spell out its guiding principles to govern the employment relationship. Leo XIII’s view quoted above was re-expressed 90 years later by Pope John Paul II in his equally important encyclical on the subject of the purpose of work when he stated that “the basis for determining the value of work is not primarily the work being done but the fact that the one doing it is a person” (John Paul II, 1991, n. 6).

Furthermore, this view of work led the Church to social action as Mackenzie (2001) states; “this will not be a quietist view of Christian vocation that surrenders to the status quo, but one that will contest corruption and exploitation and work to name and resist what is evil and to transform bad circumstances” (p. 2). Given this, the question to be posed and answered was whether this call to action had been answered and, therefore, was there an active requirement imposed on the Catholic Church as an employer within the Church’s social teaching on the employment relationship, even when the Catholic Church itself was the employer! An employer in the Catholic Church would be required to take a different view to general employers on many
aspects of the employment relationship. The VCSA would have been required to adopt a
different stance to many employers in Australia during the period 1994 to 2004.

Throughout the Church’s social teaching, particularly the foundation encyclicals of
Exercens, the right to freedom of association has been defended and stated as a fundamental
right of employees

Workers’ associations ought to be so constituted and so governed as to furnish
the most suitable and most convenient means to obtain the object proposed …
that the individual members … secure, so far as is possible, an increase in the
goods of body, of soul, and of property. (Rerum Novarum, Pope Leo XIII,
(1891/1960), n. 53)

Pope Pius XI strengthened this call to action in Quadragesimo Anno by stating that
not only should employees be allowed to join unions, they should be encouraged to do so by
the Church

While readily recognising and patronising similar associations amongst other
classes, with criminal injustice they denied the innate right of forming
associations to those who needed them most for self-protection against
oppression by the most powerful. There were even Catholics who viewed with
suspicion the efforts of the workers to form such unions, as if they savoured of a
sort of socialist or revolutionary spirit. … they have a still higher distinction,
however; that of encouraging Christian working-men to form unions according
to their various trades, and of teaching them how to do it. (Quadragesimo Anno,
Pope Pius XI, (1931/1960), n. 30-31)

Pope John XXIII (1961), in Mater et Magistra, extended this call further by making
specific reference to the need for employers to be part of that solidarity themselves

22. Pope Leo XIII also defended the worker’s natural right to enter into
association with his fellows. Such associations may consist either of workers
alone or of workers and employers, and should be structured in a way best
calculated to safeguard the workers’ legitimate professional interest. And it is
the natural right of the workers to work without hindrance, freely, and on
their own initiative within these associations for the achievement of these
ends.

Human Solidarity and Christian Brotherhood

23. Finally, both workers and employers should regulate their mutual relations
in accordance with the principle of human solidarity and Christian brotherhood.
(Mater et Magistra, Pope John XXIII, (1961), n. 22-23)

Pope John Paul II (1981) states categorically in Laborem Exercens that a
fundamental right of a worker is “the right of association, that is to form associations for the
purposes of defending the vital interests of those employed in the various professions. These
associations are called labour or trade unions” (n. 20). There is no exception granted for
any employment relationship. All employers are called to respect the right of freedom of association. He goes on to state that this moral imperative falls on both the direct and the indirect employer of workers.

The concept of indirect employer includes both persons and institutions of various kinds, and also collective labour contracts and the principles of conduct which are laid down by these persons and institutions and which determine the whole socioeconomic system or are its result. The concept of "indirect employer" thus refers to many different elements. The responsibility of the indirect employer differs from that of the direct employer - the term itself indicates that the responsibility is less direct - but it remains a true responsibility: the indirect employer substantially determines one or other facet of the labour relationship, thus conditioning the conduct of the direct employer when the latter determines in concrete terms the actual work contract and labour relations. This is not to absolve the direct employer from his own responsibility, but only to draw attention to the whole network of influences that condition his conduct. When it is a question of establishing an ethically correct labour policy, all these influences must be kept in mind. A policy is correct when the objective rights of the worker are fully respected. (Laborem Exercens, Pope John Paul II, (1981), n. 17)

So that, whether the Catholic Church is the direct employer of workers or the indirect employer, the right of the workers to association in unions is to be respected.

The Church in Australia has taken up this universal call and has both adopted and adapted these social teachings to the Australian context (Australian Social Justice Council [ASJC], 1993). “The Catholic Church in Australia has a significant role in the national debate about the social, economic and political future of the Australian nation (O’Connor, 1992, p. xi), not in least because of its claim to employ “172,000 employees in health, aged care, education, social and/or welfare sectors” (ACCER, 1994, p. 1), making it the largest employer in Australia (Commonwealth of Australia, 2000).

In particular, the Australian Catholic Bishops Conference (ACBC) has issued a number of statements such as its pastoral letter, ‘The Year of the Social Teaching of the Church” (ACBC, 1991), and pastoral statement, “Common Wealth for the Common Good” (ACBC, 1992). In 1993, the ACBC’s Bishops’ Committee for Industrial Affairs (BCIA) focused in on the area of industrial relations within the general area of social teaching and published ‘Industrial Relations – The Guiding Principles’. The formation of the ACCER in 1994 by the ACBC provided an ongoing focus and means of expression for Australian Catholic thought on the area of employment. The ACCER made a number of submissions to the Australian Government and to AIRC such as its submission on Special family Leave (ACCER, 1994), on work and life balance (ACCER, 2004) and to National Wage Cases (ACCER, 1999; 2002b; 2003) where it argued to protect the interests of low paid workers.
The ACCER has also published statements such as ‘Ethical Principles for Church Personnel Administrators’ (ACCER, 1995), position papers on the reforms to workplace relations legislation (ACCER, 2005) and ‘The Catholic Church as an employer in Australia today’ (ACCER, 2002). This later document spells out the obligations expected on employers in the Australian Church context.

Given the right to freedom of association, Church employers should recognise that trade unions have a legitimate interest in representing their members (including) in the negotiation of enterprise agreements. Church employers should seek to establish a co-operative working relationship with trade unions ... (and) recognise its representatives and endeavour to consult and negotiate with them. ... Church employers should not use the law to render trade unions ineffective, so as to deprive them of their proper role in the protection of rights of their members. Where enterprise bargaining is to be undertaken by Church organisations, it should be conducted on a collective rather than on an individualistic basis. (ACCER, 2002, p. 8)

The VCSA took up this universal call and the directives of the ACBC as evidenced by the data from the Exploratory Stage with respect to not taking up the opportunities offered by AWAs and remaining, instead, committed to collective bargaining through the teachers designated association, VIEU. The VCSA’s constitution states that it “seeks to provide employers with an understanding of the principles that should govern employment within Catholic schools. These principles should be consistent with the social teaching of the Church” (VCSA, 1983b, p. 1). In practice, this is reflected in numerous expressions from its inception (Marriott, 1984), of a commitment to an agreement-based approach to industrial relations by negotiating with VIEU as the sole collective agent for staff in Victorian Catholic schools (VCSA, 1992d, 1993e, 1993f, 1994b, 1995b, 1996b, 1997a, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002a, 2002b, 2003, 2004b) and explicit support, not just for the right of staff to exercise their right to freedom of association and to take industrial action (VCSA, 1988, 1990, 1995), but of positive encouragement of staff to join VIEU (VCSA, 1993d). In 1992, Terry Synan, the then President of the VCSA, in a joint statement with Fr Tom Doyle, the then Executive Director of the CECV, wrote

Despite some of the rhetoric, over the years there has been a good working relationship between the CECV, VCSA, CEOs, VCPSA, SACSS and the PAVCSS. All share the same goal, namely the best possible provision and structures of Catholic education for students in our schools. We have encouraged union membership amongst staff and continue to believe that it is an option open to all staff members. (VCSA, 1992d, p. 4)

In summary, the data demonstrates that the universal Church, through its social teaching, did impose an active requirement on Church employers, both as direct and indirect employers, not only to honour the principle of freedom of association and to work with trade unions to reach
collective agreements rather than individual contracts but also to positively encourage association in appropriate trade unions. This active requirement was recognised by the Australian Church through the ACBC’s statements and acknowledged by the VCSA in its publications.

If VCSA’s leadership *modus operandi* was affected by the Catholic Church’s social teaching and this altered its approach to VIEU and teachers’ rights to associate, then the employer in this situation may be afforded an active role in determining union growth. This issue was examined in the Inspection Stage and, if it was shown to be true, then Shister’s model would be shown to be deficient in this situation by providing no active role for employers.

At this stage, it has been demonstrated that Shister’s model may not be adequate for the context in which VIEU operated. In particular, that fact that VIEU’s members were teachers and that the VCSA was the employer in the employment relationship could mean that these two factors may have influenced teachers’ decisions as to whether they should or should not associate with their union, VIEU. If the Inspection Stage provided evidence that these two factors were in play, then Shister’s model would be shown to be deficient in this situation by providing no active role for employees or employers. These two factors formed part of the basis for drafting the guiding questions for the subsequent Inspection Stage.

### 6.4.3 The relationship between the meaning of work for teachers and the Church’s social teaching on work

These two previous factors (teachers’ motivators and the Church’s social teaching on freedom of association) and the previous work on the meaning of work (Chapter Three) have some synchronicity. As outlined in the initial literature review:

- a worker’s understanding on the purpose of work will have an impact of their propensity to association in a union. If the worker believes a union will assist in fulfilling their purpose for work, then the propensity to associate in that union will be increased and vice versa

- as Ekins (1987) states, there have been various views on work and the purpose of work and these have changed over time. Schumacher (1979) summed up the three main reasons as to survive, to better oneself and to be part of one’s community

- the Catholic Church’s understanding on the purpose of work has, throughout time, consistently differed from the prevailing secular view. It has consistently
rejected the lower purpose for work (to survive) and advocated the higher purposes for work (to better oneself and to be part of one’s community).

The current literature review has revealed that

- what motivates teachers to work is different; specifically that the motivational factors that influence job satisfaction for teachers are not the same as for other workers. The lower purposes for work (to survive) motivate teachers less than the higher purposes for work (to better oneself and to be part of one’s community)

- the Catholic Church’s understanding on the purpose of work has, through its social teaching, imposes an active requirement on Church employers, to honour the principle of freedom of association and to work with trade unions so that workers can better themselves as part of a community.

Coalescing these thoughts, the fact that teachers seek a higher purpose for work and that this motivation to work is actively supported by the employer, would provide a powerful combination in the workplace.

6.4.4 A review of the development of contemporary understandings of leadership

This final section of this literature review on leadership arises because a unifying theme resulting from the coalescing of the eight factors from the Exploratory Stage was the leadership influence of VIEU as well as the VCSA. It examines the development of leadership theory that has led to the contemporary understanding of what constitutes ‘good leadership’.

1 Leadership in the early 20th century: the inherent characteristic of a person

The early attempts to understand leadership concentrated on focusing on the traits of a successful leader and resulted in the Scottish historian Thomas Carlyle’s ‘great man theory’ or ‘qualities approach’ (Adair, 1979). These theorists believed that leaders were born and not made. They set about attempting to isolate the leader’s required ‘inborn qualities’ and lists were generated which included personal characteristics such as initiative, courage, intelligence and humour. Taken together these personal characteristics were supposed to identify good leaders, if not predestine those with them to be leaders. However, as series of these lists were developed, doubts began to be expressed as to the validity of this trait approach because there was little correlation between the lists being generated. Mann (as cited by Hoy & Miskel, 1978, p. 177),

225
reviewed 125 trait characteristics that generated 750 unrelated qualities of leadership, forcing the realisation that leadership had to be seen as more than the characteristic of a person. Further, the ‘qualities approach’ in its purist form was abandoned because if leaders are born, then leadership is simply about selection with training having no value (Boydell, Burgoyne & Pedler, 2004).

2 Leadership in the 1950s and 1960s: the role of the group and the situation

In a simple variation change to the trait theory, Kelley (1967) developed the attribution theory. He proposed that followers bestowed upon or attributed leadership to one person in their group to simplify their perception of the group’s organisation. He posited that while members’ perceptions may have been wrong, it was comforting for them to have a leader in good times and in bad. This approach added to the understanding of leadership by introducing the dimension that leadership was not just an inherent but could also be an acquired characteristic.

In the 1950s, Hemphill and Coon (1957) developed the Leaders Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) that focused on what kinds of behaviour a leader actually engaged in. Halpin and Winer (1957) refined the LBDQ identifying their two fundamental dimensions of leader behaviour, ‘initiating structure’ (the leader’s behaviour in establishing defined roles between members to achieve the organisation’s goals) and ‘consideration’ (the leader’s concern for the members’ needs). They argued that effective leadership occurred when there was high initiating structure and high consideration or simultaneous concern for the organisation’s goals and members’ needs. This approach added to the understanding of leadership by introducing the dimension that leadership was not independent of its context. Other theorists such as Kunz and Hoy, Hersey and Blanchard (both as cited by Hoy & Miskel, 1978, and Tannebaum & Schmidt, 1973) respectively superimposed a ‘zone of acceptance’, the group’s maturity level and the leader/followers’ interactive processes on the LBDQ framework. These approaches gave wider recognition to the role of followers in accepting the pro-active position of leadership in organisations.

In a more significant departure from the trait approach, Stogdill (1974) introduced ‘situational theory’, arguing that persons who were leaders in one situation were not necessarily leaders in another. This view of leadership reflected ‘a need to be more precise about the effect of human factors on production’ (Owens, 1970, p. 9). In situational theory, leadership was not a task assigned to a person by right of their individual characteristics, real or perceived. It recognised that because leadership had to be exercised in a group, the group influenced the leadership style. However, the criticism of this approach was that the behaviour of the leader was dependent or reactive to the task and the group.
3 Leadership in the 1970s: a synthesis of the early theories

Fiedler (1971) produced the first significant synthesis of the personal characteristic and situational theories with his contingency theory based initially on his Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) model. He argued that the appropriate style for effective goal achievement was a function of three variables of leader-member relations, task structure and leader position power and, importantly, that one style of leadership cannot be effective all the time. He further argued that because effective leadership was contingent upon the leader’s style and the favourableness of the situation, the leader should be trained to change his or her style to suit; eg, a well supported leader should be task oriented whereas a less supported leader should be relationships oriented. He also argued that primary (relationship) goals needed to be satisfied before secondary (task) goals could be effectively pursued.

In a similar vein, House (1971) introduced his path-goal theory of leadership where the leader’s role was to motivate, reward, instil self-belief and clear the path toward the goal for the group members; i.e., the leader’s role was contingent on their followers’ needs. Vroom and Yetton’s (1973) contingency model was more optimistic than Fiedler’s regarding the leader’s ability to change his or her style and have a repertoire of styles. Working on a participatory model of leadership they defined a way for a leader to analyse a situation and then choose a level of participatory decision-making that would be the most effective for the situation. Significantly, Vroom’s expectancy model (as cited by Batchler, 1982, p. 136) claimed that the greatest motivation for staff occurred when the outcome that staff valued the most was the most expected or probable outcome. These contingency approaches added to the understanding of leadership by establishing a more interdependent relationship between the leader and the followers while still accepting that the leader had the more pro-active opportunity to determine the outcome given a proper analysis of the situation, particularly the characteristics and needs of the followers.

4 Leadership in the 1980s: going beyond technical competence

However, while Fiedler (1971) and Vroom and Yetton (1973) managed to integrate leadership theory up to their time, their work came under intense criticism in the 1980s for failing to have a critical vision of the future (Foster, 1986), for failure to take account of cultural values (Sergiovanni, 1984) and for being static and value free (Greenfield, 1984) and even for being too complicated and contingent to be helpful (Watkins, 1986). Fresh aspects to leadership emerged, based on these criticisms of contingency theory, especially for being pre-occupied with the attainment of group goals as a motive. Instead, the new theorists looked toward leadership providing, first and foremost, meaning, purpose and value for the individual in the organisation.
(Peters & Waterman, 1982; Peters & Austin, 1985) so that its rules and structures did not inhibit the self actualisation of individuals but, rather, emancipated them (Foster, 1986).

Sergiovanni (1984; 1990) argued for a hierarchy of forces, with three lower levels of technical, human and expertise leading only to competence in leadership (the level tackled by Fiedler and his predecessors). He argued that real effectiveness came from the leader’s ability to communicate the organisation’s values and purpose through an abstract level of symbol and myth making (culture). This line of thought was reflected in Burns’ (1978) earlier distinction between transactional leadership, concerned with pragmatic day-to-day administration (management) and transformational leadership, that concentrated on changing the end values and attitudes of followers.

These critical approaches of the 1980s took the concept of leadership beyond the pragmatic, highlighting the difference between effective management and effective leadership. The role of the leader’s personal characteristics was heightened because they needed to epitomise the ethos of the organisation. The importance of leadership style in terms of behaviour was also developed because the leader needed not only to have the vision but also to have the technical competence to communicate it. The leader’s role was a facilitator, working with and not on people. Leadership was referred to in this new genre of theory as transformational (Burns, 1978), charismatic (Conger & Kanungo, 1988), inspirational (Yukl & Van Fleet, 1982) or visionary (Manasse, 1985; Sashkin, 1988).

5 Leadership in the 1990s and early 21st century: empowering, distributed, ethical and authentic

Kouzes and Posner’s (1990) view on leadership sums up the position reached by the 1990s and set the launching pad for the development of theory beyond. They identified five key practices of leaders

- leaders challenge the process by searching for opportunities to create change
- leaders not only envision the future but also inspire others to share that vision
- leaders enable others to act by fostering collaboration and creating an atmosphere of trust and human dignity
- leaders model the way by living out their core values
- leaders encourage the heart by keeping hope and determination alive, recognising the contributions of others and celebrating accomplishments. “They make everyone feel like heroes” (Kouzes & Posner, 1990, pp. 279-280).
As Kouzes and Posner’s (1990) view on leadership illustrates, common to all the theories up until the 1990s was that leadership came from a key individual in the organisation, who set the agenda and then attempted to persuade and/or direct their followers to follow it. Stacey (1992) challenged this approach and argued that the emphasis on vision perpetuated a myth that organisations depend on a single, uncommonly talented individual. Moreover, he argued, such visionary based approaches created a culture of dependency and conformity among followers who were seen as having nothing to add to either the organisation’s vision or direction.

A new follower-inclusive approach emerged through such writers as Senge (1990) who argued for a ‘shared vision’ built co-operatively. The practice of shared vision involves the skills of unearthing shared ‘pictures of the future’ that foster genuine commitment and enrolment rather than compliance. In mastering this discipline, leaders learn the counter-productiveness of trying to dictate a vision, no matter how heartfelt. (p. 9)

Reinforcing this follower-inclusive approach, Spears (1995) revived Greenleaf’s (1977) servant leader approach: if one is to lead, one first must serve and, to serve, a leader must listen to the followers’ needs. Peters (1992) and Bennis (1998) advocated a collaborative leadership that empowered followers and, thereby, enhanced organisational effectiveness. On similar lines, Marquardt and Berger (2000) introduced the ‘Systems Thinkers’ leader; i.e., an empathetic, trusting leader who listens and is aware of themselves and others and who, most importantly, has a commitment to the growth of the people in the organisation and to building community. Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee (2002) argued for emotionally intelligent leaders who could create a resonance within the followers, allowing them to contribute to the organisation’s vision or direction.

Storey (2004) describes this current era as ‘post-transformational’ or ‘post-charismatic’ leadership as several writers began to challenge particularly the notion of charismatic leadership. Huey (1994) argued that it relied on a presumption and undesirable consequence that leaders made followers dependent. Khurana (2002) found that there was no conclusive evidence that charismatic leadership affected an organisation’s performance. Gibson, Hannon and Blackwell (1998) criticised such leadership because it could be in an ethical or unethical manner depending on the leader’s intent and ego and MacCoby (2000) added that it could even be manipulative and narcissistic. As the preoccupation with charismatic leadership began to wane, two separate lines of thought emerged. The first, and the least taken up, was an argument for the ‘pragmatic leader’. According to Mumford and Van Doorn (2001), pragmatic leaders were neither transformational or transactional but gained influence through an intimate understanding of the organisation that led them to be practical problem solvers; their support came from their capacity
to find solutions. The second, and more influential strand, argued for transparent, moral and ethical leadership as exemplified by Fullan’s (2001) statement that “leaders who combine a commitment to moral purpose with a healthy respect for the complexities of the change process not only will be more successful but also will unearth deeper moral purpose” (p. 5). Manz and Sims (1991) had earlier challenged the underpinning premise of transformational and charismatic leadership where one person did something to others, arguing instead that “the most appropriate leader is one who can lead others to lead themselves” (p. 18). They argued that leaders became great by unleashing the potential and abilities of their followers, thereby harnessing the collective wisdom of many people instead of relying solely on their own wisdom and acumen.

Brown and Giaio (2002) and George (2003) built on this approach. Brown and Giaio (2002) introduced the notion of ‘distributed leadership’ where leaders and followers share in the process of leadership, arguing that e-commerce’s speed, ambiguity and complexity has forced multiple decision-making at all levels, resulting in an organisational structure where individuals at all levels, including those in non-management roles, can exert leadership influence over their organisational colleagues and, thereby, influence the direction of the organisation. Similarly, Tichy (1997) at an earlier date had argued for a ‘Leadership Engine’, or system, for creating dynamic leaders at every level.

George (2003) introduced the concept of authentic leadership, stating that authentic leaders operated from a core set of ethical values and genuinely sought to serve and empower people in their organisation. He argued that such leaders were guided by the heart (passion and compassion) as well as by the mind. Hunter (2004), Starratt (2006) and Duignan (2006) all support this view adding that the authentic leader paradigm fits well with the Catholic paradigm.

These ‘post-transformational’ or ‘post-charismatic’ approaches did not argue that visionary or charismatic leadership (i.e., leadership beyond technical competence) were not important or indeed relevant to what constitutes ‘good leadership’ but, rather, that such leadership, while required for ‘good leadership’, needed to be grounded in a moral and ethical consideration centred on the good of the people in the organisation. These approaches gave a genuinely equal and not a dependent or even an unequal interdependent role to all people in the organisation.

All of the approaches reviewed, from the early pre-occupation with individual characteristics, through to the theories that grappled with balancing task and people in the organisation, to the new critical, value driven and follower-inclusive approaches, have added to the contemporary understanding of what constitutes ‘good leadership’.
6.5 FRAMING THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR THE INSPECTION STAGE

6.5.1 The factors for further investigation

As stated in the introduction to this chapter, the data from the three phases of the Exploratory Stage revealed eight contextually unique factors warranting further investigation and suggested that these eight factors could be coalesced into two leading themes, namely leadership influence and the mindset of teachers.

The first of these factors was leadership influence on teachers. This leadership influence encompassed the *modus operandi* of both VIEU and the VCSA.

1. VIEU leadership’s *modus operandi*. This factor was examined firstly in terms of its awareness of the Catholic Church’s social teaching and its effect on its approach to industrial relations and secondly for its awareness of the mindset of teachers (linked to its foundations as a professional association) and its effect on its approach to industrial relations (e.g., use of democratic structures, recruitment strategies, etc.).

2. VCSA’s leadership *modus operandi*. This factor was examined for its awareness of the Catholic Church’s social teaching and for its effect on its approach to industrial relations (e.g., the maintenance of VIEU’s role as the sole bargaining agent in EBAs).

The second factor was the different mindset of teachers vis-à-vis other workers. This examination encompassed those factors that motivate teachers as a profession and whether these motivators translate across to their approach to industrial relations, in particular why teachers choose to associate in their union.

The resultant guiding questions and sub questions follow.
6.5.2 Inspection Stage Guiding Question 1

1 Have the leaders of the employee and employer groups consciously or unconsciously put in place practices and strategies that support union membership that are outside of the typical approach of unions and/or employers?

The sub questions for this guiding question were
  • are the leadership groups aware of the Church’s social teaching in the area of work and freedom of association and, if so, has this influenced their approach to trade unionism?
  • has the fact that VIEU started out as a professional association of teachers, rather than as a union, had any lasting impact on it as a union?
  • has the union leadership put in place strategies and practices that have attempted to recognise and respond to its unique context?

6.5.3 Inspection Stage Guiding Question 2

2 Are the motivators for teachers different to the general population and, if so, how has this affected their decision to associate or not to associate with VIEU?

The sub questions for this guiding question were
  • are the motivators for teachers those that address higher order needs rather than lower order needs?
  • if so, are these higher order needs associated with long term members of VIEU rather than more recently joined members of VIEU?
  • is the union leadership aware of these motivators and has the union leadership put in place strategies and practices that have attempted to meet these motivators?
Chapter 7  Inspection Stage

7.1  INTRODUCTION

This chapter reports on the eighth, ninth and tenth steps of the learning journey. It displays the data gathered from the two phases (Steps 8 and 9) of this Inspection Stage of the research and then reflects back on an anomaly in the data collected to date.

In Chapter Six the eight factors that emerged in the Exploratory Stage as possible explanations of VIEU’s union density were coalesced into two themes: first, the influence of leadership, and second, the different mindset of teachers vis-à-vis other workers. This Inspection Stage examines those two themes in depth

1.  Step 8 (Phase 1), examines the role of the leadership groups of VIEU and the VCSA and presents data from the focus group interviews with these two leadership groups

2.  Step 9 (Phase 2) examines the issue of the motivational factors for teachers and presents the data revealed by the follow up survey conducted with teachers, further focus group data and document research data.

Finally, the anomalous dip that occurred in VIEU’s non-Catholic (independent) school and Catholic school non-teacher membership between 1997 and 2000 is examined (Phase 3). While the membership and union density of teachers in Catholic schools consistently rose over the period 1994 to 2004, these two groups’ membership declined over similarly short periods.

7.2  DEFINING THE FOCUS OF THE INSPECTION STAGE

The main research question was

what factors have contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union?

A guiding question was framed for each of the three sections to this Inspection Stage of the research. For each guiding question, a set of sub questions was framed in the light of the data revealed in the Exploratory Stage to focus the enquiry.
7.2.1 **Inspection Stage Phase 1 Guiding Question**

1 Have the leaders of the employee and employer groups consciously or unconsciously put in place practices and strategies that support union membership that are outside of the typical approach of unions and/or employers?

The sub questions for this guiding question were

- are the leadership groups aware of the Church’s social teaching in the area of work and freedom of association and, if so, has this influenced their approach to trade unionism?
- has the fact that VIEU started out as a professional association of teachers, rather than as a union, had any lasting impact on it as a union?
- has the union leadership put in place strategies and practices that have attempted to recognise and respond to its unique context?

7.2.2 **Inspection Stage Phase 2 Guiding Question**

2 Are the motivators for teachers different to the general population and, if so, how has this affected their decision to associate or not to associate with VIEU?

The sub questions for this guiding question were

- are the motivators for teachers those that address higher order needs rather than lower order needs?
- if so, are these higher order needs associated with long term members of VIEU rather than more recently joined members of VIEU?
- is the union leadership aware of these motivators and has the union leadership put in place strategies and practices that have attempted to meet these motivators?

7.2.3 **Inspection Stage Phase 3 Guiding Question**

3 What evidence, consistent with the existing data, can explain the dip that occurred in VIEU’s non-Catholic (independent) school and Catholic school non-teacher membership between 1997 and 2000?
7.3 INSPECTION STAGE PHASE 1 (STEP 8)

Guiding Question.

Have the leaders of the employee and employer groups consciously or unconsciously put in place practices and strategies that support union membership that are outside the typical approach of unions and/or employers?

Two focus group interviews were conducted, one with the leadership group of VIEU and one with the leadership group of the VCSA. Participants’ individual responses were recorded. On occasions the members of the two leadership groups came to a consensus on an issue but a consensus was not sought. Where in the reported data that follows a statement, it is not attributed to one of the participants, this indicates that there was general agreement on that point at the end of discussion of that issue. Conversely, attributed statements indicate that one or more of the participants held that view but that there was no general agreement on the point.

7.3.1 VIEU focus group

VIEU leadership’s awareness of the Church’s social teaching and its influence on their approach to trade unionism

The three VIEU Secretaries interviewed had a strong understanding of the Catholic Church’s social teaching on the area of work and, in particular, freedom of association as it pertained to trade unions. All participants indicated they were aware of the Church’s social teaching in the area of work and freedom of association and elaborated that

- the Church taught about the dignity of work. “Labour” should not be regarded as an item of “capital” for use by the employer
- employees had a right to belong to a union. The Catholic Church supported the right to freedom of association, in particular in the employment relationship, to freely join unions
- employees had the right to collectively bargain with their employer and be represented in the bargaining process by unions
- employees had the right to take industrial action against the employer, including the right to strike.

Participants mentioned that the Church’s social teaching aligned to the concept of a ‘living wage’ (the minimum wage for an unskilled worker to provide food, shelter and clothing for his family) established early in the Australian industrial relations system in the 1907
Harvester Case. The Church supported employees receiving wages that were both fair and reasonable to sustain a family.

It was noted that VIEU’s research officer in the 1990s, had published a booklet on the ‘Social Teaching of the Catholic Church’, with particular emphasis on the role of trade unions; this was during Michael Flinn’s time as Secretary. This booklet was still used as part of their training of central office organisers as well as school based delegates. The participants were also asked whether the fact that the Catholic Church was the employer had influenced the way they had conducted employment relations with the employer. The unanimous response from participants was “absolutely!”

Flinn commented that VIEU had used the Church’s social teaching as a “tool” in the way that VIEU positioned themselves as a group, particularly in Primary schools where there was initially more resistance to joining unions. He commented that the line taken was that being a member of the union was “not antithetical to their commitment and involvement in their Parish school and the Church”. This was always emphasised at a time of industrial action so that the action was not seen as “anti-Church”.

Participants added that in certain individual workplace disputes, “where the employer might have been on sound legal ground, you could pull them into line with the help of the employer”. The example cited was when an employer took a strictly legal view on the return to work rights from parental leave for a teacher; employers could be persuaded on Church / pastoral care lines that a softer approach should be taken. Pastoral care was “a big weapon; ‘You call yourself a Catholic school?’”

Participants were also asked whether their approach to Catholic school employers differed to independent school employers? The response was “yes” because it was about “respecting - understanding the culture of the workplace”. However, it was stated that not only were Catholic and non-Catholic schools different and, therefore, needed to be treated and approached differently, so were secondary and primary schools and also metropolitan and country schools. Participants agreed that no single template should be used in approaching schools if the best results for membership were to be achieved.

The participants added that even within Catholic schools there needed to be different approaches. Participants indicated that certain Religious Order schools needed to be approached differently. Examples given were
• the Brigidine schools who were considering “splitting off” from the other employers during the 1997 industrial action. By fostering collaboration with this employer in these times, it applied pressure to other schools
• LaSallian schools had strong LaSallian values and these needed to be understood and respected if the union was not to inadvertently put members off
• VIEU took a different approach in Lutheran, fundamental Christian and Jewish schools because of their different cultures
• Certain wealthy Catholic schools were willing to solve industrial issues “by the use of cheque books” in order to avoid poor publicity.

All participants agreed that “colluding with the myth of who was the employer” was important, especially when the Parish Priest was the real employer at law but the Catholic Education Office (CEO) had to be dealt with to resolve disputes and reach agreements; “while at times it frustrated us, at other times it suited us”. There was agreement that, while the CEO had “no rights as an employer” because it had no employment function in schools, pragmatically, VIEU still needed to deal with the CEO as well as the VCSA.

In summary, the data revealed that VIEU’s leadership was aware of the Church’s social teaching in the area of work and freedom of association and had consciously used it in their approach to industrial relations.

2 The fact that VIEU started out as a professional association of teachers rather than as a union and whether this has had any lasting impact on VIEU as a union

It was strongly stated by all participants that this was not the case. Their strong view was that VIEU had always been a union, as had their predecessors such as the Assistant Mistresses’ Association of Victoria (AMAV). Their collective view was that ‘professional associations’ did three things; they set the standards for the profession, controlled the entry of new members to the profession and influenced the pre-service courses and requirements. None of these functions were, or ever had been, a role of VIEU or its predecessors. Again, they cited research (Spence, 1997) on the establishment of the first Girls’ School Award to support their contention that their earliest predecessors had always been involved in establishing industrially determined wages and conditions. Simply because the VCPTA/VCPSA and ATVCSS/SACSS called themselves “associations rather than unions, didn’t define their function.”
However, it was acknowledged that because these precursor associations’ members were teachers, this had affected and still did affect their (VIEU’s) method of operation. The “collegial nature of the profession of teaching” meant that teachers liked “collegiality and working together because it was a natural part of the job”. VIEU’s leadership noted the point that teachers were used to coming together to make decisions on work matters (e.g., faculty meetings, staff meetings) and “this natural propensity could be used to facilitate them coming together to ‘unionise’”.

The fact that they were teachers is a fundamental key to the whole discussion because the collegial nature of the profession of teaching has so many synergies with what it means to be a union that it helps drive the entire process of forming a union.

This “collegiality establish(ed) the culture of the workplace and it was necessary to tap into the psyche of teachers”. As a result, the participants stated that VIEU offered professional development courses, conferences and professional indemnity insurance as part of VIEU’s membership package because these issues were important to teachers and VIEU needed to be seen to be responsive to teachers’ needs.

The participants noted that an important indicator of this approach was the importance of “consultative committees” in schools; they were an indication to teachers that, as teachers, they had a say in influencing and establishing work standards in the school and that this say was as a result of the union’s action to establish them and to maintain them. Consultative committees were created by us in a way that’s almost irresistible because it fits inside the compelling collegial beliefs of teachers … I don’t think we should underestimate the way in which that as a strategy tapped into the psyche of teachers and their belief that they should control what goes on inside their workplace.

The participants also noted that what our members have is… a common employer … at least they all work in the same place and for the same person and they are all in a fenced up area. You can find our members; they’re in large locations, in groups … and they have identifiable breaks, so they are easy to talk to. If we were just organising School Officers (non-teachers) it would be very hard for us because it would be difficult to talk to them because they do not have common lunch times, they don’t have breaks as such. We’ve got no right to, other than by negotiation, to go into a school and meet with the clerical staff (School Officers), they are technically stopping work to do that but we can easily go and hold a meeting of teachers at four ‘o’ clock … Work in schools is different. Schools are probably the most least flexible workplaces in the modern world in the sense that they have defined finishing and start times, they break for lunch, they break for morning tea, you can’t think of many places that still work like that … and its very hard if we phone an employer and say that we want to visit after school, it’s very hard for the Principal to say ‘no, there’s work allocated.”
The participants also pointed out that the very collegial nature of teachers, however, also “showed up in the tension between the teaching and non-teaching members of the union” and, as a union, they were aware that this issue needed to be handled sensitively.

In summary, the data revealed that VIEU’s leadership, while maintaining that VIEU was a genuine union from the outset, acknowledged the fact that because VIEU was dealing with teachers as their members, this had influenced the way they operated as a union.

3 VIEU leadership’s modus operandi and whether it has consciously put in place strategies and practices that have attempted to recognise and respond to its unique context (e.g., democratic structures in its operations)

A general comment was that VIEU was a “mainstream union” and they were “not sure that they should operate differently”. However, there was agreement that, as a union, VIEU did operate differently and it came “from the sector they work(ed) in”. Participants agreed that to be effective in the education industry (“the profession wouldn’t tolerate much else”), they needed to ensure that they “were able to, and needed to, build a participative and democratic structure”. Participants noted that

- VIEU had always had democratic structures since the formation of VIEU in 1994 and that, on occasions, this had caused them some difficulty. They cited the following examples to illustrate their point

  o “Other unions talk about it” (i.e., democracy as a significant factor that needs to be introduced into Australian union structures) as witnessed by the ACTU (1999) report Unions @ work but VIEU did it mainly because “one of the significant benefits that VIEU (had was) that it got to create itself almost from nothing in a structural sense in the early 1990s”, therefore, there was nothing to undo. The participants commented that there was a need to record and monitor that members were having a say and that it was acknowledged and promoted that members had access to having a say in union management decisions; “We measure all of that. We measure over time, the number of participants, the rate of participation, the Council, the delegates, we check off whether reps had been trained”

  o It was believed that not being affiliated to the ALP was a factor in assisting democratic structures. They commented that
if we have an election, our election is about the performance of us as union officials, it’s not about getting votes on the floor of the ALP Conference and that does provide us with a fair bit of stability. Some of the other unions have been really destabilised because of their links to the ALP

and further noted that some unions had lost opportunities to implement agendas because their leadership groups had changed regularly and the change in approach was significant depending on which faction won the election

o It was stated that VIEU’s policy was, and always had been, that members would always be given direct access to the Secretary; “if a member phoned and demanded or wanted to speak to the Secretary they would never be told ‘no’. You might not be able to get back to them that day but direct access to the Secretary by any member with a comment or complaint was an important principle”

• VIEU had always had participative structures. Examples cited by the participants to illustrate this point were

  o that they, as leaders, were receptive to any issues in schools so that if an issue arose unexpectedly from members they would address it. The examples given were the oral CAT in English and the ‘A-B-C’ federal government reporting requirements. Neither of these were seen as an issue for the union (“we tried to ignore it”) but “members demanded that the union do something about it”. Similarly with the LAP tests in primary schools, where VIEU’s Secretary at the time stated that “members overwhelmingly forced us to take the stance we did” even though “I thought that it (LAP tests) was a good idea … but got my head beaten in … because … the members decided that this is something we’re not going to cop”

  o that there was always a delegate in each workplace: “(VIEU) would probably be one of the few unions that can claim to have a workplace delegate in every workplace” and that those delegates were trained and in close contact with central office organisers

• VIEU had always used technology to assist them. The participants noted that

  o there was an up-to-date database of members and workplaces. The details of the workplace were recorded so that access to members was facilitated. “In the mid 1990s we were able to accurately tell you the name of every
person in every workplace. We could tell you the time when morning tea was, the time lunch was, when the time the workplace was last visited”

- members’ contacts were recorded (the issue) so there was a history of each member’s contact; “We recorded every phone call that a member made into the office and every dispute and that became a really powerful tool for how we organised and conducted ourselves”. This contact history was passed on to the central office official who was taking the current call so that the official knew the history; “So it’s really easy when you talk to a member to see their history … call it up on the screen and see that this person actually rang about the same thing, this, this and this time”

- fax streaming schools was another example of VIEU being the first to take advantage of the technology to service members. The participants noted that the employers were slower off the mark with this technology and that gave VIEU an edge for a while in efficiently communicating with schools.

All participants agreed that these factors had influenced VIEU’s recruitment/retention campaigns. Recruitment strategies mainly focused on

- effective “industry campaigning” from an early date to stop “union busting. If you can destroy the centrality of the award, you can destroy the capacity to bargain at an industry level”. The participants noted that
  - the way the employers chose to centralise made it easier for VIEU to ensure that the pay and conditions for all their members were kept together (in Catholic schools)
  - this was not possible in ‘independent’ schools. The AISV took up the option to destroy the centrality of awards but the VCSA did not pursue this line

- the use of delegates in schools to approach potential members

- the use of delegates to track the mobile teaching force

the internal mechanisms that VIEU uses are absolutely unique … VIEU does three things at the end of every year that are unique. Every one of the delegates gets a list saying ‘here’s all the members. If they’re moving tell us where they’re going to’. Every single member gets a change of details form and in February of the following year another letter is sent out to everyone saying ‘here’s a list of all the people who we think are now in your workplace. If we’ve got people missing, fill it in and send it back to us.

This approach was a recognition that VIEU worked in an industry with 500+ worksites. It was a specific retention practice to meet that issue (”most people
just drop off because they’re slack”) so that members were not lost due to their high mobility rates

- the development of the ‘non-member policy’ was an example of a recruitment policy. Participants noted that this policy was introduced so that teachers couldn’t join when they had an existing problem. A teacher who “joins with a problem sucks up resources … you haven’t unionised them. All you have done is join a member up for a given period of time” and they would most likely leave soon after the problem was solved. The policy ensured that teachers realised that they needed to be a member as a form of insurance and not try to take out the policy when the damage was already done. It ensured some solidarity amongst staff members.

  It took eighteen months of consultation in the schools so there was lots of discussion and debate in the schools about what level of service we would provide, if any, to a non-member … the members in schools toughened it up … people (now) know that they cannot join us with a problem.

- the use of technology was mainly used to retain members
  - there was a “call up” when any individual membership lapsed
  - when a member resigned the reason was recorded. Outside agencies were used to follow up members who resigned so that more honest feedback on their reasons for leaving was obtained

- consultation with members on what were the current issues in schools and then encouraging non-members to join to “have a say” on the agenda. “Part of it is a communication out through reps to non-members that if you are not a member you are not going to have a say … and you won’t have a say in the process of negotiations” for new pay and conditions in the enterprise bargaining process.

The participants responded, when asked what they believed were the main factors for the growth in union density, that as a union they

- were in touch with the needs of their members because they listened and had a practice of using organisers who came from the industry (former teachers) and not professional industrial officers who had no knowledge of the industry in which they were working. There was a commitment to listening to members and “hearing the voice of members and reflecting it”

- had a history of being an effective union; that “had delivered the results to members”, in part because they had taken a pragmatic approach to strategic negotiations. They “didn’t take high ambits and settle for something a lot
short’, a practice they believed would have tended to have members lose faith in the genuineness and/or ability of the union to effect results.

In summary, the data revealed that VIEU’s leadership had consciously put into place strategies (particularly democratic and participative structures as well as using cutting edge technology) to grow its union membership. The VIEU leadership group was aware that their modus operandi was viewed as outside of the typical approach of unions.

7.3.2 VCSA focus group

1 VCSA leadership’s awareness of the Church’s social teaching in the area of work and freedom of association and its influence on their approach to trade unionism

The three VCSA Presidents interviewed had a strong understanding of the Catholic Church’s social teaching on the area of work and, in particular, freedom of association as it pertained to trade unions. All participants indicated they were of aware of the Church’s social teaching in the area of work and freedom of association. When asked what that social teaching was, the response was that the Church taught that employees had certain inalienable rights, including

- the right to participate in the employment relationship and “the right to be involved in discussions, to talk about what they see as important in the industrial area and to be listened to”
- the right to associate and form unions
- the right to collectively bargain and be represented in the bargaining process by unions and to “have a say in management”
- the right to take industrial action, including the right to strike (withdraw their labour) but only as a last resort.

The participants stated that the VCSA’s vision of Church was based on a community model and assumed that the members of the community would work collaboratively together. Employers should not assume “a conflict situation” exists and then work out strategies based on conflict resolution. Instead, the participants stated that they were committed to a view that we’re working together, that we are a community of people, that we are working out of a vision of the Church and that our preferred position is not a position of conflict or a position of opposition but of working together for the best solutions where the employers worked on a collective bargain with the union representing the employees.
It was noted that this approach should be, and had been, adopted despite the prevailing industrial relations scene. The example cited was 1997 ("the peak of the confrontational approach") when the employers regarded it was important "to continue to dialogue with the union" despite being under considerable industrial relations duress and "try and keep the door open".

All participants agreed that the Church’s social teaching had influenced the way the VCSA had conducted its employment relations with VIEU. When asked in what ways, the responses were that

- as employers they “had always tried to keep the doors open with the union. There was never a question of not negotiating with them” as the union that represented employees “even though it became extraordinarily difficult at some times”. This was most sorely tested in 1997, “a difficult year” where the leadership of VIEU was under Flinn as VIEU Secretary

  one of the factors that caused our major conflict was the leadership of the union at that particular time which was a fairly aggressive form of leadership. We were informed before we had our major industrial disputation that they were going to go ‘hell for leather’; they gave us warning of that.

- there was a belief the years from 1997 and the years thereafter under Flinn were “an aberration”

  it was noted that in earlier years under Flinn, when the Victorian Premier Jeff Kennett abolished the IRCV, there was a co-operative, “working together” approach. The two instances cited were

  - in 1993 and the moving of staff conditions across to a new federal AIRC Certified Agreement, a decision that the VCSA would have preferred not to make at the time … but we accepted the inevitable … and there was a lot of working through what both the union and ourselves would do, a lot of working together in that as to how we would approach the new situation.

  - in 1996 when significant IR changes were introduced through the Workplace Relations Act (1996) and the VCSA took the approach that AWAs were not appropriate;

    the federal government expressed a preference to going to AWAs which in effect lessened the power of the unions in the sense to negotiate. The VCSA was always faithful to the model that it wasn’t prepared to go down the track of AWAs but that it would rather have dealt with the union … it came
out of a conscious belief that (it was) the appropriate way to go rather than have employees try and negotiate conditions on their own. It respected that collective right.

Participants noted that it was only the period from 1997 onwards that Flinn’s leadership was “more aggressive”

- there was a belief that Tony Keenan and Deb James had taken more of “a non-confrontational approach” and that they took “a bigger picture” approach and “any industrial action … was extremely mild” compared with 1997. They brought “a level of sanity” to the approach, whereas Flinn’s leadership was more “erratic” and “grandstanding” in approach.

The participants stated that the VCSA had explicitly “rejected the AWA approach” introduced by the federal Workplace Relations Act (1996) and had preferred “collective bargaining” as an approach. The approach was “working together rather than in opposition” and it recognised the fact that employees could choose to be collectively represented and choose who their collective representative would be.

Terry Synan made particular note of the fact that the VCSA in its early days had been guided by Treston’s (1983; 1987) work that drew a distinction between “a vocational model and an industrial model for workplace relations”. The concept of vocation involved a sense of calling, an “empowering” approach rather than an “overpowering” approach; a view aligned to the belief that teaching was about making a difference, about a sense of purpose. Synan emphasised that the vocational model moved staff members beyond doing a job merely for wages.

In summary, the data revealed that the leaders of the VCSA were aware of the Catholic Church’s social teaching on trade unions and that they had made a conscious decision to follow this teaching and that this influenced their approach to trade unionism.

2 The fact that VIEU started out as a professional association of teachers rather than as a union and whether this has had any lasting impact on VIEU as a union

All participants agreed that this factor had had an effect on the *modus operandi* of VIEU. When asked in what way, the reasons given included that

- VIEU was a white collar or professionals’ union and, therefore, they provided services such as training and professional development for members on issues
such as occupational health and safety and discrimination issues. It was felt that this approach harked back to the early days, to VIEU’s predecessors; that their beginnings as professional associations had continued to influence them when VIEU became a mainstream union. By way of example, reference was made by Synan to Fr Norm Ford’s (1986) booklet on ‘Professional Responsibilities and Private Lives of Teachers in Catholic Schools’. He noted that it was significant that it was a joint publication sponsored by both the VCSA and the VCPSA and that the booklet raised ethical issues that were supported by the employer and employee associations of the time

- it was felt that VIEU still “crosses the boundary between a professional association and the union”. The participants noted that they believed that teachers saw membership of VIEU as “part of their professionalism”
- it was also felt that this blurring of the distinction could soon begin to change with the establishment of the Victorian Institute of Teaching (VIT) and, therefore, VIEU would lose some of this professional representative function and become more purely industrial in its representation
- teachers still saw schools working for and within the Church with a concomitant commitment to working towards “consensus and working with authorities”. For teachers, there was still a tone of “how we can work together to advance Catholic education” and that VIEU had an appreciation that this “big picture view” needed to be acknowledged in the way it dealt with its members.

In conclusion, when asked “what factors do you believe have contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union”, all participants agreed on the three following reasons

1 the structure of Catholic education with its many employers (including the “disparateness” and “whimsical nature” of some) meant that it was in the interests of VIEU to work with the VCSA. For VIEU not to have worked with the VCSA would have meant dealing with hundreds of employers with little chance of bringing uniformity of wages and conditions to its members

2 that the VCSA always encouraged unionism among staff members because of the Catholic Church’s social teaching, even during difficult times. The 11 December 1992 VCSA Bulletin (VCSA, 1992d) was cited to demonstrate this point: “We have encouraged union membership amongst staff and continue to believe that it is an option open to all staff members”
3 VIEU had been an effective union in terms of “outcomes delivered” even though employers may “not have argued with those outcomes”. All agreed that VIEU had delivered parity of wages and consistently improved working conditions to its members over a number of years.

In summary, the data revealed that the VCSA leadership group corroborated the VIEU leadership group’s contention that the fact that VIEU was dealing with teachers as their members had influenced the way that VIEU operated as a union.

7.3.3 Summary

The data collected in this Inspection Stage Phase 1 through the two focus group interviews effectively answered the first guiding question and its three sub questions

- the leaders of VIEU
  - were aware of the Catholic Church’s social teaching and had consciously used it in their approach to industrial relations
  - while maintaining that VIEU was a genuine union from the outset, acknowledged the fact that because VIEU was dealing with teachers as their members, this had influenced the way they operated as a union
  - had consciously put into place strategies (particularly democratic and participative structures as well as using cutting edge technology) to grow its union membership. The VIEU leadership group was aware that their *modus operandi* was atypical of unions

- the leaders of the VCSA were aware of the Catholic Church’s social teaching on trade unions. The VCSA leadership group had made a conscious decision to follow this teaching and this influenced their approach to trade unionism. They corroborated the VIEU leadership group’s contention that the fact that VIEU was dealing with teachers as their members had influenced the way that VIEU operated as a union.
7.4 INSPECTION STAGE PHASE 2 (STEP 9)

7.4.1 Introduction

The data from the third phase of the Exploratory Stage demonstrated that

- there was a discernable hierarchy of reasons given by teachers for joining VIEU and that this hierarchy was different to the general trade union population. In Victorian Catholic schools, option F (solidarity with teachers in school/system) outranked all the other reasons given by the general trade union population.
- the most demographic divergent groups on this issue of solidarity were those respondents with 10 or more years of experience in VIEU (who were more likely to choose solidarity as a reason) as compared with those with 9 or less years of experience (who were less likely to choose solidarity as a reason), albeit that both of these demographic groups rated solidarity highly.

In addition, the pre-Inspection Stage literature review revealed that teachers are motivated more by higher order needs (intrinsic rewards) rather than lower order needs (extrinsic rewards).

The guiding question for this second phase of the Inspection Stage was

Are the motivators for teachers different to the general population and, if so, how has this affected their decision to associate or not to associate with VIEU?

The sub questions for this guiding question were

- are the motivators for teachers those that address higher order needs rather than lower order needs?
- if so, are these higher order needs associated with long term members of VIEU rather than more recently joined members of VIEU?
- is the union leadership aware of these motivators and has the union leadership put in place strategies and practices that have attempted to meet these motivators?

Sub questions 1 and 2 were investigated by distributing an email survey to the 145 respondents who provided an email address as their contact method when answering the final
question on the initial survey (part of the third phase of the Exploratory Stage) that asked if they were willing to participate in a follow up exercise.

The survey listed four statements. Those statements were as follows

- Statement 1 concerning the issue of collaboration (safety and security)
  “Preferably, VIEU should work collaboratively with the employers to progress matters and avoid adversarial approaches whenever possible”

- Statement 2 concerning the issue of participative access (belongingness)
  “Being part of the union gives me a say in issues (educational and industrial) at both the school level and at the system level”

- Statement 3 concerning the issue of democratic processes (esteem and recognition needs)
  “It is important to me that VIEU listens to my point of view and is willing to change its policies as a result”

- Statement 4 concerning the issue of solidarity (self actualisation need)
  “It is important to me that VIEU has a ‘big picture’ view and addresses broad social justice issues (e.g., the common good to foster a more inclusive and just society) and not just address industrial relations issues”.

Each of the four statements expressed a different aspect of the higher order needs that were raised in the Exploratory Stage, namely

- collaboration
- participation
- democratic structures and
- solidarity

which were confirmed in the pre-Inspection Stage literature review as factors that motivated teachers.

The statements were constructed to produce a hierarchy based on the motivational needs of teachers, as revealed in the pre-Inspection Stage literature review with

- Statements 1 (security in collaboration rather than conflict) and 2 (belongingness through participation) reflecting the lower order needs, and
- Statements 3 (esteem and recognition through decision making) and 4 (solidarity through self actualisation) reflecting the higher order needs.
Sub question 3 was investigated by putting two questions to VIEU’s leadership as part of their focus group interview. For comparative purposes the same two questions were put to the VCSA’s leadership group as part of their focus group interview.

7.4.2 Sub question 1. Are the motivators for teachers those that address higher order needs rather than lower order needs?

77 of the 145 respondents who were emailed (53.1%) responded to the follow up survey.

Respondents were asked to select one of the six options, as follows,

A: Strongly disagree    B: Broadly disagree    C: Somewhat disagree
D: Somewhat agree       E: Broadly agree       F: Strongly agree

for each of the four statements.

The overall answers to the six options for each of the four statements revealed a strong level of support for the ‘agree statements’, particularly the Broadly Agree and the Strongly Agree options, with 80.8% of the overall answers being an agree option and only 19.2% of the overall answers being a disagree option (Table 41).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement 1</th>
<th>Statement 2</th>
<th>Statement 3</th>
<th>Statement 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that the data were nominal

- the measure of central tendency chosen was the mode and
- a series Chi² tests (non-parametric) were conducted to test whether there was any difference between the four statements over the total six options.

The mode, or most frequent response for each of the four statements, was calculated as shown in Table 42.
### Table 42
Follow up survey: Most frequent response to each statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Preferably, VIEU should work collaboratively with the employers to</td>
<td>E: Broadly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progress matters and avoid adversarial approaches whenever possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Being part of the union gives me a say in issues (educational and</td>
<td>E: Broadly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industrial) at both the school level and at the system level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 It is important to me that VIEU listens to my point of view and is</td>
<td>E: Broadly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willing to change its policies as a result</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 It is important to me that VIEU listens to my point of view and is</td>
<td>F: Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willing to change its policies as a result</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initially a Chi² test was conducted for all six options across all of the four statements and a probability of 0.004 resulted, indicating that there was a significant difference between six options (strongly disagree to strongly agree) for the four statements with statement 4 providing the greatest variance from the expected results (see Appendix G, Table G1 for details). This supported the fact that statement 4’s mode was different to the other three statements.

A Chi² test was then conducted to check if there was a difference between the grouped agree and disagree options for the 4 statements and this produced a probability of <0.0001, indicating that there was a stronger significant difference between options (grouped disagree to grouped agree) for the 4 statements (see Appendix G, Table G2 for details).

Further Chi² tests were then conducted to ascertain whether there was a hierarchy amongst the four higher order needs as expressed through the four statements. Six tests (on the full array of pairs) were conducted to ascertain whether there was a difference between each set of paired statements. Table 43 summarises the results (refer to Appendix G, Tables G3 & G4 for details of the two significant results. Statements 1 & 4 and Statements 2 & 4).
Table 43
Follow up survey. Chi² tests for each pair of statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair of statements</th>
<th>Chi² value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Sig at .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>9.833</td>
<td>p = 0.0801</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 1 &amp; 3</td>
<td>8.500</td>
<td>p = 0.1307</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 1 &amp; 4</td>
<td>13.059</td>
<td>p = 0.0228</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>6.223</td>
<td>p = 0.2851</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 2 &amp; 4</td>
<td>13.072</td>
<td>p = 0.0227</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>10.224</td>
<td>p = 0.0691</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of these six tests were then used to generate a hierarchy of statements:

- Statement 4 (a higher order need) was shown to be significantly different to Statements 1 and 2 (both lower order needs); i.e., teachers expressed significantly stronger support for solidarity (through self actualisation) than for either security (in collaboration rather than conflict) or belongingness (through participation).

- Statements 1, 2 (both lower order needs) and 3 (a higher order need) were shown not to be significantly different to each other; i.e., teachers expressed no significantly different support for security (in collaboration rather than conflict), belongingness (through participation) or esteem and recognition (through decision making).

- Statement 3 is anomalous in that it is shown:
  - not to be significantly different to statement 4 and
  - not to be significantly different to statements 1 and 2

yet Statement 4 was shown to be significantly different to Statements 1 and 2. This result suggests that it fits somewhere between Statements 4 and statements 1 and 2 but is not significantly different from either.

As a result, Statement 3 was not able to be included in the hierarchy of significantly different levels of statements. The hierarchy that was derived from the series of Chi² tests is shown in Table 44 below.

Table 44
Follow up survey. Chi² test results
Statements that are significantly different

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Statement 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Statements 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As stated previously, the data from the email survey was nominal and not interval so non-parametric tests were the most appropriate. However, to throw some indicative, certainly not definitive, light on the likely positioning of Statement 3 in the hierarchy of statements, parametric tests (means and t tests) were conducted. To do these tests, the six options (A to F) were assigned interval scores (1 to 6 respectively).

The mean, median and standard deviation for each statement was calculated for each statement (see Appendix G, Table G5 for details) and then paired Student t tests (parametric tests) were conducted on each pair to ascertain whether the means for each pair were significantly different. The results are summarised in Table 45.

**Table 45**
Follow up survey. Paired t tests for each pair of statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Sig at .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>4.53 &amp; 4.52</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 3</td>
<td>4.53 &amp; 4.70</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 4</td>
<td>4.53 &amp; 4.68</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>4.52 &amp; 4.70</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &amp; 4</td>
<td>4.52 &amp; 4.68</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>4.70 &amp; 4.68</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The answers in the right hand column in bold (pairs 1 & 3 and pairs 2 & 3) revealed different results to the Chi$^2$ results indicating that Statement 3 was regarded as significantly stronger than statements 1 and 2. This result produced the following hierarchy (Table 46).

**Table 46**
Follow up survey. t test results
Statements that are significantly different

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Statements 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>4.70 &amp; 4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Statements 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>4.53 &amp; 4.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of these parametric tests cannot be relied upon uncritically given that the original data (nominal) does not meet the parameters required by parametric tests (Siegel and Castellan, 1988) and was converted to interval data with the assumption that the measure between each nominal point was exactly the same. Only the non-parametric Chi$^2$ tests are definitive, however, the indicative combined results of the Chi$^2$ tests and the t tests demonstrate that

- Statement 4, concerning the issue of solidarity (self actualisation need - It is important to me that VIEU has a ‘big picture’ view and addresses broad social...
justice issues (e.g., the common good to foster a more inclusive and just society) and not just address industrial relations issues), the top of the taxonomy of the higher order needs, was the most strongly supported of the statements

- Statement 3, concerning the issue of democratic process (esteem and recognition needs - It is important to me that VIEU listens to my point of view and is willing to change its policies as a result), the penultimate of the taxonomy of the higher order needs, was the second most strongly supported of the statements

- Statements 1 and 2, concerning the issues of collaboration (safety and security - preferably, VIEU should work collaboratively with the employers to progress matters and avoid adversarial approaches whenever possible) and participative access (belongingness - being part of the union gives me a say in issues (educational and industrial) at both the school level and at the system level), the lower two of the taxonomy of the higher order needs, were still strongly supported (both 20.8% disagree and 79.2% agree) but not to the same extent as the higher of high order needs.

Finally, Chi$^2$ tests were conducted to check that there was consistency between respondents’ views on the issue of solidarity over the first and second surveys. The Exploratory Stage revealed that the two most popular reasons why teachers chose to join VIEU were

- F (solidarity) and
- C (improving teaching conditions)

and that both were significantly higher than the other reasons

- A (protection from the employer)
- B (improving pay)
- D (direct services) and
- E (ideological belief).

The respondents to this second (email) survey were grouped according to their prime reason given for joining VIEU (A to F) from the first survey. Chi$^2$ tests were then conducted to test for any significant differences between the options chosen by these respondents across the four statements in the second (email) survey, specifically those respondents who chose

- reason F and those who chose reasons A, B, C, D and E
- reason C and those who chose reasons A, B, D, E and F.

(see Table 47 below).
Table 47
Follow up survey. Chi² tests
for any difference across the four statements in the second survey
by respondents who chose reasons C and F in the first survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparisons</th>
<th>Chi² value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Sig. at 0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reason C and reasons A, B, D, E &amp; F</td>
<td>35.414</td>
<td>p = 0.0021</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason F and reasons A, B, C, D &amp; E</td>
<td>28.484</td>
<td>p = 0.0187</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(refer to Appendix G, Tables G6 & G7 for details).

The tests revealed that

- those respondents who chose Option F (Solidarity) in the initial survey were more likely to strongly agree with the higher order needs Statement 4 than respondents who chose any of the other Options A, B, C, D or E in the initial survey and conversely
- those respondents who chose Option C (Improving teaching conditions) in the initial survey were more likely to disagree with the higher order needs Statement 4 than respondents who chose the Options A, B, D, E or F in the initial survey.

These tests confirmed that, as a whole, respondents who chose Option F (as their first preference) in the initial survey were more likely to strongly agree with Statement 4 (on solidarity) than respondents who chose any of the other five Options (A to E as their first preference) in the initial survey. Furthermore, this was not the case for respondents who gave the other most popular reason for joining VIEU, Option C.

Accordingly, sub question 1, ‘are the motivators for teachers those that address higher order needs rather than lower order needs’ can be answered in the affirmative. The data showed that

- respondents overwhelmingly agreed with the higher order statements (80.8% to 19.2%) in this Inspection Stage survey
- there was a hierarchy of statements with respondents agreeing more strongly as the level of taxonomy of needs increased; i.e., solidarity received the strongest agreement from respondents, confirming the Exploratory Stage findings
- there was consistency over the two surveys with respondents who chose Option F (as their first preference) in the initial survey being more likely to strongly agree with Statement 4 (on solidarity).
7.4.3 Sub question 2. Are these higher order needs associated with long term members of VIEU rather than more recently joined members of VIEU?

The data from sub question 1 demonstrated that there was a discernable hierarchy within the four survey statements, with the fourth (solidarity) receiving the strongest agreement from respondents; confirming the Exploratory Stage findings. The Exploratory Stage also revealed that the most demographically divergent groups on the issue of solidarity were respondents with 10 or more (more likely to choose solidarity as a reason) or 9 or less years of experience (less likely to choose solidarity as a reason), although both groups rated solidarity highly.

This sub question examined whether respondents who had 10 or more years of experience were more likely to agree strongly with the four Statements in the second survey, particularly the higher order Statement 4, than respondents who had 9 or less years of experience.

Given the small sample size of respondents with 9 or less years of experience (12), the comparison was not done over the six options but over the grouped ‘disagree’ options (A, B and C) and the grouped ‘agree’ statements (D, E and F). A Chi² test of significance was run using the 9 or less years of experience responses as the ‘observed’ data and the 10 or more years of experience responses as the ‘expected’ data. A p value of 0.2356 was returned, indicating that there was no significant difference between the grouped ‘agree’ responses and ‘disagree’ responses for respondents with 9 or less and 10 or more years of experience. The data cells were too small to run the same test on just Statement 4 (Solidarity). However, while parametric tests on this group were inappropriate (given that the data were not interval) as an indication of the relative rankings given by these demographic groups to Statement 4 (solidarity), the options chosen were converted to interval data (with the assumption that the measure between each nominal point was exactly the same) and a mean, median and mode calculated for each group (see Table 48).

| Table 48
| Follow up survey respondents’ (who chose option F in the first survey) rankings for Statement 4 on the second survey. |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 9 or less years of experience   | 10 or more years of experience  |
| Mean                            | Median                         | Mode                            | n                               |
| 3.50                            | 3.50                           | A: Strongly disagree (2) & F: Strongly agree (2) | 4                               |
| 4.52                            | 5.00                           | E: Broadly agree (9) & F: Strongly agree (9) | 27                              |
Repeating the caveat above regarding the use of parametric measures and noting the small sample size of the 9 or less years of experience, these measures of central tendency indicate a general trend for respondents with 10 or more years of experience to more strongly agree with the higher order need Statement 4 on solidarity than those respondents with 9 or less years of experience. The mode can be relied upon with nominal data and this indicates a strong preference by respondents with 10 or more years of experience to select the strongly and broadly agree options as compared with the respondents with the 9 or less years of experience, albeit the data sample is small for the latter group. To test whether this indication had any substance, other data were examined.

The other data that was available on this issue, that is, higher order needs (solidarity) as a reason for joining VIEU and the length of time a member had been in VIEU can be found in the Exploratory Stage. In that Stage, it was revealed that when a solitary reason was given by respondents for joining VIEU, then option F (solidarity) had a very much higher frequency than other options (refer to Table 25). Option F was given by 195 respondents as their only reason for joining VIEU with the next most frequent response being 52 for option B (ideological belief in unions). Option C (improved teaching conditions) that had almost as many overall responses as F, (1,815 compared with 1,896 respectively) only recorded 17 responses as a sole reason for joining VIEU.

The 195 respondents who chose Option F (as their solitary reason) in the initial survey were divided into the five demographic groups and a Chi$^2$ test of significance was conducted that produced a p score of <0.0001. The full Chi$^2$ test is included (Table 49) so that the variance can be used to illustrate an important detail; i.e., that almost all of the variance (99.2%) is associated with the difference between the observed and the expected in one of the five demographic groups, that is the group of 9 or less and 10 or more years of experience as a member of VIEU. The recent members of VIEU (9 or less years of experience) were significantly less likely to choose F (solidarity) as a reason for joining VIEU than the group with long standing membership (10 or more years of experience).

In summary

1. while the data for the whole group of respondents demonstrated that there was no significant difference between the grouped ‘agree’ responses and ‘disagree’ responses for respondents with 9 or less and 10 or more years of experience, there was an indication that respondents with 10 or more years of experience had a higher modal response than those with 9 or less years of experience
the data of the group that returned a solitary reason for joining VIEU demonstrated that long standing members of VIEU were significantly more likely to choose F (solidarity) than recent members of VIEU.

Table 49
Follow up survey. Chi² test on solidarity as the solitary reason given for joining VIEU and the demographic background characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141.7</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 9 years of experience</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>26.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 10 years of experience</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>148.9</td>
<td>8.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>147.8</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi² test</td>
<td></td>
<td>df = 9</td>
<td>P = &lt; 0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reject Ho. There is a significant difference between the demographic groups where ‘solidarity’ was the solitary reason given for joining VIEU.

In conclusion, the data for this sub question, taken collectively, demonstrated that higher order needs were associated with long term members of VIEU rather than more recently joined members of VIEU.
7.4.4 Sub question 3. Is the union leadership aware of these motivators and has the union leadership put in place strategies and practices that have attempted to meet these motivators?

The first part of this Inspection Stage revealed that VIEU’s leadership group were aware of the Catholic Church’s social teaching on work and of the mindset of its members as teachers. Furthermore, that these two factors had influenced their *modus operandi* as a union, in particular, that they had consciously used strategies (e.g., use of democratic structures) to grow VIEU’s membership. The second part of this Inspection Stage revealed that VIEU’s members, as teachers, were motivated by higher order needs, particularly solidarity, as a reason for joining VIEU. This third part examines the connection between these two parts and examines whether VIEU’s leadership was aware of their members’ commitment to solidarity as a reason for joining VIEU and whether, as a result, they had consciously used strategies to address this issue.

Two sources of data were used to examine this question

- first, in the focus group interviews the leaders were asked “which of the 6 reasons from the survey do you believe is the most popular reason why teachers join the union?” and “which of the 6 reasons from the survey do you believe is the least popular reason why teachers join the union?” These questions addressed the first part of the question, namely, ‘is the union leadership aware of these motivators’

- the second part of the question, ‘has the union leadership put in place strategies and practices that have attempted to meet these motivators’ was addressed by an examination of VIEU’s historical documentation through its website and official publication VIEUPOINT.

1 Was the union leadership aware of these motivators?

As part of the focus group interview, VIEU’s leaders were given a copy of the survey from the Exploratory Stage that listed the six options under Question 3 as suggested reasons for joining VIEU. These options were

- A: protection from the employer
- B: improving pay
- C: improving teaching conditions (e.g., reduced workload)
- D: services such as credit facilities, insurance (health, property, etc.)
- E: ideological belief in unions and/or politics and
• F: solidarity with teachers in the school and the system.

VIEU’s leaders were initially asked ‘which of the 6 reasons from the survey do you believe is the least popular reason why teachers join the union?’ There was unanimous agreement that direct services (reason D) would be the least popular reason followed by ideological belief in unions (reason E).

Subsequently, they were asked ‘which of the 6 reasons from the survey do you believe is the most popular reason why teachers join the union?’ After considerable discussion there was unanimous agreement that wages (reason B) and conditions (reason C) would be main reasons for joining the union, with both being equal in importance. They believed that these two reasons would be followed by solidarity (reason F) and protection from the employer (reason A) on equal footing.

Initially, there was a difference of opinion over the relative importance of solidarity (reason F). Initially, Flinn rated it as a low factor (below reason A and in line with reason E) whereas Keenan and particularly James argued that it would be more important and would rate after wages and conditions (reasons B and C) in importance and at about the same level as protection from the employer (reason A). After discussion it was agreed as outlined above. The leaders made the point that these factors would have changed over time and Flinn agreed that solidarity was probably an emerging issue, growing in importance.

As a point of comparison, the VCSA’s leaders were also asked the same questions. With regard to the question ‘which of the six reasons from the survey do you believe is the most popular reason why teachers join the union?’, as with VIEU, there was agreement that the reasons have changed over time. In the earlier days, they noted that ‘parity of wages’ was a major issue with teachers in Catholic schools progressively receiving 80%, then 90% and eventually full parity of wages with the teachers in Government schools. Parity of conditions had been harder to achieve and this was now taking precedence as the wages issue waned. On this logic it was agreed that currently they believed improved conditions (reason C) would be the most popular reason as the teacher workload issue continued to grow.

It was felt that solidarity (reason F) would be a developing reason. They stated that in the early days there had been a reluctance to “take industrial action against the administration of the school”. However, there was now a strong feeling that fellow teachers (in their own school and in general) should be supported. It was felt that this reason would now have probably
outgrown ‘improving wages’ (reason B) in popularity although this would have been the major factor in earlier years.

With regard to the question ‘which of the six reasons from the survey do you believe is the least popular reason why teachers join the union?’, there was agreement that ‘direct services’ (reason D) would be the least reason with ‘ideological belief’ (reason E) close to it. It was felt that protection from the employer (reason A) would not rate highly, although it was conceded that in some cases it may well be an issue but “only individual cases … not a collective problem”. As a point of interest, Synan (the President of the VCSA for the earliest years of this research) initially rated ‘solidarity’ (reason F) lower than the other two participants, but still above ‘direct services’ (reason D). He agreed with the other Presidents that it had become an emerging issue.

The results of these rankings are listed in Table 50.

Table 50
VIEU leadership’s rankings compared with
the rankings for reasons assigned by teachers and the leadership of the VCSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIEU members (ordered after statistical tests)</th>
<th>VIEU leadership group</th>
<th>VCSA leadership group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2 Most popular</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1 Most popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: solidarity with teachers in school/system</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: improving teaching conditions (e.g., workload)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 B: Improving pay</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &amp; 5 A: protection from the employer</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: ideological belief in unions and/or politics</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Least popular D: services such as credit facilities, insurance, etc.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6 Least popular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of points of unison emerged
• the least popular reasons (lower three reasons) were clear in all three groups with D (services) being the least popular reason, followed by E (ideological belief ) and A (protection from the employer).
• the most popular reasons (upper three) were the same for all three groups, namely, B (wages), C (conditions) and F (solidarity). However, the order varied depending on where F (solidarity) was placed. VIEU members placed it first, VCSA leadership second and VIEU leadership third (see Table 10 below).

Significantly, both leadership groups recognised that solidarity was the emerging issue for teachers in Catholic schools. It was the more recent leaders in both VIEU and the VCSA that argued for its inclusion higher in the order and it was the earlier leaders (Flinn and Synan) who have both been away from active involvement in Victorian Catholic education for a number of years who rated it relatively poorly.

Consequently, the first part of this sub question can be answered in the affirmative, that is, VIEU’s leadership group was aware of these motivators and, with the exception of F (solidarity) were able to very accurately predict the rankings of the reasons why teachers chose to join VIEU. With regard to option F (solidarity) there was

• an awareness that it was an emerging issue and that it had taken over from the lower order needs of security and belongingness (protection from the employer and ideological belief in unions) as well as the pecuniary interest, direct services

• an acknowledgement that the issue needed to be addressed with its members because broader social issues, not just industrial issues, were important to teachers.

2 Has the union leadership put in place strategies and practices that have attempted to meet these motivators?

The data from the first part of this sub question demonstrated that VIEU’s leadership group was aware that the higher order motivator, option F (solidarity), was an important and emerging issue for its members.

In the Exploratory Stage an examination of VIEU’s website demonstrated that it had taken the broader and not the narrower view of the role of trade unions incorporating a range of services and benefits such as insurance, financial advice and professional development to its members. A further examination of its webpage also showed that broader social justice issues also figured prominently. VIEU’s home page ‘Welcome to VIEU’ (VIEU, 2006a) had 8 sub-menus, including the normal ‘About Us’, ‘News’ and ‘Members services’ that would be expected on any union website. However, it also has a dedicated sub-menu on ‘Social Justice’.
In that Social Justice site are links to other social justice organisations such as Justice Education in Catholic Schools (www.jecs.melb.catholic.edu.au), Caritas Australia (www.caritas.org.au) and Reconciliation Australia (www.austlii.edu.au/au/orgs/car).

VIEU has a Social Justice Committee that meets to examine issues via a guest speaker, provide a forum for members to raise and share ideas/resources and to act as a reference group for VIEU. The website states the purpose as follows:

Given the personal nature of the members and the schools at which they choose to work, VIEU sees the Social Justice Committee as a way of expanding the outreach and influence of the union in the broader community. (VIEU, 2006b)

Additionally, a scan of all VIEUPOINT editions in the period 1994 to 2004 found ample evidence that VIEU actively supported social justice issues outside the industrial relations sphere. In general, VIEU is an active supporter of ‘Union Aid Abroad’, the humanitarian aid agency of the ACTU. An example of this is ‘The Make Life Fair Everywhere’ campaign, a national campaign to raise awareness of the need for union people in Australia to show international solidarity with people in developing countries. The broader social justice agenda has been with VIEU from its inception in 1994 (for example, Flinn’s editorial on “Educators fight racism” (VIEU, 1996d)) but, on the strength of the number of VIEUPOINT’s articles and the Secretary’s message, it gained momentum in the time of Keenan’s leadership. Since 2003 VIEU has had a social justice site (www.vieu.org.au/social/) (VIEU, 2006c), as indicated above and a regular ‘social justice’ page in VIEUPOINT. Some specific examples from VIEUPOINT to demonstrate this broader social agenda include:

- comment on ethical issues such as international ‘sweatshops’; “VIEU has encouraged schools to commit to supporting the Fairwear Schools campaign … to promote awareness of social justice for outworkers” (VIEU, 2000c, p. 2). The campaign encouraged schools to source school uniform suppliers from ethical overseas suppliers
- comment on world political issues such as refugees and terrorism “2001: A race odyssey… what happened in New York was a despicable act of terrorism … (but) ‘beating up’ fear of refugees escaping a horrible war and regimes, deserves no understanding … Both the Coalition government and the Labor opposition should hang their heads in shame …” (VIEU, 2001b), p. 2
- a “Christmas Appeal to help restore East Timor’s battered education system” (VIEU, 2000a) and support for the Australia East Timor Friendship Schools Project
• support and publication of the Peace rally on 14 February 2003 and the anti-war rally on 20 March 2003 (VIEU, 2003a, p. 11) and publicising action taken by schools such as one minute’s silence/praying for peace, supporting Caritas
• support and publication of assistance given by schools following the Boxing Day 2004 tsunami (VIEU, 2005a)
• inputting into the Victorian Institute of Teaching’s (the teacher registration authority) professional Code of Ethics (VIEU, 2004d).

The evidence from its website and from VIEUPOINT demonstrated that VIEU had put in place strategies and practices that have attempted to address the broader social issues, not just industrial issues, that were important to teachers. Consequently, the second part of this sub question can be answered in the affirmative.

7.5 INSPECTION STAGE PHASE 3 (STEP 10)

7.5.1 The anomalous ‘dip’ in VIEU’s membership

The Exploratory Stage revealed a ‘dip’ in the membership density of VIEU’s Catholic non-teacher members from 1997 to 2000 (falling in 1997 and taking three years to recover) in VIEU’s independent school membership and from 1998 to 2000 (falling in 1998 and taking two years to recover) for independent school membership, as illustrated in Figure 66.

7.5.2 Inspection Stage Guiding Question 3

The guiding question for this section was

what evidence, consistent with the existing data, could be brought to bear to explain the dip that occurred in VIEU’s non-Catholic (independent) school and Catholic school non-teacher membership between 1997 and 2000?

I The ‘dip’ in independent schools and the modus operandi of the VCSA and VIEU

As demonstrated in the Exploratory Stage and the Inspection Stage, the modus operandi of the VCSA was a factor in teachers remaining with VIEU particularly when VIEU’s monopoly right to represent workers was removed by the federal government. The date of the ‘dip’ was
important in this context. The extension of the Enterprise Bargaining principle and the introduction of Australian Workplace Agreements (AWAs) in 1996 when the Workplace Relations Act (1996) was introduced by the newly elected Howard government, effectively sidelined unions in mainstream Australian workplaces. However, this opportunity to sideline VIEU and introduce non-union EBAs and AWAs was not taken up by the VCSA. As noted previously, the VCSA’s approach to Enterprise Bargaining was a published preference for collective agreements over individual agreements (VCSA, 1993b).
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**VIEU’s membership densities 1997 to 2000**

However, this protection was not extended to VIEU in all non-Catholic (independent) schools where the VCSA was not the employer. The fact that there is a ‘dip’ in non-VCSA schools corroborates the fact that its attitude assisted VIEU in maintaining membership. In the focus group interview with VIEU’s leaders this point was reinforced in their answer to the third question ‘do you approach Catholic school employers differently to independent school employers? The response was

it dovetails with what the government does. The government (Howard’s) moved to destroy the centrality of awards, and of course the government does that because it is fundamentally union busting. If you destroy the centrality of the award you can destroy the capacity to bargain at industry level. And in the independent school sector what you’ve got is an organisation or organisations that have pursued the destruction of the award as a relevant instrument.
However, there was acknowledgement that independent schools also operated out of a ‘pastoral framework’ so that some could be “pulled back … because you can pull on the pastoral care stuff because the stuff that they are espousing to students are … not extended to members of staff”. Hence, while some independent non-Catholic employers did take advantage of the opportunity to sideline VIEU, many others maintained a similar approach to the VCSA’s approach. The ‘dip’ supports the contention that it took longer for the collective pressure to build in independent schools but, as it did, VIEU regained its footing in these schools and membership recovered.

2 The ‘dip’ in non-teacher membership

However, the explanation above does not explain why non-teacher membership declined in 1997 given that the VCSA made no distinction between teachers and non-teachers. One explanation arising from the membership data, the historical document analysis and the focus group interview with VIEU’s leadership is that VIEU is predominantly a union for teachers.

As indicated by Table 51, teachers have always dominated VIEU’s membership. As noted previously, VIEU’s early precursor associations were founded for teachers only.

Table 51
Percentage of VIEU’s membership by teachers and non-teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Non-teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The focus group interview for VIEU recognised that this was an issue for them, stating that the “very collegial nature of teachers, however, also showed up in the tension between the teaching and non-teaching members of the union” and this needed to be handled sensitively. In the focus group interview, VIEU’s leaders recognised that their strategies for recruiting non-
teachers were very much more prescribed than their successful strategies for recruiting teachers. VIEU’s leaders stated that

if we were just organising School Officers (non-teachers) it would be very hard for us to talk to them because the don’t have common lunch times, they don’t have breaks as such … we’ve got no right other than by negotiation to go into a school and meet with the clerical staff, because they are technically stopping work to do that but we can easily go and have a meeting with teachers.

In addition, Consultative Committees in schools that are a source of strength for the unions in attracting teachers deal only with teacher issues and non-teachers are sidelined. Furthermore, the other successful strategy of having a delegate in every school may not be as present for non-teachers. In most cases, the school-based delegate would be a teacher. However, these factors in themselves do not explain the ‘dip’, they only account for the generally lower density rates for non-teachers. This issue will be revisited further in a later section.

3 The ‘dip’ in membership density and the change in the modus operandi of VIEU

The aftermath of the industrial action in 1997

The date of the ‘dip’ is significant because 1997 was, according to both the VCSA and VIEU, the year of the most intense industrial action seen either before or up to 2004 in Catholic schools in Victoria. In 1997 Flinn, the General Secretary of VIEU at that time, wrote under the heading ‘troubled times for education’, that “Catholic schools are now gripped by the most far-reaching industrial action seen in over 100 years of Catholic schooling” (VIEU, 1997a, p. 3). Fr Hugh Brown expressed a similar sentiment in his column in the VCSA Information Bulletin at the end of 1997, stating

1997 has been a testing time for us all – employers and employees alike. The industrial traumas of the year have taken a toll. It is both a criticism and a challenge to state that the industrial relations model that operated … in 1997 was both confrontational and divisive. (VCSA, 1997c, p. 1)

VIEU adopted the view that strikes had a positive effect on union density. Flinn wrote in 1997

just a few days ago, thousands of staff in Catholic schools took part in industrial action … for many this was their first time … During the last six weeks, more than 600 new members have joined VIEU. (VIEU, 1997b, p. 3)

and reinforced this view in the focus group interview by stating

counter to the belief that employers have, the best thing that can ever happen to a union is to have a strike … because you grow … if you were running a business you would have a strike every week.”
This is reflected in Flinn’s *modus operandi* in his time as General Secretary leading up to the major dispute of 1997. During that time a number of rallies and stop-works were called

- a rally on 8 December 1994 outside the Catholic Education Office in Melbourne as part of a ‘Redundancy and Wages Campaign’. The rally was called off when agreement was reached by negotiation (VIEU, 1994d)
- a stop-work on 22 June 1995 as part of a campaign around a new federal Certified Agreement on teachers’ salaries and conditions (VIEU, 1995)
- following depiction of the VCSA as “unreasonable” (VIEU, 1996a, p. 6), a call for industrial action in April of 1996 (VIEU, 1996b) over salary increases to teachers that resulted in a stop-work on 9 May 1996, with a resolution being passed at that stop-work to consider further industrial action if no result was reached by 27 May 1996 (VIEU, 1996c)
- a stop-work meeting on 23 May 1997 and a protest rally outside the CEO Melbourne on 28 May 1997 over salary increases to teachers and non-teachers (VIEU, 1997a)
- a stop-work meeting on 19 June 1997, reportedly the largest ever held, involving 5,500 staff in Melbourne and a further 2,000 staff who did not attend the rally but stopped work (VIEU, 1997c).

This issue of the *modus operandi* of VIEU and how it changed in 1997 was raised in the VCSA’s focus group interview. 1997 was raised as a difficult year where the leadership of VIEU (under Flinn as VIEU Secretary) adopted ‘a very aggressive form of leadership’. However, there was a belief from the VCSA’s leaders that 1997 and the year or two thereafter under Flinn were ‘an aberration’. There was also a belief by the VCSA’s leaders that Keenan and James had taken ‘a non-confrontational approach’ and that they took ‘a bigger picture’ approach. They brought ‘a level of sanity’ to the approach, whereas Flinn’s leadership was more ‘erratic’ and ‘grandstanding’ in approach in 1997.

The contention that VIEU’s *modus operandi* changed in 1997 was supported by a scan of VIEUPOINT from 1994 to 2004. Stop-work action in Catholic schools stopped after the 1997 dispute, including 1998 and 1999 when Flinn was General Secretary. In Keenan’s time as General Secretary, the tone moved away from the use of industrial action as a means of resolving disputes with a greater emphasis on working collaboratively with the employer. Only one stop-work was called in Keenan’s time as General Secretary; it was called on 3 March 2004. However, the stop-work was not directed specifically at the employer in Catholic schools but
against the Victorian Government. It was a joint rally to support Government schoolteachers, the first ever joint (government and non-government) teacher rally. Keenan wrote at the time that

this is a truly sorry dispute, brought about by a Labor government that is refusing to negotiate in good faith with the recognized union representing staff in government schools. (VIEU, 2004a, p. 3)

The scan of VIEUPOINT demonstrated that between 1998 and 2000 there was a slowing of direct industrial action and then from 2000 onwards, a broader agenda becomes evident for the union. The narrow industrial focus fades, with social justice issues becoming more common. This is evidenced by the collaborative and conciliatory editorials from Keenan as General Secretary. Examples between 2000 and 2004 include

- Under the heading ‘Resolution looms’,

Following three weeks of intensive negotiations between VIEU and the VCSA we are able to report that following significant movement by the VCSA in negotiations, the parties are close to reaching agreement. (VIEU, 2000b, p. 2)

- The same edition under the heading ‘What is “Protected Industrial Action?”’ pointed out that

The Workplace relations Act provides protection to employees taking industrial action to support or advance claims … negotiation and evidence of a genuine attempt to reach agreement must precede the taking of any industrial action. (VIEU, 2000b, p. 2)

- A March 2001 VIEUPOINT front page cartoon under the heading ‘What’s the union ever done for me?’ highlighted that besides wages, improved conditions such as long service leave, paid parental leave, improved promotion structures, decreased workloads (including increased release time, smaller class sizes and fewer ‘extras’ had all been achieved by ‘Agreement’. (VIEU, 2001a, p. 1).
This message was repeated in the March 2005 edition (VIEU, 2005b).

- On enterprise bargaining and the need for agreement

More members in independent schools have negotiated certified agreements with pay increases to or above those in government and Catholic schools. It is increasingly obvious to staff in these schools that the best way of protecting their rights and conditions is through a certified agreement. (VIEU, 2001b, p. 2)

- a ‘family friendly’ approach to members’ conditions (VIEU, 2003b) concentrating on recognising the necessity of members to balance work and family commitments

- on negotiation style

Negotiations have started on the VIEU claim … Discussions are conducted on a without prejudice basis … this allows both sides to explore issues and options around the claims without locking into any position. (VIEU, 2003c, p. 3)
• on a balanced approach. After reaching agreement to a new Certified Agreement with the VCSA in June of 2004, Keenan’s editorial listed the improvements achieved including in the areas of wages, superannuation and family friendly workplaces. He added

It is disappointing that we have not been able to make further gains in regulating maximum workloads; however, during negotiations we became convinced that, until the issue of improved state government funding for Catholic schools is resolved, we have little ability to further reduce class sizes and scheduled class times. (VIEU, 2004b, p. 3)

• on criticism of fellow unions on the issue of funding non-government schools.

Many members have contacted us over some misleading advertisements regarding the level of … funding going to government and non-government schools. … Even more disturbing, however, is the recent decision of the NSW Teachers Federation to launch a High Court challenge to the funding of religious schools … It is the tired politics of the 1950s … and will do nothing to confront the challenges facing education in 2004. (VIEU, 2004c, p. 3)

If strikes are good for unions, then the data on VIEU’s membership following 1997 does not support this contention. Certainly membership grew between the period 1994 and 1997 where there was a series of stop-work meetings and other direct industrial actions. However, after 1997, as the data showed, there was a drop in VIEU’s density for non-teachers in Victorian Catholic schools and for staff in independent schools. If Flinn’s previously stated statement of June 1997 is correct, that is “during the last six weeks, more than 600 new members have joined VIEU” (VIEU, 1997b, p. 3), then these gains were short lived. One year later in 1998, Catholic schoolteacher membership was up 124 members and non-teacher membership up 77 members with independent school staff membership down by 149, a net gain of 52 members. Given that 600 members had joined up, there was a balancing loss of 548 members or the new members did not stay in VIEU for long. The statistics to check which scenario occurred are not available.

As previously demonstrated, a dip occurred in the density rate of non-teachers in Catholic schools and in the density rate for staff in independent schools in the years immediately following 1997. A closer examination of the statistics for teachers in Catholic schools demonstrated that a similar effect happened in that sector as well. While the membership figures remained steady (1997 = 5,250 and 1999 = 5,586) and the density rate remained steady (1997 = 35.85 and 1999 36.2%), the growth rate dropped considerably as demonstrated by Figure 67.

The growth rate of the union density for teachers in Victorian Catholic schools fell significantly below the trend line for the three years, 1998, 1999 and 2000. The growth rate
recovered thereafter in much the same way as the union density rate for Catholic non-teachers and staff in independent schools.

In summary, following the industrial action of 1997

- the union density growth rate stagnated for the only time in the 1994 to 2004 period for teachers and their union density growth rate fell significantly below the trend line for the only time in that period
- the overall union density rate dropped for the only time in the 1994 to 2004 period for non-teachers in Catholic schools and for staff in independent schools.

Statistics compiled from VIEU (2005).

![Figure 67: VIEU’s union density growth rate for teachers 1994 to 2004](image)

No direct data has been collected to demonstrate that there is a casual relationship between the 1997 industrial action and the dip experienced in the years that followed. The industrial action of 1997 was associated with a change of government from a union sympathetic Labor government to a union non-sympathetic Coalition government at that time and the consequent sidelining of unions by the extension of Enterprise Bargaining and the introduction of AWAs through the Workplace Relations Act (1996). According to Shister’s (1953) model, union density at this time would decline because one of the three interdependent factors necessary for union growth, a supportive sociolegal framework, changes from positive to negative. That was the only other known factor that changed in 1997. However, as the Exploratory and Inspection Stages data revealed, VIEU was shielded from this effect by the
modus operandi of VCSA who still negotiated solely with VIEU and did not take advantage of the Workplace Relations Act (1996) changes. Additionally, the Workplace Relations Act (1996) changes, which were still in effect and were strengthened in the 2000 to 2004 period, has no effect on the union density rates or union density growth rates from 2000 to 2004.

The year 1997 was a significant date and, as the data from VIEUPOINT and the two focus interview groups demonstrated, 2000 was also a turning point as there was a change in the General Secretary and the introduction of a broader, not so narrowly industrially focused, agenda including a social justice agenda. It is also worth noting that the years 1998 and 1999 showed signs of the start to a recovery in the union density rates in the Catholic non-teacher sector and the independent staff sectors; years when direct industrial disputation waned.

A literature review on this issue (Cameron, 1985) revealed that authors in this area are divided on whether strikes have a positive or negative effect on union density rates. No specific references could be found for teacher unions or for white collar workers. Some related data on the issue of members’ attitude to confrontational versus cooperative approaches by VIEU to the employers was sought through the follow up survey to union members through question one. Statement 1 read

“Statement 1
Preferably, VIEU should work collaboratively with the employers to progress matters and avoid adversarial approaches whenever possible”

The respondents overwhelmingly agreed with this statement, 20.8% to 79.2% with a mean score of 4.53, a median of 5 and a mode of option E (broadly agree), putting their typical response in the region of E or broadly agree. A Chi² test was performed on the overall difference between respondents’ disagree versus agree responses (for all responses) and it returned a significant preference for a collaborative approach over a confrontational approach (p = <.0001) (Table 52).

Table 52
Follow up survey. Responses to Statement 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement 1</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Disagree v Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>16 responses or 20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Broadly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>= Total disagreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Somewhat agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Broadly agree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>61 responses or 79.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Strongly agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>= Total agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This result coalesces with the data that demonstrated that teachers are motivated by higher order needs. Teachers align more with an approach that is not based on safety or security needs (linked to a confrontational approach) and more with one that is based on esteem/recognition and self-actualisation needs (linked to a collaborative approach). This is also in line with several research findings on what motivates teachers in Australia; teachers were found to be motivated by a desire to work “with and for people”, and to make a difference (Dinham & Scott, 2000a, 2000b, 2002; Scott, Stone & Dinham, 2001). It is also supported by Dinham and Scott’s (2000a) research finding that the old post-Herzberg models of teacher satisfaction (two domain model of teacher satisfaction/dissatisfaction) should be replaced by a three domain model, where the new third outer domain introduces “the growing yet variable influence and importance of societal based factors and forces which are acting to influence teacher … satisfaction” (2000, p. 1) and are largely out of their control. Furthermore, Dinham and Scott (1999, 2000a) found that the more turbulent, difficult and demanding the third domain was, the more it led to teachers’ satisfaction with both their conditions of work and what they saw as their ‘core business’. Teachers dislike an agenda outside of their workplace that they cannot control, whether that influence is increased government accountability requirements or industrial disputation at a system level. They prefer a collaborative approach that does not invade their workplace.

4 The ‘dip’ in membership density for non-teachers

Non-teachers’ motivators v teachers’ motivators

No data were collected from non-teachers in this research, therefore only speculation can be engaged in as to their reasons for leaving VIEU between 1997 and 1999. It may be related to the different motivators for teachers and non-teachers. If teachers respond more to higher order needs, then it may be assumed that non-teachers could respond to needs of a lower order. They would be more inclined to respond to safety/security needs or belongingness/friendship needs than esteem/recognition needs and self-actualisation/self-fulfilment needs. The lowest of Maslow’s (1943) needs are the safety/security needs. They encompass more than simple protection from harm but also embrace the need for law and order in people’s lives. Safety needs become heightened during conflict and threatening situations but once the threat or conflict is finished, the protection from the threat can be abandoned. If people join a union because they feel threatened at a particular point in time, then as soon as the threat passes, they will leave the union if they joined that union for protection. If non-teachers joined VIEU during the turbulence of 1997 for safety/security needs, then they would tend to leave VIEU in 1998 when the industrial turbulence was over. If teachers joined VIEU in 1997 because the were motivated by a sense of solidarity, then when the turbulence of 1997 was over, they would still remain in VIEU.
because the need of motivation for solidarity would not have been affected by the cessation of industrial action.

As indicated earlier, no data were collected from non-teachers in this research. Therefore, this is only speculation, but it has synergy with the model developed for teachers from the data collected for that cohort of VIEU members and explains why some form of dip would have occurred for some non-teachers after the end of the 1997 industrial turbulence.

7.6 SUMMARY OF THE INSPECTION STAGE

The results of the Inspection Stage are presented in Table 53.

Table 53
Inspection Stage’s results summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guiding Question 1</td>
<td>The leaders of the employee and employer groups have consciously put in place practices and strategies that support union membership that are outside of the typical approach of unions and/or employers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Have the leaders of the employee and employer groups consciously or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unconsciously put in place practices and strategies that support union membership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that are outside of the typical approach of unions and/or employers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• are the leadership groups aware of the Church’s social teaching in the area of</td>
<td>• the leaders of VIEU and the VCSA were aware of the Catholic Church’s social teaching and consciously used it in its approach to industrial relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work and freedom of association, and if so, has this influenced their approach to</td>
<td>• the fact that VIEU were dealing with teachers as their members had influenced the way that they operated as a union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trade unionism?</td>
<td>• had consciously put into place strategies, democratic and participative structures, as well as using cutting edge technology to grow its union membership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• has the fact that VIEU started out as a professional association of teachers,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rather than as a union, had any lasting impact on it as union?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• has the union leadership put in place strategies and practices that have</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attempted to recognise and respond to its unique context?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guiding Question 2

2 Are the motivators for teachers different to the general population and, if so, how has this affected their decision to associate or not to associate with VIEU?

Sub questions

- are the motivators for teachers those that address higher order needs rather than lower order needs?
- if so, are these higher order needs associated with long term members of VIEU rather than more recently joined members of VIEU?
- is the union leadership aware of these motivators and has the union leadership put in place strategies and practices that have attempted to meet these motivators?

The motivators for teachers are different to the general population and this does affect their decision to associate with VIEU as detailed below

- the motivators for teachers were those that address higher order needs and there was a hierarchy of statements
- higher order needs (particularly F – solidarity) were associated with long term members of VIEU rather than more recently joined members
- the union leadership was aware of these motivators (particularly solidarity) and had put in place strategies (e.g., addressing broader social justice agendas) to meet them.

Guiding Question 3

3 What evidence, consistent with the existing data, can be brought to bear to explain the dip that occurred in VIEU’s non-Catholic (independent) school and Catholic school non-teacher membership between 1997 and 2000?

The dip that occurred in independent schools could be related to a different employer attitude to IR legislative changes and the dip in Catholic non-teacher membership was consistent with different motivation needs and a change in the modus operandi of VIEU’s leadership.

This chapter concludes the gathering of data as part of the research design. The next chapter of this thesis presents a review and synthesis of the Exploratory and Inspection Stages data.
Chapter 8  A new Conceptual Framework

8.1 INTRODUCTION

This research set out to discover, via a learning journey, what factors contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union. This chapter reports on the tenth and final step of that learning journey.

This synthesis draws upon the contextual framework established in Chapter Three, the literature reviews in Chapters Four (that encompassed all of the explanations offered for the decline in union membership in Australia and worldwide) and Six (the emergent issues that challenged Shister’s model) and extensively on the data gathered along the way in the learning journey, particularly the data obtained from the three phases of the Exploratory (Chapter Five) and the three phases of the Inspection Stages (Chapter Seven). This chapter presents a reconciliation of the eliminated possible explanations using Wiersma’s (1995) modified ‘analytic induction approach’ but not to the total exclusion of the ‘funnel’ approach (Sprinthall et. al., 1991) so that all examples or ‘cases’ of the phenomenon are included to build a new and comprehensive conceptual framework. The answers obtained to the guiding questions are brought together into a coherent whole.

A revision of the initial framework, based on Shister’s model, is then presented. This new conceptual framework revises two of Shister’s premises and then extends it to incorporate two new factors. Two final observations are included to finalise the learning journey.

8.2 A SUMMARY OF THE DATA FROM THE EXPLORATORY AND INSPECTION STAGES

The three guiding questions and answers for the Exploratory Stage were:

1. Is the profile of VIEU’s membership typical or atypical of union membership in Australia from 1994 to 2004? Six postulates were derived from this literature review for the Exploratory Stage Phase 1 part of the research.
The data demonstrated that VIEU’s demographic profile was typical of union membership in Australia (particularly the education sector’s) from 1994 to 2004. It demonstrated that there was no demographic factor that was the source of the counter trend growth. In fact, the data revealed that some of these demographic factors should have had a more negative impact on the Victorian Catholic sector and led to a greater decline rather than the counter trend growth. Two issues arose that required further exploration, namely that the Catholic Church was the employer (and its approach to employment relations) and that VIEU’s teacher members were different to their non-teacher members.

2 Are the general factors cited worldwide and the specific factors cited for Australia for the decline of trade union membership (arising from the literature review) present and have they impacted on VIEU from 1994 to 2004?

The data revealed that the four worldwide factors cited for the decline of trade union density were present in the Catholic sector of the education industry and, therefore, the absence of these factors could be eliminated as a possible explanation for the counter trend. The data also revealed that six of the Australian specific factors cited for the decline of trade union density were present in the Catholic sector of the education industry and, therefore, the absence of these factors could be eliminated as a possible explanation for the counter trend.

The data revealed that three of the Australian specific factors cited for the decline of trade union density were not present in the Catholic sector of the education industry and, therefore, their absence may form a possible explanation for the counter trend. Those factors were, first, that the foundations of VIEU were as a professional association, not a trade union; second, that VIEU did not lose its monopoly as a bargaining agent for teachers in Victorian Catholic schools; third, that VIEU’s internal political structures and its commitment to democracy and consultation were different to the general union approach.

3 Are the factors cited by teachers for joining VIEU typical of union membership in Australia from 1994 to 2004? Three sub questions were derived from this literature review for Exploratory Stage Phase 3 part of the research.

The data revealed that there was a discernable hierarchy of reasons given by teachers for joining VIEU and this hierarchy was different to the general trade
union population, in particular, solidarity with teachers in school/system outranking all others. The data also revealed that the most demographic divergent groups on the issue of solidarity were respondents with 10 or more or 9 years or less experience.

The conclusion to the pre-Exploratory Stage literature review outlined Shister’s (1953) model for the general growth and decline in union density. It found that Shister’s model was adequate both as a framework for the comprehensiveness of the Exploratory Stage literature review and as an as initial conceptual framework for this research. A subsequent guiding question was established to ascertain whether, as a result of the collection of data in the Exploratory Stage, any new and/or unexpected factors had emerged that should cause a revision of Shister’s model prior to the commencement of the Inspection Stage. That guiding question was

4. Is Shister’s (1953) model for the general growth of unions adequate in VIEU’s context?

The data suggested that Shister’s model was inadequate for VIEU’s context. Initially, the remaining possible explanations were coalesced and two themes emerged, namely the conscious leadership influence of VIEU’s and of the VCSA’s executives in using strategies to grow union membership as well as the different mindset of teachers, vis-à-vis other workers. These two themes challenged the comprehensiveness of Shister’s model. Shister envisaged no active role for employees. In Shister’s model, union members were only putty in the hands of effective union leaders. They had no capacity to affect union policy or practice. Similarly, Shister’s model provided no active role for employers. He ascribed only a negative role for employers with regard to unionisation.

The subsequent Inspection Stage examined these two emergent issues. In addition the anomalous dip in VIEU’s non-teaching and non-Catholic membership between 1997 and 2000 was examined. Three resultant guiding questions were framed for the Inspection Stage to test the validity of these emergent issues.

The guiding questions and answers were:

1. Have the leaders of the employee and employer groups consciously or unconsciously put in place practices and strategies that support union membership
that are outside the typical approach of unions and/or employers? Three sub questions were derived from this literature review for the Inspection Stage Phase 1 part of the research.

The data revealed that the leaders of VIEU were aware of the Catholic Church’s social teaching in the area of work and freedom of association. The data showed that VIEU’s leadership consciously employed the Catholic Church’s social teaching to direct its approach to industrial relations, particularly in its expectations of employers. Additionally VIEU’s leadership were aware that their teacher members had particular expectations of the role of VIEU and of the way that teachers expected VIEU to operate as an association. Consequently, VIEU’s leadership had consciously put into place strategies that appealed to teachers in order to grow its union membership. VIEU’s leadership was also aware that these strategies were viewed as outside of the typical approach of unions.

The data also revealed that the leaders of the VCSA were aware of the Catholic Church’s social teaching on trade unions. It showed that VCSA’s leadership had made a conscious decision to follow this teaching and, therefore, that the Catholic Church’s social teaching had strongly influenced their approach to trade unionism. Finally, VCSA’s leadership corroborated VIEU leadership’s contention that the fact that VIEU was dealing with teachers as their members had influenced the way that VIEU had operated as a union.

2 Are the motivators for teachers different to the general population and, if so, how has this affected their decision to associate or not to associate with VIEU?

The data revealed that the motivators for teachers are different in that they address higher order needs rather than lower order needs. A clear hierarchy of needs emerged confirming (the Exploratory Stage findings) that solidarity (not a strong reason for non-teacher) was a dominant reason for teachers, particularly for long-standing members of VIEU. The data further revealed that VIEU’s leadership group was aware that the higher order needs were stronger motivators, particularly solidarity, and this needed to be addressed with its members because they had recognised that broader social issues, not just industrial issues, were important to teachers.
3 What evidence, consistent with the existing data, can be brought to bear to explain the dip that occurred in VIEU’s non-Catholic (independent) schools and Catholic non-teacher membership between 1997 and 2000?

The data revealed a consistency with the existing data, namely that the dip that occurred in independent schools is related to a different employer attitude to IR legislative changes and that the dip in Catholic non-teacher membership is consistent with different motivation needs and a change in the modus operandi of VIEU’s leadership.

In summary, both of the themes that emerged in the Exploratory, namely the conscious leadership influence of VIEU’s and of the VCSA’s executives in using strategies to grow union membership, as well as the different mindset of teachers, vis-à-vis other workers, were confirmed as active influences on the growth of VIEU’s union density in the Inspection Stage. This evidence was triangulated by the evidence in the dip that occurred in VIEU’s non-Catholic (independent) school and Catholic non-teacher membership between 1997 and 2000.

8.3 A REVIEW OF SHISTER’S MODEL

8.3.1 Introduction

The review of the literature in Chapter Three established that the only generally accepted comprehensive model for union growth and decline was Shister’s (1953) model, a long-standing and well-accepted model (Fox et. al., 1995). Shister listed three interdependent factors necessary for growth, namely, a favourable work environment, a supportive sociolegal framework and the quality of union leadership. He further asserted that these three factors were interdependent, so that if the work environment and sociolegal background were unfavourable and unsupportive (as the Exploratory Stage data generally revealed to be so), then even the most inspirational union leaders could not grow the union. His model was summarised in the following Figure 68.

However, the Exploratory Stage data revealed that there had been growth in VIEU’s density despite this fact and that one of the contextually unique factors warranting further investigation was VIEU leadership’s modus operandi.
The work environment
- the rate and pattern of economic change (economic prosperity v hard times)
- the primary concentration of trade unions on improving wages and conditions
- a shift in the underlying philosophy from IR to HRM

The sociolegal framework
- Climate of opinion (public perception)
- Government legislation (loss of privileged place & preference clauses & Accord & EBAs - AWAs)
- the political links of unions (Labor Party)
- part of an international trend

Trade union leadership
- All leaders do not react in the same way to changes in the work environment or the sociolegal framework
- the British origins of the trade union movement and its effect on modus operandi
- the reporting of false figures
- the effects of amalgamation of unions
- the internal political structures & failure to modernise

Figure 68
Shister’s model
In Chapter Six it was established that in Shister’s schema there was no role for the employees or the employer to influence union growth, particularly in an active way; i.e., employers and employees are ‘dependent’ variables, not ‘independent’ variables. However, data from the Inspection Stage confirmed that these two factors are additional factors to the three interdependent factors cited by Shister and, therefore, need to be reconciled with Shister’s model to create a new conceptual framework.

The data also revealed that one further modification was required to Shister’s model when dealing with teachers in Victorian Catholic schools and why they chose to associate or not to associate within VIEU. That factor was that there was a hierarchy within the factors. Not all factors were equal when it came to influencing union density. This issue was dealt with as a preliminary consideration, in particular the importance of union leadership in influencing membership growth. The Chapter then outlines the role, respectively, of

- employees in influencing the union agenda
- employers in union growth
- teachers in influencing the union agenda

with corroborating evidence from the findings of the Exploratory and Inspection Stages of this research.

### 8.3.2 A hierarchy of factors – the importance of union leadership as a factor

Shister did not provide a hierarchy of factors, but simply stated that the three factors outlined were independent and that all three factors needed to interact to produce a result; none of the three factors could be left out of the consideration when determining the parameters that defined the strength or decline of union density. Initially there was some suggestion that he regarded leadership as a vital factor

while it is true that these forces - what we have termed the "work environment" and the "sociolegal framework" - set the limits to the relevant patterns of union growth, the actual patterns will fall somewhere within these limits; just where they fall will be determined in no small measure by the nature of union leadership. (Shister, 1953, p. 429)

However, as stated before, he did not regard leadership as the dominant factor because he regarded it was totally ineffective in the face of a combined unfavourable work environment and an unfavourable sociolegal framework

no matter how ingenious the leadership, unionism will not emerge in the lead sector if the work environment and the sociolegal framework together are sufficiently unfavorable to organization. But, by the same token, a favorable work environment and sociolegal framework will not automatically generate unionism, if the leadership does not pursue the appropriate organizing
techniques, set up the appropriate structural and administrative machinery, etc. And precisely because it is a lead sector, the leadership must consciously devise organizing techniques, etc., to meet the particular needs of this sector. (Shister, 1953, p. 431)

For Shister, union leadership was constrained within limits, these limits being set by the relevant work environment and the sociolegal framework, thereby denying any dominance of one factor over any other.

However, as the data revealed in this research, the factor of leadership was able to overcome a situation where there was an unfavourable work environment and an unfavourable sociolegal framework. The data revealed that leadership was the dominant factor of the three and was capable of overcoming the influence, even the joint influence, of the other two factors.

Cooper, as cited by Svensen, Small and Griffin (1999) points out that there is a lacuna in the Australian literature regarding the role of the unions themselves in membership growth and decline. He argues that the focus of Australian researchers has been on external variables that impact on unions, rather than the union strategies themselves. The literature review conducted for the Exploratory Stage of this research would support Cooper’s assertion. This research has demonstrated that the Australian research, in doing so, has missed an important and, most probably, dominant factor in determining union density, at least with respect to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools.

Writers such as Lucio and Simpson (1992) illustrate the general approach adopted by Australian researchers when they state that the “decline in trade unionism is therefore not solely the outcome of economic and industrial transformations, but also reflects the inability to maintain a key, effective pressure and influence at both national and workplace levels” (p. 184) ascribing a major role to the external factors of economic and industrial transformations (the workplace environment and sociolegal framework) and a secondary role to union reaction to those transformations.

Equally critical is not just whether the union leadership reacts to the situation set by the workplace environment and sociolegal framework but how the leadership reacts. Lucio and Simpson (1992) again illustrate the general approach adopted with the leadership of unions being expected to impose a solution, to apply ‘effective pressure’ to the workplace rather than being reactive to the pressures expressed by the workplace. The difference in approach is summarised neatly by Johns (2002) who outlines that the union leadership response has generally taken the path of seeking closer working relations with the government (depending on the government of the time), restructuring and reorganising or appealing to the public interest in difficult times, essentially, adopting ‘top down’, centralised
union agenda solutions to the issue of union decline rather than a grass roots solution. Cooper and Patmore (2002) summarise the research on Australian union density growth and decline theory and argue that too many unions are dependent on the work environment and sociolegal framework to deliver them membership density rather than going out and making a difference themselves.

A large body of research has been produced examining the ways in which various factors have conditioned the growth or decline of union membership. What most of it has in common, apart from the desire to explain trends in union membership, is the emphasis, sometimes exclusively, upon structures and processes which form the environment in which unionism emerges, grows and declines. The implication is that the only role that unions play in the process of membership growth or decline is that they are the organisations that members move to and from. This has the effect of portraying ‘workers (and unions) as primarily objects rather than agents of history’. The implication of such an analysis for unions in the current political and industrial environment is that they should await the election of more friendly governments, for more favourable labour market conditions to arise or for more welcoming employer policies to develop, before expecting membership fortunes to be reversed. (p. 4)

They conclude by arguing that Australian trade union growth theory, in highlighting only the range of exogenous factors to explain fluctuations in membership, has failed to recognise that trade unions, through their leaders, are active agents in shaping their own destiny (Cooper & Patmore, 2002).

Cooper’s (1999) comment on the lacuna in Australian literature regarding the role of the leadership of unions in influencing union decline was made just prior to the ACTU’s launch of the ‘Unions@Work’ campaign (ACTU, 1999). This campaign differed from previous ACTU campaign in that it focused on a recruitment strategy rather than a restructuring strategy. The ‘Unions@Work’ campaign attempted to introduce an ‘organising’ approach as opposed to a ‘servicing’ approach. It was an attempt at ‘grass roots unionism’ (Holland and Handy 2003). The fundamental differences between these two approaches is summarised in Table 54, produced in a Trade Union Training Australia (TUTA) publication, as cited by Holland and Handy (2002, p. 5).

However, many unions did not adopt the approach (Holland & Hanley, 2002) and many others remained sceptical, as Cook (2000) points out; “notwithstanding the fanfare, the ACTU’s ‘Unions at Work’ differs little from its past recruitment campaigns” (p. 1) because it was based on an imposed campaign of “glossy advertisements, promotional gimmicks (and) high-powered recruitment teams to attract members” (p. 2) rather than a genuine grass roots campaign. As Holland and Hanley (2002) state the focus of Organising Works is the development of organisers who visit the workplace ... and address issues of concern to those at the shopfloor and identify how the union movement can provide a role in addressing grievances and problems. (p. 5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Servicing Union Model</th>
<th>An Organising Union Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The union is seen as a third party. It enters the workplace to increase membership or solve problems</td>
<td>Members own the campaign to unionise their workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unions tell members how they can solve their problems</td>
<td>Members generate own issues and organise to solve them together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relying on employer to provide lists of names and workers to union official</td>
<td>Mapping the workplace and staff attitudes are crucial – names and information is provided by the workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relying on workplace access and employer cooperation</td>
<td>Initial organising can be done outside work – in workers’ homes and other places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold selling union membership by organisers</td>
<td>Establishing initial contacts and finding natural leaders to help recruit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling the union for services and insurance protection</td>
<td>Workers empowered to do it for themselves through education and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relying on full time officials to recruit and solve problems</td>
<td>An internal organising committee formed and workers encouraged to build the union through one to one organising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment is seen as a separate activity</td>
<td>Recruitment and organising are integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results are achieved but they are likely to be short term</td>
<td>Results are obtained through sustained efforts – more likely to be permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The union is blamed when it can’t get results</td>
<td>Members share decisions and solve problems together with union leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members complain when they pay fees and the union does nothing</td>
<td>Members make a real contribution to union struggles and identify with the union. An attack on the union is an attack on themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisers resent members for not coming to meetings or participating</td>
<td>The image of the union is positive and active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management acts, while the union reacts and it is always on the defensive</td>
<td>The union has its own agenda with members involved and it keeps management off balance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data from this research revealed that VIEU’s leadership not only embraced the organising model, it was already operating and using a genuine grassroots approach to unionism and in a conscious way. A number of examples arose in the focus group interview with VIEU’s leaders:

- Flinn: “Other unions talk about it (i.e., democracy as a significant factor that needs to be introduced into Australian union structures) but VIEU did it”
- Keenan: ‘In the 1990s Greg Combe and the ‘Organising Works’ model ... looked at how unions should be restructuring to be relevant and effective and to recruit and grow... they’re a bit dogmatic about it but it was just exactly what we (already) did ... we had the freedom to do (it) because we were starting with a blank sheet ... probably for a lot of unions their leadership would have liked to have been able to do what we did but it took a lot more to get to that ... about
democratic structures, shifting resources into training delegates (and) we measure all that over time, for example, the number and rate of participation in councils, training...”

- Flinn: "one of the significant benefits that VIEU had is that it got to create itself almost from nothing in a structural sense in the early 1990s and it was able to and needed to build a participative and democratic structure ... there is no reason why you cannot have a good strong democratic structure... The way in which VIEU invested in the development of its workplace delegates to the point where it’s probably one of the few unions that can claim to have a delegate in every workplace. The structural arrangements in the union really have made it a very democratic and very participative organisation.

In summary, the Exploratory Stage data revealed that leadership was a key factor in VIEU’s membership density growth and was not an equal factor in influencing that growth. Furthermore, the Inspection Stage data revealed that VIEU’s leaders were aware of the strategies that they developed, particularly the need to use participative and democratic structures in VIEU’s organisational model. While the union movement from 2000 through Unions@Work (ACTU, 1999) were recognising the need for union leadership to change its approach and actively influence the growth of unions through an ‘organising’ approach (albeit only some), VIEU, since its inception in 1994, had already been using this model of organisation.

### 8.3.3 The employee role in influencing the union agenda

Closely related to the role of VIEU’s leadership, is the role afforded to employees or the membership of VIEU as active agents in determining the growth of VIEU’s membership density. Shister only ascribes a passive role to employees as respondents to the union leadership’s agenda as illustrated

Once the union is organized, its ability to survive and grow will be conditioned, in no small measure, by the ability of the leadership to adapt the relevant group to changing socioeconomic conditions. Leadership aptness in this context encompasses (1) recognizing new conditions, (2) the elaboration of policies to meet these conditions, and (3) the persuasion of the rank and file to pursue such policies. (1953, p. 430)

As previously cited, Cooper and Patmore (2002), in line with Shister’s model, state that the common view adopted by unions is that “workers (are) primarily objects rather than agents of history” (p. 4) who have no role in shaping their own destiny. Mason and Bain (1991) challenge this assumption and, in a study of 100 British trade unions, demonstrate that it is possible for unions to increase their membership and not be constrained by socio-economic
factors provided that more than lip service is paid to recruitment by the union leadership. They argue that, if resources (budgetary and staffing) are dedicated to recruitment by the leadership and that the recruitment is done at the workplace, then success can be achieved. However, they report that “factors related to union structure ... inhibit(ed) a more concerted and imaginative approach to recruitment, and to *modus operandi* which often adhere to traditional and well-worn practices” (p. 44). The difference in approach is summed up by Cooper and Patmore (2002) in referring to the ‘organising’ model of recruitment

Proponents of the ‘organising model’ argued that unions needed to reorient their operations to dedicate resources toward growth, build workplace activism .... According to this model, member-officer relations needed to be restructured to ensure that members were active participants in unions. Thus the essential role of the official according to the model was to ‘empower’ workplace activists and build a culture of collective identity among work groups. (p. 6)

Unlike the approach of most unions to their members, as portrayed by Cooper and Patmore (2002) and Mason and Bain (1991), VIEU has built its organising structures on employee participation and a commitment to democracy. Again, as with their approach to leadership, this has been a conscious approach as evidenced by the focus group interview with VIEU’s leaders as evidenced by their comments

- James: “there is perhaps a unique way (that we) operate but it comes a little bit from the sector that we work in, the people who are our members. If we were organising ... ASU membership, you would have to operate differently because that’s who your people are”

- Keenan: “in the early days ... there were some very heated debates out in the workplace ... we tried to ignore it (the issue) and there were carloads and carloads of teachers coming in to demand that we do something”

- Flinn: “The structural arrangements in the union really have made it a very democratic and very participative organisation. I think it grows out of the profession. The profession wouldn’t tolerate anything else”

- Flinn: “members overwhelmingly forced us to take the position we did ... I thought the (issue) was a good idea but I got my head beaten in and we then ran the campaign ... a good example of where the members decided that this is something we are not going to cop ... we might be sitting back a bit distant from the workplace thinking ‘well, is this a real issue or isn’t it’ and the members just say ‘well, yes it is’”.

Several examples of campaigns were given where the members decided a campaign should be run where the central office would have let the issue slip except for direct membership pressure.
There was a recognition that the central organisers needed to be former teachers to have credibility and understanding of the school scene. In answer to the question about why VIEU had gone against the trend, Flinn answered:

> It is because ... we all came from the industry. We are committed to understanding, knowing and embedding ourselves in the culture of the industry. We are committed to changing it, but we have been fundamentally committed to hearing the voice of the members and reflecting that voice. From what I see of VIEU compared with what I see around (with other unions) that’s a really fundamental difference.

When asked how issues arose for the union campaign, the agreed answer was:

> Through the structures... organizers are in close contact with the workplace delegates and are in schools a lot. Delegates or workplace representatives are ... the voice of what goes on in the workplace. You will be told. (An amalgam of all three VIEU Secretaries’ comments on the question posed)

In summary on the point of membership as an active influence, the Exploratory Stage data revealed that teachers’ reasons for joining unions differed significantly from other employees; they had higher order needs based on solidarity rather than lower order needs based on protection from the employer or remuneration. Furthermore, the Inspection Stage data revealed that VIEU’s leaders were aware that teachers’ needs had to be addressed in their recruitment and organising strategies and that their campaigns had to be shaped, in part, by their members. The data from the Inspection Stage focus group interview of VIEU leaders revealed that this was founded in the collegial nature of the teacher profession and this demanded a collegial way of acting as a union. Again, while the union movement from 2000 through Unions@Work (ACTU, 1999) were recognising the need for union leadership to change its approach and be more participative and democratic in its organising structures, VIEU, since its inception in 1994, had already been using this model of organisation.

### 8.3.4 The employer role in union growth

As stated, in Shister’s model there was no provision for an active role for employers and, by default, he ascribed only a negative role for employers with regard to unionisation. Employers were not dealt with as a separate factor in his model being regarded as, at best, an influence on the ‘work environment’ factor. The underlying assumption was one of ‘managerial resistance’ to unions.

On the management side, successful unionization of the lead sector tends to reduce resistance in the unorganized sectors, other things being equal. If the lead sector is in competition with the unorganized sector, the danger of a competitive labor-cost disadvantage is obviously reduced. In view of the reduction of this danger, it becomes questionable whether it is worth spending considerable sums of money to “fight” unionism, notably since there is no certainty as to whether such a fight would prove successful. Further, the
resistance of management in the unorganized sector may be mitigated if it learns of real managerial benefits derived from unionism in the lead sector. Again, if some managerial sectors have already yielded, the unorganized managements (in a given industry or a given community) run little risk of being ostracized by their business and social acquaintances. That again tends to reduce managerial resistance to unionism. (Shister, 1953, pp. 423 - 433)

Indeed, the pejorative language associated with employers in Shister’s model was more closely aligned with active hostility by employers in line envisaged with Friedman in stating “whether defeat ... destroys unions depends on whether employers exploit their success through coordinated repression… to crush unions effectively (1998, p. 55). No consideration was given to the fact that employers may not have had any resistance or non-hostility to unionism.

The Exploratory Stage data revealed that the VCSA did not exploit the opportunities presented by the unfavourable sociolegal framework and that this was a conscious decision on the part of the VCSA’s leadership. The pre-Inspection Stage literature review established that there is no trade union resistance mentality in the social teachings of the Catholic Church, indeed the opposite, that there was an active requirement imposed on the Church employers to encourage associations of workers, specifically trade unions. The pre-Inspection Stage literature review also established that this active requirement was recognised by the Australian Catholic Church through the ACBC’s statements and acknowledged by the VCSA in its publications. The Inspection Stage, through the focus group interview with the VCSA Presidents in the 1994 to 2004 time period, confirmed that they were aware of the Catholic Church’s social teaching on trade unions and that it was a conscious decision to follow this teaching that had influenced their approach to trade unionism, even under duress, for example

- Burn: “(teachers have) the right to organise into associations ... trade unions and to take action to secure better wages and conditions, right through to if necessary withdraw labour ... A lot of the language of industrial relations has developed out of almost an assumption of a conflict situation ... we have always tried to be committed to a view that we are working together, that we are a community of people, that we are working out of a vision of the Church and that our preferred position is not a position of conflict or opposition but of working together”

- Brown: “we were entering in to a period of time in industrial relations where it was very adversarial and that was going across the country ... the federal government’s legislation said fight it out until one wins ... what we went through was a period of the most sustained industrial action that we had ever had ... and it got pretty nasty ... but there was always the understanding from our point of view, the VCSA’s point of view that it was important to continue
to dialogue with the unions and try and keep the door open ... there was never a question of not negotiating with them even though it became extraordinarily difficult at some times ... The federal government expressed a preference to going to AWAs which in effect lessened the power of the union ... now the VCSA was always faithful to the model that it was not prepared to go down the track of AWAs but would rather have dealt with the union and that came out of an almost unconscious belief that that was the appropriate way to go rather than have employees try and negotiate conditions for themselves on their own so it was a respect of that collective right”

- Synan: “during my time we were taken from the Victorian industrial scene in to the Commonwealth one and that was a major move. It was a move that we would have preferred not to make at the time but because of what was happening under the industrial relations legislation, we couldn’t stop it ... there was a lot of working through what both the union and ourselves would do and a lot of working together in that as to how we would approach the new situation and we were encouraging to the union in those times”.

At one level it could be argued that the VCSA’s attitude simply meant that VIEU was not subject to the full negative force of the sociolegal framework and, therefore, was not caught in the situation that Shister described of having simultaneously an unfavourable work environment and an unsupportive sociolegal framework. Hence, VIEU’s leadership was not as dominant a factor as might be assumed. However, two factors work against this explanation

- first, members’ perceptions. The period of 1997 and 1998 were times of strong industrial action in schools where VIEU deliberately created a climate of resistance to the unsupportive sociolegal framework in the minds of its members. 1997 witnessed the largest strike in Victorian Catholic schools in history. Members, in deciding whether or not to join the union would have been of the view that the sociolegal framework was unsupportive despite the favourable attitude adopted by the VCSA

- second, orchestration by VIEU. As already indicated, the leadership of VIEU used the general sociolegal climate to its advantage rather than presenting a unified approach with the employer body, the VCSA, an equally possible alternative available to it. It made the judgement that a strike was to its benefit. As Flinn noted in the VIEU focus group interview, “counter to the belief that employers have, the best thing that can ever happen to a union is to have a strike. Because you grow … if you were running a business you would have a strike every week”.
However, the position may have been different if the VCSA had taken advantage of the opportunity presented by AWAs and not continued to adhere to the Church’s social teaching on trade union activity, even when it was under duress, and duress that it considered unfair given its actual position. The data from the Exploratory Stage revealed that VIEU did not have the same success in terms of growth with non-Catholic schools. The ‘dip’ in non-VCSA schools supports the fact that its attitude assisted VIEU in maintaining membership. In the focus group interview with VIEU’s leaders, this point was reinforced in their answer to the third question ‘do you approach Catholic school employers differently to independent school employers?’ The response was “in the independent school sector what you’ve got is ... organisations that have pursued the destruction of the award as a relevant instrument”.

Importantly, the data showed that the VCSA’s attitude simply assisted VIEU to maintain its membership when the simultaneously unfavourable work environment and an unsupportive sociolegal framework combination initially commenced in 1997 (See Figure 69). The climate of a simultaneously unfavourable work environment and an unsupportive sociolegal framework combination continued until 2004 (when this research finished) and the membership started to climb from 2000, suggesting a further factor that is discussed later in this chapter.

**Figure 69**

**VIEU’s overall membership density**

Visser’s (1990, 1992) studies support this view and report that inclusive union systems tended to have higher levels of unionisation, and unions in inclusive union systems suffered less from membership losses than unions that operated in divided and fragmented systems.
In summary, the data reveals that the attitude of the employer does influence the growth of union membership, at least in terms of assisting VIEU to maintain its membership density when other non-VCSA schools declined in membership at a time when the other factors in Shister’s model, the unfavourable work environment and the unsupportive legal framework, were working against union density.

8.3.5 Shister’s model and teachers

Shister (1967), in a later paper, specifically addressed the issue of teachers and unions. He did not see teachers or their association as real unionists or real unions.

It is questionable whether one can equate these professional associations with unions, even when they are engaged in what clearly amounts to collective bargaining. It is unlikely, for instance, that they will ever affiliate with the AFL-CIO (The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, the US equivalent of the ACTU). It is a moot question whether they will spend time, effort, and money lobbying for such measures as higher minimum wages, improved unemployment insurance, etc. It is debatable whether they will support strike activity, when striking becomes the only way out, to the same extent that a union would. Only time will disclose the answers to these and related questions. For the present, however, the fact remains that these professional associations are in serious competition with regular unions. (p. 583)

Shister (1967) related this difference to the fact that teachers were white collar professionals mainly employed in the public sector and he drew a distinction between economic and non-economic issues.

It is significant that growth among professional employees should have taken place either in governmental units or in non-profit private organizations ... where the ability to keep pace with general increases in salaries and fringe benefits has been lacking. We are not implying, of course, that economic considerations alone have been responsible for organization in these sectors. Various grievances relating to non-economic matters (that is, size of classes in teaching, physical size of classrooms, the right to select texts, greater professional independence sought by social workers, etc.) have also been at play. To begin with, however, some of these grievances represent significant costs to the employing unit and can hardly be called non-economic, even though the union member does not benefit economically from the correction of the problems. (p. 583)

As in Australia, as outlined earlier, the US white collar professional associations have only emerged in the last 30 years and, therefore, were not taken into account in Shister’s model. However, the lack of incorporation of teachers and white collar professions was moot at best, given that the modus operandi of the professional associations of the 1950s and 1960s
significantly changed by the 1990s so that there was little or no discernable difference from the *modus operandi* of mainstream unions save and except for the VIEU leadership’s recognition that, as professionals, teachers needed to have a voice in the campaigns organised by the union and that they required participatory and democratic structures because of the collegial nature of the profession.

In summary, the data revealed that a hierarchy of factors did act in concert to influence VIEU’s growth and that the dominant factor was the *modus operandi* of VIEU’s leadership.

Finally, in the section that follows, two further observations are made to complete the learning journey

- the first arises from data gleaned in the Exploratory and Inspection Stages of the research and examines teachers’ sense of solidarity and VIEU leadership’s inclusion of a ‘big picture’ approach to encompass broader social issues
- the second is a reflection on organisational growth that arose from the dip that occurred in VIEU’s growth and examines Handy’s (1994) notion of the sigmoid curve to examine the general growth patterns of organisations over time.

8.4 TWO FURTHER OBSERVATIONS TO COMPLETE THE LEARNING JOURNEY

8.4.1 Teacher solidarity and their attitude to the employer

The survey conducted in the Exploratory Stage revealed that solidarity was the most popular reason given for teachers joining VIEU. The follow up survey conducted in the Inspection Stage revealed that solidarity related to VIEU having a ‘big picture’ view and addressing broader social justice issues (e.g., the common good to foster a more inclusive and just society) and not just industrial relations issues. This survey also revealed that teachers significantly agreed with the statement that VIEU should work collaboratively with employers to progress matters and avoid adversarial approaches whenever possible.

There is a strong body of evidence to indicate that individuals can show commitment to both a union and an employer simultaneously and that a positive and harmonious industrial
relations climate is often related to dual commitment or dual allegiance (Deery et. al., 1997; Deery, Iverson & Erwin 1994; Gordan & Ladd, 1990; Guest 1995; Guest & Dewe 1991; Wood 1996). This dual commitment is the result of a positive industrial relations climate that relies on harmonious union-management relations.

This co-operative atmosphere between the leadership of VIEU and the leadership of the VCSA is particularly evident in the years when Keenan was VIEU’s Secretary and union density recommenced growth after a period of plateaued membership density (1997 to 1999) following the 1997 industrial action including the largest strike in Victorian Catholic education history. In this period of harmonious industrial relations the teachers’ sense of solidarity began to encompass the employer as evidenced by the response to Statement 1 of the follow up survey in the Inspection Stage (preferably, VIEU should work collaboratively with the employers to progress matters and avoid adversarial approaches whenever possible). 61 or 79% of respondents agreed with this statement as opposed to 16 (or 21%) who disagreed with it.

Solidarity in this sense, as Schwan (1981) states

does not refer to partisans fighting for particular social perspectives and movements, it refers to the objective link between all individuals in a commonwealth as partners, and to the recognition of it ... solidarity is mutual help with a final goal of self help. It never intends to impose uniformity. On the contrary, it asks for a plurality of individual and collective intentions, endeavours and accomplishments that respects the necessary unity, order and observes the standards defined by political rights and moral duties. (pp. 9–10)

Pusic (1981) similarly defines solidarity as “the need to assist one’s fellows in need” (p. 843) and reports that a study by Bolcic in 1972 found that workers with higher education and in higher skilled positions placed a higher value on the value of solidarity than did workers who were less educated and manual workers.

The ACTU (1999) Unions@Work campaign also promoted solidarity, particularly the need of the general union movement to identify with the general population and adopt the causes associated with the general population. Johns (2002) reports that the ACTU’s Unions@Work paper reviewed the International Confederation of Free Trade Union’s 2000 Congress study on restructuring unionism and resolved that

for Australian trade unions, ... the public perception of trade unions is that they focus on labour rights only. It believes that trade unions have not been effective at defining their role in the broader social agenda. For example, often unions do not clearly explain their role in establishing and maintaining basic human rights (of which labour rights are only one component) to their own members, let alone a broader audience. It has only been recently that unions have had to justify many of their actions as union density has been in decline. Demonstrating their
role in the broader social agenda has not been a priority. These sentiments will serve to increase the divide between the two constituencies of the union movement and possibly ensure that unions become just another, albeit large NGO, rather than a representative of employees in the workplace. To this end, they will be of little use to their members and of no use to any government who, at some point, may want an avenue to speak to the workforce. (pp. 22-23)

In summary, teachers’ sense of solidarity can encompass the inclusion of broader social issues including cooperation with employers, particularly in times of harmonious industrial relations.

8.4.2 Organisational growth patterns and the sigmoid curve

This final observation is a reflection based on Handy’s (1994) model of organisational growth. While it is speculative in part, it ties back to data associated with the dip in VIEU’s overall growth between 1997 and 2000.

Handy (1994) introduced the notion of the sigmoid curve (Figure 70) to explain how organisations should plan for significant, ongoing change if they are to avoid the plateauing of growth and/or decline.

Kuhn and Marsick (2005) cite a number of writers who support the model developed by Handy. According to Handy, the S (sigmoid) shaped curve graphically represents the growth cycle of most organisations. He postulated that there is an initial period of establishment followed by a period of growth and development (slope 1). Eventually, all growth periods plateau and then decline (slope 2). The options for management at the plateau time, and before decline begins, is

Figure 70
The sigmoid curve
(Handy, 1994, p. 23)
to change approach. If the old ways continue, the decline (slope 2) occurs. If change occurs and new methods and approaches are adopted, then a new growth period (slope 3) commences and the organisation thrives before plateauing again and declining again (slope 4) without renewed, appropriate, further change. To optimise growth, change must occur at point A. He postulates that most organisations only commence change at point B, when it is too late and decline has begun. The shaded area in between Points A and B represents a time of confusion and experimentation within the organisation. If the new (experimental) methods introduced fail to immediately arrest the decline, they are abandoned for more familiar past methods that lead inevitably to decline (slope 2). Leaders have a critical role in recognising that the plateau period has arrived and that change is needed.

The pattern of growth for VIEU’s membership densities closely resembles the pattern of growth outlined by Handy in all three of the categories of membership for VIEU, as illustrated in Figure 71.
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**Figure 71**

**VIEU’s membership category union densities**

Statistics compiled from VIEU (2005c).

- the teachers’ union densities climb from 1994 (32.6%) to 1997 (35.8%) before plateauing until 1999 (36.2%) and then starting a new growth curve from 2000 (36.5%) to 2004 (50.7%)
- the non-Catholic union densities climb from 1994 (17.2%) to 1997 (20.2%) before plateauing/declining until 1999 (19.3%) and then starting a new growth curve from 2000 (20.6%) to 2004 (27.2%)

296
the Catholic non-teacher union densities climb from 1994 (15.5%) to 1996 (17.6%) before plateauing/declining until 1999 (16.0%) and then starting a new growth curve from 2000 (17.4%) to 2004 (28.7%).

Assuming that Handy’s (1994) pattern of growth is in play in VIEU’s situation, then

- one set of factors cause the growth from 1994 to 1997
- then it is a persistence with the old ways continuing from 1997 to 2000 that causes the plateauing and decline
- when change occurs in 2000 and new methods and approaches are adopted, then the new growth period commences and the organisation once more thrives.

This is in line with the data revealed in the research

- lower order needs of protection and remuneration were stressed by Flinn in his time as Secretary from 1994 to 1997. These needs met with general membership approval at that time and, consequently, there was growth
- the persistence with these older needs as a recruitment basis continue from 1997 to 2000 under Flinn but no new members were attracted (all those members attracted by such a needs basis would have been drawn in by the intense industrial action of 1997) and that caused the plateauing of teachers’ density and the decline in the other two sections of Catholic non-teachers and non-Catholic school membership
- when change occurred in 2000 with the election of Keenan, a new emphasis on higher order needs of teaching conditions and solidarity occurred, resulting in new growth and the organisation once more thrived.

Corollary evidence for this occurred in

- the recognition by James and Keenan that solidarity was an emergent reason for teachers to join VIEU as opposed to Flinn’s view (correct from his time as Secretary) that protection and pay would be higher reasons. Reinforcing this, Burn and Brown rate solidarity as a more important reason than Synan
- the fact that VIEU members of 10 years of experience or more have a significantly higher preference for solidarity as a reason for joining VIEU than teachers with 9 years of experience or less. This indicated that members seemed to join for lower order needs but, as these needs were met, they moved to higher order needs as a reason to stay
the fact that dual commitment was more likely to be accommodated in those times of harmonious industrial relations which occurred from 2000 onwards, including a capacity to include employers in the solidarity expressed by some members. Turnbull (2003) notes that ‘partnership agreements’ are beneficial to employers and employees in an environment where the employer is not in a competitive economic model with other employers to increase productivity. Considerable evidence indicates that partnership agreements “pay off” ... opposition to unionism makes sense in the absence of corporate governance structures that promote stakeholder (as opposed to shareholder) interests and public policy measures that either provide incentives for management to enter meaningful social partnership with labor or impose effective constraints on doing otherwise (Kochan & Osterman, 1994; Deakin et. al., 2002). In the absence of normative constraints or wider social obligations on the pursuit of individual self-interest, partnership agreements are more akin to a “productivity coalition” between management and unionized labor against economic outsiders. (pp. 506-507)

the fact that the ACTU’s ‘organising’ model rather than ‘servicing’ model was introduced from 2000 and this model, adopted fully by VIEU when other unions did not fully embrace it, included a grassroots approach where members had a strong say in setting the agenda, including a broader social justice agenda.

the fact that the literature review (Cameron, 1985) was divided on the issue of whether strikes have a positive or negative effect on union density rates. Strikes and industrial action would appear to have a positive effect, as indicated by the first growth curve, but there was a ceiling to this factor and continuing industrial action, or overuse of industrial action, might eventually cause decline.

8.5 CONCLUSION

In this chapter the answers obtained to the guiding questions were brought together into a coherent whole and two final observations were included to finalise the learning journey. A revision of the initial framework, based on Shister’s model, was presented. In the final chapter, this modified version of Shister’s model provides the basis for the answer to the main research question.
Chapter 9 Reconciliation of the Findings

9.1 INTRODUCTION

The focus of this research was an examination of the counter cultural trend of teachers in Catholic schools in Victoria, during the period 1994 to 2004, to associate with their union, VIEU. In this time period there was a steady increase in the membership numbers and union density rates in VIEU. Over the same historical period in Australia and worldwide there was a marked trend by employees not to associate in trade unions.

In Chapter Eight a synthesis was presented of the findings from the research and a revised conceptual framework that challenged Shister’s (1953) long-standing model. In this final chapter, the modified version of Shister’s model provides the basis for the answer to the main research question. The research is then finalised by drawing an overarching conclusion to the learning journey and formulating a number of recommendations for further research in this area as well as implications for Australia’s trade union movement.

9.2 RECONCILIATION OF ALL FACTORS EXAMINED

As stated earlier, Wiersma’s (1995) modified ‘analytic induction approach’ was used in this research. This approach examines all examples or ‘cases’ of the phenomenon in attempting to build a comprehensive descriptive model or conceptual framework; Shister’s original model was adopted as the initial conceptual framework. The data from the ‘cases’ were then tested against that framework through a three phase Exploratory Stage followed by a three phase Inspection Stage with new learnings along the journey being incorporated into the conceptual framework to resolve the research question and explain the paradox under investigation.

Initially, there was nothing in the profile of VIEU’s membership to make it atypical of union membership in Australia from 1994 to 2004. In fact, inasmuch as the Victorian Catholic education sector was predominantly

- female
- a white collar professional occupation
- in the private sector
- with a high proportion of part time workers

this profile should have led to a greater decline rather than the counter trend growth.
Additionally, the exogenous factors associated with the work environment

- the rate and pattern of economic change
- the unions’ primary concentration on improving wages and conditions
- the amalgamation of unions, and
- a shift in the underlying philosophy from IR to HRM

and the sociolegal framework

- poor public perception of unions
- oppressive government legislation causing a loss of privileged place and preference clauses
- the introduction of Accords, EBAs and AWAs
- the political links of unions, and
- the international trend

were all unfavourable to VIEU and should have led to a greater decline rather than growth.

While the reasons given by teachers for joining VIEU were exactly the same as for the general population, the rankings and relative importance of those reasons was significantly different to the general trade union population. In particular, solidarity with teachers in the school/system rated significantly higher than the other reasons for joining and the most demographic divergent groups on the issue of solidarity were respondents with 10 or more or 9 years’ experience or less. This was in line with the factor that VIEU arose out of professional associations rather than mainstream unions.

The Exploratory Stage revealed eight factors that were unique to the Victorian Catholic education context and, therefore, could singly or collectively form the basis of an explanation for why teachers in Victorian Catholic schools have gone against the trend by choosing to become members of their union. These remaining possible explanations were coalesced and two themes emerged, namely there was a conscious leadership influence in both VIEU’s and the VCSA’s executives that was at odds with the approaches taken by their respective counterparts and that the different mindset of, and motivators for, teachers vis-à-vis other workers had influenced the recruitment strategies of VIEU.

Finally, the growth pattern for VIEU’s membership density was not consistent but closely resembled the pattern of the sigmoid curve, suggesting that different factors influenced the early and the latter stages of VIEU’s growth. In particular, the dip that occurred in independent schools and in Catholic non-teacher membership was consistent with different motivation needs and a change in the *modus operandi* of VIEU’s leadership.
No contextual, demographic, exogenic factor or reason given for joining unions ran against this cohesive explanation once Shister’s model was adapted to allow for an active role for employees and for the employer. In doing so, a comprehensive conceptual framework can be established to provide an explanation to the issue under study. That revised conceptual framework is outlined in the next section.

9.3 A NEW PRESENTATION OF SHISTER’S MODEL

Shister’s framework is not totally dismantled because it is acceptable in a variety of scenarios, particularly where the employer attitude is negative (as he assumes) and the employees are neutral or inactive in attempting to influence union policy and strategy (as he assumes). This reconceptualisation, based on the findings on this research, focuses on the situations where the employer attitude is positive and the employee attitude is active.

Commencing with the situation where the work environment is favourable (e.g., there is economic prosperity, labour is in demand and the union is successfully organising in proximate locations) or the sociolegal framework is supportive of unions (e.g., closed shops, preference clauses, the sole right to be the bargainer), then growth is occurring and the employer attitude is largely irrelevant. The employer is forced to deal with the union, whether they like it or not, whether they are supportive of unions or not, either as a result of the economic imperative or the legal mandate. Only poor union leadership impedes growth if it fails to capitalise on these favourable circumstances.

The employer attitude is only a factor when the work environment is unfavourable and/or the sociolegal framework is unsupportive because it can act as a countervailing balance by not taking advantage of poor economic times (not allowing capital to dominate labour) or unfavourable sociolegal frameworks (continuing to negotiate with the union under no compulsion). It is not an independent variable but a dependent variable capable of mollifying the impact of an unfavourable work environment and/or an unsupportive sociolegal framework.

In terms of the employee attitude, the reconceptualised framework challenges Shister’s premise that worker dissatisfaction is not an independent variable but derived from dissatisfaction with the work environment or sociolegal framework. No thought has been given to worker dissatisfaction with the leadership of the union or, more significantly, in this research, with worker satisfaction with the agenda and style of the union’s leadership. Accordingly, Shister provided no separate classification for employee influence (dissatisfaction or
satisfaction). However, Shister noted that as worker dissatisfaction was generated, their propensity to unionise was increased, thus

- dissatisfaction with the work environment due to an unfavourable work environment provides a potential for growth, and
- dissatisfaction with the sociolegal framework due to an unsupportive sociolegal framework provides a potential for growth

provided that the leadership was astute enough to capitalise on the situation. If the leadership of the union was not astute, then the potential growth was not realised. Alternately, if the union leadership was astute, then the potential growth was realised.

The ‘astuteness’ of the union leadership is associated with

- their knowledge of the reality of the situation. Are they aware that the work environment and/or the sociolegal framework are providing the potential for union growth?
- their knowledge of their members’ state of mind
- their willingness to allow members to influence union policy and strategy.

The flow diagram (Figure 72 - A New Conceptual Framework) that follows outlines the reconceptualised framework based on the findings of this research

- it does not regard the three factors as equal. The data demonstrated that leadership was the dominant factor and could overcome the other two factors of an unfavourable work environment and an unsupportive sociolegal framework
- it does not regard the three factors as interdependent given that they are not equal. The commencing point (in the centre of the diagram) for the flow diagram is the interaction of the work environment and sociolegal framework.

The continuing points of the flow diagram reflect the effects that the union leadership has on those two factors

- the new factor of employer support is introduced but only in a situation to countervail the effects of an unfavourable work environment and/or unsupportive sociolegal framework. It has no contributory effect (given that the effect would not be countervailing in this situation) where the work environment is favourable and the sociolegal framework is supportive
- the new factor of employee influence is introduced as a force that measures the ‘astuteness’ of the union leadership, ultimately determining whether the union membership is poor or good. Good leadership is based on knowledge of the members’ needs and adopting appropriate strategies to meet those needs, thereby affording active and influential (not a dependent) role to employees.
Optimal growth in union density occurs when all 3 interdependent factors are working in favour of the union:
- A favourable work environment
- A supportive socio-legal framework
- Good union leadership

Optimal growth in union density can also occur when the 2 exogenous factors are unfavourable but are counterbalanced by good union leadership (= members' needs & employer relationship)

**Figure 72**
A new conceptual framework of the determinants of union growth
9.4 DETERMINANTS OF VIEU’S COUNTER CULTURAL TREND

The main research question was, what factors have contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union?

Its resolution lies in a number of factors that are interdependent but not equal. Leadership of the union is the dominant factor in association with an active role for VIEU’s members and a cooperative relationship with the employer in times when the other exogenous factors are unfavourable.

In other words, ‘good union leadership’ was the dominant factor and had the potential to overcome the other two factors of an unfavourable work environment and an unsupportive sociolegal framework. ‘Good union leadership’ has the capacity to overcome the decline of union density in Australia and to assist unions to avoid “the real risk that the movement could soon become an historical footnote from the industrial age” (Lewis, 2000, p. 151).

9.5 SOME REFLECTIONS ON WHAT CONSTITUTES GOOD LEADERSHIP

9.5.1 A contemporary understanding of what constitutes ‘good leadership’

In answering the research question, it was concluded from the data that ‘good union leadership’ was needed to overcome the union density decline prevalent during the period of the research in the Australian context. However, if Australia’s union movement is to respond to these findings, it begs the question ‘what is good union leadership?’

To answer this question, a literature review of the development of the contemporary understandings of leadership was conducted and is included in Chapter Six. In this section, having reviewed the key findings of that literature review, a definition of what constitutes ‘good leadership’ in the current context is attempted. Finally an examination of whether VIEU measured up to that definition is then outlined.

The literature review completed in Chapter Six outlined the development of leadership theory and concluded with a brief summary of the contemporary understanding of what constitutes ‘good leadership’. As leadership theory developed, successive layers of
understanding were added to the requirements for what constitutes good leadership. The contemporary sense of good leadership is that it

- is more than an inherent individual characteristic (e.g., Mann, as cited by Hoy & Miskel, 1978, p. 177)
- considers both the task at hand and the needs of the people (or followers) of the organisation (e.g., Halpin & Winer, 1957)
- is flexible and responsive to the situation (e.g., Fiedler, 1971)
- can inspire transformational change (e.g., Burns, 1978)
- goes beyond a set of technical skills that can be acquired or developed (e.g., Peters & Waterman, 1982)
- has a clearly communicated vision for the way forward (e.g., Sashkin, 1988)
- empowers and develops followers (e.g., Peters, 1998)
- is value driven (e.g., Sergiovanni, 1990)
- has a moral purpose (e.g., Fullan, 2001) and
- is authentic or distributed and follower-inclusive (e.g., George, 2003).

9.5.2 A leadership definition derived from the research

Despite this unfolding understanding of leadership, no universally accepted definition of leadership has emerged. As Bennis and Nanus (1985) state, following a comprehensive review of leadership literature

decades of academic analysis have given us over 350 definitions of leadership. Literally thousands of empirical investigations of leaders have been conducted ... but no clear and unequivocal understanding exists as to what distinguishes leaders from non-leaders and, perhaps more important, what distinguishes effective leaders from ineffective leaders. (p. 4)

More recently, Boydell et. al. (2004) report that the issue had simply become worse and not better. Their search of an Ebso site found that articles on leadership had grown exponentially, from 136 in 1970/71, to 258 in 1980/81, to 1,105 in 1990/91 and then to an astounding 10,062 in 2001/02 equating to an average of 419 articles a month. As Storey (2004) adds, in commenting on their findings, despite this deluge of literature there has been no consensus on what constitutes ‘good leadership’ and there is still far more diversity than commonality among writers on this issue.

However, given the developmental themes that emerged from the literature review, the definition that has been accepted to guide this section is a combination of four writers’ views, each reflecting a stage reached in the maturing of our current understanding of leadership
first, Packard’s oft cited definition that leadership is “the art of getting others to want to do something that you are convinced should be done” (1962, p. 170) reflecting the perspective that a leader must have at least the technical skills (basic competency) to be a ‘good leader’

second, Burns’ (1978) that “leadership brings about real change that leaders intend” (p. 414) reflecting the perspective that, in addition to basic competency, a leader must have a vision or purpose to be a ‘good leader’

third, Bennis and Nanus’s (1985) that “leadership seems to be the marshalling of skills possessed by a majority but used by a minority. It's something that can be learned by anyone, taught to everyone, denied to no one” (p. 27) reflecting the perspective that, beyond basic competency and a vision, a leader must be adaptive and follower-inclusive to be a ‘good leader’ and

finally, Hargreaves and Fink’s (2006) that “leadership ... begins with a strong and unswerving sense of moral purpose” (p. 23) reflecting the perspective that, in addition to all of the above attributes, a leader must be ‘authentic’ to be a ‘good leader’.

In this definition, it is implicit that leaders can make a difference, as a result of a conscious decision, by using strategies that can be learned to make them more effective. However, to be authentic, the desired end must be ethical in that it focuses on the common good and not the promotion of self.

Having reviewed the key findings of the literature review and accepted a working definition of what constitutes ‘good leadership’ for the purposes of this research, the final part of this section examines how VIEU’s formal leadership group measured up to that definition.

9.5.3 What constitutes ‘good union leadership’ in the current context

Measuring VIEU leadership’s performance against this broad definition illustrates why this leadership group was able to overcome the two factors of an unfavourable work environment and an unsupportive sociolegal framework and successfully increase its union density while most other unions were in decline. VIEU’s leadership was able to

• get others to want to do something that they were convinced should be done with grounded technical skills (e.g., use of the latest technology in recruitment and retention strategies); i.e., they possessed and used basic competencies
• bring about real, intended change by balancing the task (recruitment) with the needs of the people in the organisation (members and potential members); i.e., they possessed a vision that complemented their basic competencies
• marshal the skills of the majority by employing the follower inclusive strategies of distributed leadership
• bring a strong and unswerving sense of moral purpose (solidarity) by employing ‘authentic’ leadership acceptable to their members.

It should be noted that in VIEU’s case, the argument for selecting the right leadership (recognising desirable attributes) was not applicable because the Secretaries of unions were elected officials and not appointed by the Executive (also elected) except inasmuch as the Executive, or any other group running a ticket for election, should ensure that the nominated person had the appropriate technical skills and vision.

As the data from the Inspection Stage showed, VIEU leadership measured up to that criteria revealed by the literature review. This is illustrated by a number of strategies and practices adopted by the leadership group. VIEU’s leadership over the period 1994 to 2004 consistently operated using a number of underpinning principles and practices.

• know your clients. VIEU had in place structures to gauge the current needs and attitudes of their members, particularly teachers, giving them an active role in determining VIEU policy and strategy
• a democratic and participatory approach. VIEU’s leadership consciously established a participative and democratic structure when other unions simply afforded lip service to this commitment. There was a recognition that teachers had a collegial approach and that the union needed to honour and mirror this approach when engaging members. VIEU also avoided structures that mitigated against a democratic and participatory approach
• know your industry. VIEU’s leadership was aware that schools were different to most workplaces. There were set breaks when access to members could be optimised
• specific retention practices were used so that mobile members were tracked and not lost because of a change in workplace
• underpinning these approaches was an attitude that members’ views changed and, therefore, they needed to be constantly monitored and included in the direction taken by VIEU as an organisation.
‘Good union leadership’, in the context of a school environment, meant honouring the ethos of the membership, as professionals, to ensure that members’ views were heard and that members were aware that their views had been heard. Accordingly, VIEU’s leadership did not try to design policies, campaigns and strategies and then work out how to sell them to members but rather, engaged with members and gave them an active role in determining VIEU’s policies, campaigns and strategies.

‘Good union leadership’, in the context of a Catholic environment, meant making strategic alliances when necessary. It meant recognising the ethos of the employer, as members of the Catholic Church with a commitment to the Church’s social teaching in the area of work and employment relations, to ensure that the employers’ stance was taken into consideration when designing policies, campaigns and strategies; this recognition was particularly important when the two groups’ positions were at odds. Accordingly, VIEU’s leadership used the employers’ position to protect and reinforce the effectiveness of its own position.

Without wanting to overstate the case, Galbraith’s (1997) observation is pertinent:

All of the great leaders have had one characteristic in common: it was the willingness to confront unequivocally the major anxiety of their people in their time. This, and not much else, is the essence of leadership. (p. 330)

It is without question that VIEU’s leadership from 1994 to 2004 confronted the trade union issue of their time, the apparently inexorable decline in union membership, in an industry where the demographic profile was clearly against them. They overcame the problem of declining union density with a potential membership base in the private sector, with white collar workers who were predominantly female and had a higher than normal part time ratio.

9.6 RECOMMENDATIONS

9.6.1 Implications for Australia’s trade union movement

This research's findings have provided a significant theoretical implication in the area of the growth of unions by revising the long-standing and well-accepted model proposed by Shister (1953), as demonstrated earlier. It revealed that strong leadership can overcome unfavourable growth conditions. Subject to the limitations expressed later, it also has implications for the modus operandi of the trade union movement in Australia if it is to remain relevant in current society.
Specifically, locally based union leaders

- need to systematically research the needs of their industry and incorporate those needs in their approach (the work environment including the employers’ needs and the sociolegal framework including current societal needs)
- need to systematically research the needs of their members and potential members, recognising that higher order needs replace lower order needs as motivational factors, and incorporate those needs in their approach
- allow members to genuinely influence the policies and practices of their union
- recognise that authentic and effective leadership is not about convincing followers to adopt the leadership’s pre-determined top-down strategy.

The ACTU as the peak union body

- would do well to revisit its ‘Unions@Work’ campaign (ACTU, 1999) and re-encourage an ‘organising’ approach as opposed to a ‘servicing’ approach. However, rather than imposing the model, it needs to convince union leaders of its efficacy so that they adopt this approach and own it at a ‘grassroots’ level
- acknowledge Bennis and Nanus’s (1985) view that leadership is "something that can be learned by anyone, taught to everyone, denied to no one" (p. 27) and put in place training programmes for leaders that foster ‘good union leadership’; leadership beyond basic competency and a top down vision, to a local-needs, adaptive and member-inclusive approach.

9.6.2 Further research

The capacity of practitioners to generalise the findings, will be strengthened by two clarifying pieces of research, as suggested below.

1 On the relative impact of the leadership strategies adopted by VIEU

This research has been limited to a trade union, VIEU, working within the Victorian Catholic school context from 1994 to 2004. Further research centred on the union density rates of other IEUA branches in other states within the same time period should allow some comparison of the effect of the leadership factor depending on what strategies have been used by these branches. Specifically, if data were available for an IEUA state branch that chose not to adopt the same attitude as VIEU, then some assessment of this leadership factor could be usefully made given that the modifying effect of the employer should be the same in each state.
2 On the relative impact of the attitude adopted by the VCSA

Should the data be available from VIEU in the period 1994 to 2004, then research involving any different attitudes adopted by employers in non-Catholic Independent schools could prove valuable in determining the effect of the modifying factor of the employer on some of the exogenous factors. Specifically, if data were available for those non-Catholic Independent employers’ schools that chose to adopt the same attitude as the VCSA as compared with those non-Catholic Independent employers’ schools who chose to take up the opportunity offered by AWAs, then some assessment of this modifying influence could be usefully made, given that the leadership strategies adopted by VIEU should be the same in all non-Catholic Independent schools.

9.6.3 Generalising the findings

This research has been limited to a particular trade union, VIEU, working within the Victorian Catholic school context from 1994 to 2004. The findings do not purport to present a panacea to the problem of union density decline in the Australia trade union movement. Teachers have specific needs, higher order needs associated with the mindset of the teaching profession. So, for example, addressing the issue of solidarity (with a broader social issues, not just industrial issues approach) to all employees who may, instead, need to have met their lower order needs of protection from the employer or inadequate wages met, will most probably fail. However, the research provides significant hope for the trade union movement in Australia. If unions are to avoid “the real risk that the movement could soon become an historical footnote from the industrial age” (Lewis, 2000, p. 151), then the example of VIEU provides some hope. For the general trade union movement, genuine researching and addressing the particular needs of members and potential members at a particular time is the learning from this research.

9.7 CONCLUSION

Researchers in this area have concentrated on the exogenous factors associated with the decline of trade unions in Australia (Cooper, as cited Svensen et. al., 1999) by concentrating on the demographic, contextual, historical, political and economic factors, among others, that have impacted upon trade unions in Australia and worldwide. They have attempted to discover a factor or factors in concert acting outside of Australia’s trade unions and outside of their control upon which to ‘blame’ this apparently exorable decline. In doing so, they have overlooked the role of unions themselves, and, in particular, the role that the effectiveness of union leadership
has played in this decline. Poor leadership, if it has not actually contributed to or exacerbated the decline by adopting ineffective strategies or sticking with outmoded strategies or by simply adopting a ‘head-in-the-sand’ approach and waiting for the wheel to turn on a downhill slope, has at least failed to arrest that decline when it was within its power to do so.

As this research has demonstrated, in the Victorian Catholic education context, astute leadership was not only capable of arresting the decline, it was capable of reversing the decline and producing growth when nearly all of the exogenous factors were stacked against it; by moderating the effects of some of the exogenous factors with strategic alliances and, more importantly, by optimising the impact of those endogenous factors within its control, particularly by overtly recognising and meeting the particular needs of its members.
Appendix A

TABLES ASSOCIATED WITH CHAPTER 1

Table A1
VIEU’s membership numbers and membership density from 1994 to 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Catholic teachers</th>
<th>VIEU members</th>
<th>Union density %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>11,743</td>
<td>4,253</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>11,834</td>
<td>4,359</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>11,967</td>
<td>4,635</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>12,041</td>
<td>4,861</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>12,390</td>
<td>5,103</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>12,765</td>
<td>5,279</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>13,038</td>
<td>5,892</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>13,355</td>
<td>6,409</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>13,567</td>
<td>6,962</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>13,739</td>
<td>7,763</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics compiled from the CEOM for teachers in Victorian Catholic schools and from VIEU (2005c) for VIEU members.

Table A2
A comparison of membership densities between the overall Australian workforce, the education sector of the Australian workforce and VIEU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>The total Australian workforce</th>
<th>The education sector of the Australian workforce</th>
<th>VIEU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics compiled from ABS (1999, 2002a, 2004a) for the total workforce and for the education sector workforce. Statistics compiled from VIEU (2005c) for VIEU members.
### Appendix B

**GLOSSARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australian</strong></td>
<td>&quot;The WorkPlace Relations Act (1996) provides for … AWAs. These agreements are made between an employer and an individual employee … an AWA operates to the exclusion of any award … (state…or…federal) … and prevails over conditions of employment specified in any state law” (Ronalds, 1997, pp 584-585).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workplace</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awards</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Legally enforceable determinations … of industrial tribunals that set terms of employment. Awards are the traditional way of setting minimum pay and conditions in Australia” (ABS, 2001, p. 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Award</strong></td>
<td>The series of wage fixing principles used in Australia since 1991.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restructuring</strong></td>
<td>“In 1991 the Australian Industrial Relations Commission introduced a series of bargaining principles (the Restructuring and Efficiency Principle, the Structural Efficiency Principle, and the Enterprise Bargaining Principle) which provided a framework for decentralised bargaining and workplace reform” (ABS, 2004b, p. 11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collective</strong></td>
<td>“a written agreement concluded between one or more employers or an employers' organisation on the one hand, and one or more workers' organisations of any kind on the other, with a view to determining the conditions of individual employment, and in certain cases, to the regulation of other questions relative to employment” (ABS, 2001, p. 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bargaining</strong></td>
<td>see Enterprise Bargaining.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee</strong></td>
<td>“a person who works for a public or private employer and receives remuneration in wages, salary, a retainer fee by their employer …”. (ABS, 2002b, p.1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Employer**       | “a person who employs workers under a contract of employment … An employer exercises some control over employees, is responsible for the payment of salary or wages and for providing safe working
conditions, and has the power to dismiss employees”. (Yerbury & Karlsson, 1992, p.113).

**Enterprise Bargaining**

“a process of direct negotiation in a particular enterprise between the employer and the employee – or more usually their unions”. (Yerbury & Karlsson, 1992, p.117). Also interchangeably used in the literature with collective bargaining.

**Enterprise Agreement**

“an agreement between employer and employees of their union(s) regarding wages, conditions, work practices, etc., in a particular enterprise, usually as a result of enterprise bargaining”. (Yerbury & Karlsson, 1992, p.116). see also Collective Agreement.

**Independent School**

a non-government school where the employer is not the Catholic Church through a Religious Order, Bishop or Parish Priest.

**Non-teacher/teaching staff**

an employee that is not a teacher or a principal of the school (eg an Education Assistant, School Officer, Psychologist, etc.).

**Trade Union**

“is an organization consisting predominantly of employees. The principal activities of a trade union include the negotiation of rates of pay and conditions of employment for its members. (ABS, 2002a, p.1).

**Trade union Member**

“is an employee with membership in a trade union relating to their current job.” (ABS, 2002a, p.1).

**Trade union Membership rate**

“is the proportion of a specified group of employees who are trade union members.” (ABS, 2002, p.1). This is used interchangeably used in the literature with union density.

**Union density**

“the proportion of potential members who are actually current members of a trade union.” (Yerbury & Karlsson, 1992, p.360).
Appendix C

EXPLORATORY STAGE SURVEY


Would you please complete ALL questions by circling the appropriate answer

Personal Background Information

Are you :-
(a) currently a Primary or a Secondary school teacher

P  S
(b) male or female

M  F
(c) a teacher with more than 10 years of experience

9 or less   10 or more
(d) Full time or Part time

F  P
(e) in the Melbourne Archdiocese or in a country Diocese

Melb  Country

Questionnaire

1. Are you currently a member of VIEU.  Yes  No

2. Have you joined for the first time this year - 2006.  Yes  No

3. If you have answered “Yes” to question one, please indicate whether any of the suggestions (A to G) was a reason to join

A: protection from the employer  Yes  No

B: improving pay  Yes  No

C: improving teaching conditions (eg reduced workload) Yes  No

D: services such as credit facilities, insurance (health, property, etc.), discount purchasing, professional indemnity, professional development  Yes  No

E: ideological belief in unions and/or politics  Yes  No

F: solidarity with teachers in the school and the system  Yes  No

G: Any other reason (if other than A to F)

If you have answered “Yes” more than once in this question, please rank your “Yes” replies with 1 being the most significant for you.

1       2       3       4       5       6

Ranks (letter) ... ... ... ... ... ...
4. If you have answered “No” to question one (ie you are not a member of VIEU), please indicate whether any of the suggestions (A to G) was a reason not to join

A: no need for protection from the employer  Yes  No
B: adequate wages  Yes  No
C: adequate conditions  Yes  No
D: no need for any direct or indirect services offered by VIEU  Yes  No
E: ideological belief regarding unions and/or politics  Yes  No
F: no need for solidarity with other teachers in the school and the system  Yes  No

G: Any other reason (if other than A to F)

........................................................................................................................................

If you have answered “Yes” more than once in this question, please rank your “Yes” replies with 1 being the most significant for you.

   1    2    3    4    5    6

Ranks (letter)  ...  ...  ...  ...  ...  ...

5. If you have answered “No” to question one, have you ever been a member of VIEU.

   Yes  No

Would you be willing to participate in a short individual (max 15 minute) or group focus follow-up interview on these issues, with the researcher? The interview would be recorded for the benefit of transcript. However, you would not be identified as an individual in the transcript. If “Yes” please supply your contact arrangements.

Yes  No

Contact details: ...............................................................

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

Please put the completed questionnaire in the REPLY PAID envelope supplied and post it (no stamp required) or return it to your Principal.

THANK YOU IN ANTICIPATION FOR YOUR TIME AND HELP
Date

Dear Principal

Included in this envelope is a number of survey forms with reply paid envelopes. Sufficient forms, covering letters and envelopes have been included to cover all teachers in your school.

The survey is being conducted by the Australian Catholic University as part of an ACU study exploring union membership of teachers in Catholic schools in Victoria during the period 1993 – 2005.

The project has the approval and support of VIEU, the Catholic Education Offices in Victoria and the Victorian Catholic Schools Association (VCSA). Both VIEU and VCSA hope to gain a better working understanding from this project. Additionally this study has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at Australian Catholic University.

The questionnaire will only take a few minutes of your teachers’ time to complete and respondents will be anonymous unless they choose to be part of a follow up interview.

A high response rate is important to the success of this project. Your prompt cooperation and participation is greatly appreciated.

Any questions regarding this project can be directed to me on 02 9701 4357. The findings of the research will be made available at the completion of the research project to VIEU and to the VCSA.

Please take a few minutes now to distribute the questionnaires to all of your teachers, both full time and part time. Teachers will be asked to return the questionnaire in the reply paid envelope by (date).

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Associate Professor Deirdre J Duncan

School of Educational Leadership
INFORMATION LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS


SUPERVISORS: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR DEIRDRE DUNCAN
DR GAYLE SPRY

PROGRAMME: DOCTOR OF PHILOSPHICY

Dear Participant,

We are conducting an Australian Catholic University project. The research project is examining why teachers in Victorian Catholic schools choose to join or not to join their union, the Victorian Independent Education Union (VIEU). The project is supported by VIEU and by the Catholic Education Offices in Victoria through the Victorian Catholic Schools Association (VCSA), the employer association in Victoria. Both VIEU and VCSA hope to gain a better working understanding from this project.

The attached survey will only take a few minutes of your time to complete. Please return it in the postage-paid reply envelope. A range of other methods of collecting data will be used as part of the overall research design, including historical document research, this survey, individual interviews and focus group interviews that will include the main participants in employment relations in Victorian Catholic schools. At the conclusion of the survey you may indicate that you consent to be further involved in this study by volunteering to be interviewed, either individually or as a member of a focus group.

PLEASE BE ASSURED THAT YOUR RESPONSE TO THIS SURVEY WILL BE HELD IN STRICT CONFIDENCE AND THAT ONLY AGGREGATED STATISTICS WILL BE USED. THERE IS NO NEED TO IDENTIFY YOURSELF OR YOUR SCHOOL. WHILE THE SURVEY IS ANONYMOUS, FILLING IN AND RETURNING THE SURVEY WILL CONSTITUTE VOLUNTARY CONSENT.

All of the questions can be answered by circling the response you consider appropriate.

Your response is important. The accuracy of the study depends heavily upon your response, to ensure the views and opinions reflect the majority view. The findings of the research will be made available at the completion of the research project to VIEU and to the VCSA.
Your cooperation is appreciated. Any questions regarding this project should be directed to the main Supervisor, Associate Professor Deirdre Duncan on telephone number 02 9701 4357 in the School of Educational Leadership, ACU.

This study has been approved by the Research Ethics Committee at Australian Catholic University. In the event that you have any complaint or concern about the way you have been treated during the study, or if you have any query that the Supervisor has not been able to satisfy, you may write to the

Chair of the Human Research Ethics Committee
C/o Research Services
Australian Catholic University
Melbourne Campus
Locked Bag 4115
FITZROY VIC 3065
Tel : 03 9953 3158
Fax : 03 9953 3315

Any complaint or concern will be treated in confidence and fully investigated. You will be informed of the outcome.

Please take a few minutes now to complete the questionnaire and return it in the reply paid envelope by (date).

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Associate Professor Deirdre J Duncan
School of Educational Leadership

Dr Gayle Spry
School of Educational Leadership
Inspection Stage
Focus Group Questions.

VIEU focus group

1. Are you aware of the Catholic Church’s social teaching in the area of trade unions?
2. Has this influenced the way you have conducted employment relations with the employer?
3. Do you approach Catholic school employers differently to independent school employers?
4. Has the fact that the VIEU started out as a professional association rather than a union had any lasting impact on what you offer as a union?
5. Which of the 6 reasons from the survey do you believe is the most popular reason why teachers join the union?
6. Which of the 6 reasons from the survey do you believe is the least popular reason why teachers join the union?
7. Do you believe there would be any significant differences between any of the 5 demographic factors (in the survey) in the reasons for joining the union?
8. Do you believe you are different to the traditional or mainstream union?
9. Have any of these factors influenced your recruitment/retention campaigns?
10. Do you have different recruitment and retention strategies?
11. What factors do you believe have contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union?

VCSA focus group

1. Are you aware of the Catholic Church’s social teaching in the area of trade unions?
2. Has this influenced the way you have conducted employment relations with the union?
3. Which of the 6 reasons from the survey do you believe is the most popular reason why teachers join the union?
4. Which of the 6 reasons from the survey do you believe is the least popular reason why teachers join the union?
5. Do you believe there would be any significant differences between any of the 5 demographic factors (in the survey) in the reasons for joining the union?
6. Do you believe VIEU is different to the traditional or mainstream union?
7. What factors do you believe have contributed to teachers in Victorian Catholic schools going against the general trend by choosing to associate in their union?
### Table D1
**Sample v population - Chi² analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary &amp; Secondary</th>
<th>Male &amp; Female</th>
<th>Full time &amp; Part Time</th>
<th>Metropolitan &amp; Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.651</td>
<td>0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total variance</strong></td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>2.407</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi²</td>
<td>2.6963</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.9116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance level at 0.01 = Accept Ho.**
**Table D2**

**VIEU members v population - Chi² analysis**

| Ho = There is no significant difference between VIEU members in the sample and the population in terms of their demographic characteristics: Primary/secondary, Male/Female, Full time/Part Time and Metropolitan/Country. |
|---|---|---|---|
| H1 = There is a significant difference between VIEU members in the sample and the population in terms of their demographic characteristics: Primary/secondary, Male/Female, Full time/Part Time and Metropolitan/Country. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary &amp; Secondary</th>
<th>Male &amp; Female</th>
<th>Full time &amp; Part Time</th>
<th>Metropolitan &amp; Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0070</td>
<td>0.0033</td>
<td>1.1034</td>
<td>0.0343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0074</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td>2.4105</td>
<td>0.1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td>0.0045</td>
<td>3.5139</td>
<td>0.1351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi²</td>
<td>3.6679</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance level at 0.01 = Accept Ho.

**Table D3**

**VIEU members v sample - Chi² analysis**

| Ho = There is no significant difference between VIEU members in the sample and the whole sample in terms of their demographic characteristics: Primary/secondary, Male/Female, Full time/Part Time and Metropolitan/Country. |
|---|---|---|---|
| H1 = There is a significant difference between VIEU members in the sample and the whole sample in terms of their demographic characteristics: Primary/secondary, Male/Female, Full time/Part Time and Metropolitan/Country. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary &amp; Secondary</th>
<th>Male &amp; Female</th>
<th>Full time &amp; Part Time</th>
<th>Metropolitan &amp; Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0237</td>
<td>0.0059</td>
<td>0.0297</td>
<td>0.0068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0247</td>
<td>0.0022</td>
<td>0.0930</td>
<td>0.0177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0484</td>
<td>0.0081</td>
<td>0.1227</td>
<td>0.0245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi²</td>
<td>0.2036</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.9999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance level at 0.01 = Accept Ho.
### Table D4

**Question 3A: Protection from the employer**

**Overall responses**

3. If you have answered Yes to question one, please indicate whether any of the suggestions (A to G) was a reason to join

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A: protection from the employer</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No &amp; Yes</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null response</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2625</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D5

**Question 3B: Improving pay**

**Overall responses**

3. If you have answered Yes to question one, please indicate whether any of the suggestions (A to G) was a reason to join

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B: Improving pay</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No &amp; Yes</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null response</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2625</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D6
Question 3C: Improving teaching conditions
Overall responses

3. If you have answered Yes to question one, please indicate whether any of the suggestions (A to G) was a reason to join
   C: improving teaching conditions (eg reduced workload)  Yes  No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses for all 2,625 VIEU members who responded</th>
<th>% of responses for Reason C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No &amp; Yes</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null response</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D7
Question 3D: Services such as credit facilities, etc.
Overall responses

3. If you have answered Yes to question one, please indicate whether any of the suggestions (A to G) was a reason to join
   D: services such as credit facilities, insurance, etc. Yes  No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses for all 2,625 VIEU members who responded</th>
<th>% of responses for Reason D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No &amp; Yes</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null response</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D8

Question 3E: Ideological belief in unions and/or politics

Overall responses

3. If you have answered Yes to question one, please indicate whether any of the suggestions (A to G) was a reason to join

E: ideological belief in unions and/or politics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses for all 2,625 VIEU members who responded</th>
<th>% of responses for Reason E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 1</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 2</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 3</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 4</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 5</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No &amp; Yes</td>
<td>1,827</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null response</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D9

Question 3F: Solidarity with teachers in the school and the system

Overall responses

3. If you have answered Yes to question one, please indicate whether any of the suggestions (A to G) was a reason to join

F: solidarity with teachers in the school and the system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses for all 2,625 VIEU members who responded</th>
<th>% of responses for Reason F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 1</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 2</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 3</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 4</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 5</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No &amp; Yes</td>
<td>2,102</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null response</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D10
**Question 3G: Any other reason**

Overall responses

3. If you have answered Yes to question one, please indicate whether any of the suggestions (A to G) was a reason to join

- **G:** Any other reason (if other than A to F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses for all 2,625 VIEU members who responded</th>
<th>% of responses for Reason G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No &amp; Yes</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null response</td>
<td>2,502</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table D11**

**Question 3**

Overall responses: Yes and No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses for relevant 2,625 VIEU members who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: protection from the employer</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Improving pay</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: improving teaching conditions (eg workload)</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: services such as credit facilities, insurance, etc.</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: ideological belief in unions and/or politics</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: solidarity with teachers in school/system</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: any other reason (if other than A to F)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes for Chapter 5, Table 24
In addition to the 2,209 ‘rank 1’ responses there were 416 ‘non-rank 1’ responses making up the 2,625 VIEU members’ responses. These 416 responses consisted of:

- 274 responses that had no ‘rank 1’ because their response gave 2 or more equal ‘rank 1’ votes or 2 or more rank unallocated responses which resulted in them being averaged and, therefore, on all occasions being allocated an equal ‘rank 2’, ‘rank 3’ or ‘rank 4’
- 139 blank responses where no reasons were given
- 3 responses listed 1 or more No responses without then giving either any Yes response or their own response under option ‘G’.

Table D12
Question 3A. Protection from the employer
Primary v Secondary responses
Chi² analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance

- Pearson Chi² = 8.639 (c)
- Likelihood ratio = 8.656

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significance Chi²</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 cells (0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 192.50

Significance level at 0.010
Reject Ho. There is a significant difference in the total of ‘Yes’ –v- ‘No’ responses.
Table D13
Question 3A. Protection from the employer
9 years or less experience v 10 years or more experience
Chi² analysis

**Ho** = There is no significant difference between respondents with 9 years or less experience and respondents with 10 years of more experience for the ranks assigned to the option, Protection from the employer.

**H1** = There is a significant difference between respondents with 9 years or less experience and respondents with 10 years or more experience for the ranks assigned to the option, Protection from the employer

**H1 a:** within the overall rankings for Yes and No

**H1 b:** within the Yes rankings only

### Table: H1 a: Difference within the rankings: Yes and No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 9 yrs</td>
<td>≥ 10 yrs</td>
<td>≤ 9 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 1</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance**
- **Pearson Chi²** 32.623(a)  df 6  Asymp.Sig. (2 sided) 0.000
- **Likelihood ratio** 35.699  df 6  Asymp.Sig. (2 sided) 0.000

**a.** 0 cells (0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.26

Significance level at 0.010
Reject Ho. There is a significant difference within the overall rankings for Yes and No.

### Table: H1 b: Difference within the Yes rankings only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 9 yrs</td>
<td>≥ 10 yrs</td>
<td>≤ 9 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 1</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance**
- **Pearson Chi²** 31.589(b)  df 5  Asymp.Sig. (2 sided) 0.000
- **Likelihood ratio** 35.040  df 5  Asymp.Sig. (2 sided) 0.000

**b.** 0 cells (0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.50

Significance level at 0.010
Reject Ho. There is a significant difference within the Yes rankings only
Table D14
Question 3A. Protection from the employer
Metropolitan v Country responses
Chi² analysis

Ho = There is no significant difference between Metropolitan and Country respondents for the ranks assigned to the option, Protection from the employer.

H1 = There is a significant difference between Metropolitan and Country respondents for the ranks assigned to the option, Protection from the employer within the Yes rankings only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 1</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 2</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 3</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 4</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance Value | df | Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi² | 15.177(b) | 5 | 0.010
Likelihood ratio | 15.759 | 5 | 0.008

0 cells (0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.22

Significance level at 0.010
Reject Ho. There is a significant difference within the Yes rankings only.
**Table D15**  
**Question 3B. Improving pay**  
**Primary v Secondary responses**  
**Chi² analysis**

**Ho** = There is no significant difference between Primary and Secondary respondents for the ranks assigned to the option, *Improving pay*.

**H1** = There is a significant difference between Primary and Secondary respondents for the ranks assigned to the option, *Improving pay*

a: within the overall rankings for Yes and No  
b: within the Yes rankings only

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 2</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>7.876</td>
<td>8.552</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 3</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 4</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>6.849</td>
<td>7.437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.487</td>
<td>2.701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.616</td>
<td>1.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>19.641</td>
<td>21.326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Chi²</td>
<td>40.967(a)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likelihood ratio</td>
<td>41.241</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.51

Significance level at 0.010
Reject Ho. There is a significant difference within the overall rankings for Yes and No.

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 2</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>7.273</td>
<td>8.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 3</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 4</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>7.231</td>
<td>7.958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.623</td>
<td>2.887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.664</td>
<td>1.831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>19.259</td>
<td>21.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Chi²</td>
<td>40.454(b)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likelihood ratio</td>
<td>40.704</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. 0 cells (0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.43

Significance level at 0.010
Reject Ho. There is a significant difference within the Yes rankings only
Table D16

Question 3C. Improving teaching conditions
Primary v Secondary responses
Chi² analysis

Ho = There is no significant difference between Primary and Secondary respondents for the ranks assigned to the option, Improving teaching conditions.
H1 = There is a significant difference between Primary and Secondary respondents for the ranks assigned to the option, Improving teaching conditions
   a: within the overall rankings for Yes and No
   b: within the Yes rankings only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 1</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 2</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 3</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>1,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance Value df Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi² 21.882(a) 6 0.001
Likelihood ratio 23.519 6 0.001

a. 2 cells (14.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.93
Significance level at 0.010
Reject Ho. There is a significant difference within the overall rankings for Yes and No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 1</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 2</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 3</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance Value df Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi² 21.472(b) 5 0.001
Likelihood ratio 23.114 5 0.000

b. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.93
Significance level at 0.010
Reject Ho. There is a significant difference within the Yes rankings only.
Table D17

**Question 3C. Improving teaching conditions**

**Male v Female responses**

**Chi² analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ho</th>
<th>There is no significant difference between Male and Female respondents for the ranks assigned to the option, Improving teaching conditions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>There is a significant difference between Male and Female respondents for the ranks assigned to the option, Improving teaching conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a:</td>
<td>within the overall rankings for Yes and No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b:</td>
<td>within the Yes rankings only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### H1 a: Difference within the rankings: Yes and No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 2</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 3</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi²</td>
<td>32.391(a)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 2 cells (14.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.11

Reject Ho. There is a significant difference within the overall rankings for Yes and No.

### H1 b: Difference within the Yes rankings only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 2</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 3</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>1,323</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi²</td>
<td>28.320(b)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.08

Significance level at 0.010

Reject Ho. There is a significant difference within the Yes rankings only
Table D18

Question 3C. Improving conditions
9 years or less experience v 10 years or more experience
Chi² analysis

Ho = There is no significant difference between respondents with 9 years or less experience and respondents with 10 years or more experience for the ranks assigned to the option, Improving teaching conditions.

H1 = There is a significant difference between respondents with 9 years or less experience and respondents with 10 years or more experience for the ranks assigned to the option, Improving teaching conditions

a: within the overall rankings for Yes and No
b: in the total of Yes v No responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 9 yrs</td>
<td>≥ 10 yrs</td>
<td>≤ 9 yrs</td>
<td>≥ 10 yrs</td>
<td>≤ 9 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>6.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 2</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>2.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>1.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>14.631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance Value df Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)

Pearson Chi² 18.878(a) 6 0.004
Likelihood ratio 18.425 6 0.005

a. 2 cells (14.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 0.90
Reject Ho. There is a significant difference within the overall rankings for Yes and No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 9 yrs</td>
<td>≥ 10 yrs</td>
<td>≤ 9 yrs</td>
<td>≥ 10 yrs</td>
<td>≤ 9 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>6.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>0.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>7.392</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance Value df Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)

Pearson Chi² 9.538(c) 1 0.002
Likelihood ratio 8.745 1 0.003

b. 0 cells (0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 29.69
Significance level at 0.010
Reject Ho. There is a significant difference in the total of Yes v No responses.
**Question 3D. Services such as credit facilities, etc.**

9 years or less experience v 10 years or more experience

**Chi² analysis**

\[ H_0 = \text{There is no significant difference between respondents with 9 years or less experience and respondents with 10 years or more experience for the ranks assigned to the option, Direct Services.} \]

\[ H_1 = \text{There is a significant difference between respondents with 9 years or less experience and respondents with 10 years or more experience for the ranks assigned to the option, Direct Services} \]

\[ a: \text{within the overall rankings for Yes and No} \]

\[ b: \text{within the Yes rankings only} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 9 yrs</td>
<td>≥ 10 yrs</td>
<td>≤ 9 yrs</td>
<td>≥ 10 yrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>1.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>18.072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi²</td>
<td>23.406(a)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood ratio</td>
<td>22.865</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ a. 0 \text{ cells (0\%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.60} \]

Reject Ho. There is a significant difference within the overall rankings for Yes and No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 9 yrs</td>
<td>≥ 10 yrs</td>
<td>≤ 9 yrs</td>
<td>≥ 10 yrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>9.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>16.977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi²</td>
<td>21.517(b)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood ratio</td>
<td>19.825</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ b. 0 \text{ cells (0\%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.15} \]

Significance level at 0.010

Reject Ho. There is a significant difference within the Yes rankings only.
Table D20

Question 3E. Ideological belief in unions
Primary v Secondary responses
Chi² analysis

Ho = There is no significant difference between Primary and Secondary respondents for the ranks assigned to the option, Ideological belief in unions.
H₁ = There is a significant difference between Primary and Secondary respondents for the ranks assigned to the option, Ideological belief in unions
   a: within the overall rankings for Yes and No
   b: in the total of Yes v No responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed Primary</th>
<th>Observed Secondary</th>
<th>Expected Primary</th>
<th>Expected Secondary</th>
<th>Variance Primary</th>
<th>Variance Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>7.561</td>
<td>7.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 1</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>6.771</td>
<td>6.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 2</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>1.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>17.522</td>
<td>17.389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance Value df Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi² 34.911(a) 6 0.000
Likelihood ratio 35.070 6 0.000

a. 0 cells (0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 35.86
Reject Ho. There is a significant difference within the overall rankings for Yes and No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed Primary</th>
<th>Observed Secondary</th>
<th>Expected Primary</th>
<th>Expected Secondary</th>
<th>Variance Primary</th>
<th>Variance Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance Value df Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)
Pearson Chi² 20.223(c) 1 0.000
Likelihood ratio 20.302 1 0.000

b. 0 cells (0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 232.11
Significance level at 0.010
Reject Ho. There is a significant difference in the total of Yes v No responses.
**Table D21**

**Question 3E. Ideological belief in unions**

9 years or less experience v 10 years or more experience

**Chi² analysis**

| Ho | There is no significant difference between respondents with 9 years or less and 10 years or more experience for the ranks assigned to the option, Ideological belief in unions. |
| H1 | There is a significant difference between respondents with 9 years or less and 10 years or more experience for the ranks assigned to the option, Ideological belief in unions |
| a | within the overall rankings for Yes and No |
| b | within the Yes rankings only |
| c | in the total of Yes v No responses. |

| H1 a: Difference within the rankings: Yes and No |
| Observed | Expected | Variance |
| ≤ 9 yrs | ≥ 10 yrs | ≤ 9 yrs | ≥ 10 yrs | ≤ 9 yrs | ≥ 10 yrs |
| No | 144 | 322 | 101 | 365 | 18.567 | 5.121 |
| Yes: rank 1 | 70 | 384 | 98 | 356 | 8.076 | 2.228 |
| Yes: rank 2 | 41 | 279 | 69 | 251 | 11.482 | 3.167 |
| Yes: rank 3 | 55 | 158 | 46 | 167 | 1.739 | 0.480 |
| Yes: rank 4 | 40 | 146 | 40 | 146 | 0.001 | 0.000 |
| Yes: rank 5 | 33 | 83 | 25 | 91 | 2.502 | 0.690 |
| Yes: rank 6 | 12 | 60 | 16 | 56 | 0.817 | 0.225 |
| Total | 395 | 1,432 | 395 | 1,432 | 43.183 | 11.912 |

| Significance | Value | df | Asymp.Sig. (2 sided) |
| Pearson Chi² | 55.095(a) | 6 | 0.000 |
| Likelihood ratio | 55.596 | 6 | 0.000 |

- 0 cells (0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.57
- Reject Ho. There is a significant difference within the overall rankings for Yes and No.

| H1 b: Difference within the Yes rankings only |
| Observed | Expected | Variance |
| ≤ 9 yrs | ≥ 10 yrs | ≤ 9 yrs | ≥ 10 yrs | ≤ 9 yrs | ≥ 10 yrs |
| Yes: rank 1 | 70 | 384 | 84 | 370 | 2.251 | 0.509 |
| Yes: rank 2 | 41 | 279 | 59 | 261 | 5.500 | 1.244 |
| Yes: rank 3 | 55 | 158 | 39 | 174 | 6.289 | 1.422 |
| Yes: rank 4 | 40 | 146 | 34 | 152 | 0.946 | 0.214 |
| Yes: rank 5 | 33 | 83 | 21 | 95 | 6.297 | 1.424 |
| Yes: rank 6 | 12 | 60 | 13 | 59 | 0.123 | 0.028 |
| Total | 251 | 1,110 | 251 | 1,110 | 21.406 | 4.841 |

| Significance | Value | df | Asymp.Sig. (2 sided) |
| Pearson Chi² | 26.247(b) | 5 | 0.000 |
| Likelihood ratio | 25.470 | 5 | 0.000 |

- 0 cells (0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.28
- Significance level at 0.010
- Reject Ho. There is a significant difference within the Yes rankings only

| H1 c: Difference in the total of Yes v No responses |
| Observed | Expected | Variance |
| ≤ 9 yrs | ≥ 10 yrs | ≤ 9 yrs | ≥ 10 yrs | ≤ 9 yrs | ≥ 10 yrs |
| No | 144 | 322 | 101 | 365 | 18.567 | 5.121 |
| Yes | 251 | 1,110 | 294 | 1,067 | 6.357 | 1.754 |
| Total | 395 | 1,432 | 395 | 1,432 | 24.924 | 6.875 |

| Significance | Value | df | Asymp.Sig. (2 sided) |
| Pearson Chi² | 31.798(c) | 1 | 0.000 |
| Likelihood ratio | 30.126 | 1 | 0.000 |

- 0 cells (0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 100.75
- Significance level at 0.010
- Reject Ho. There is a significant difference in the total of Yes v No responses.

---
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Table D22
Question 3F. Solidarity with teachers in the school or system
Primary v Secondary responses
Chi² analysis

Ho = There is no significant difference between Primary and Secondary respondents for the ranks assigned to the option, Solidarity with teachers.
H¹ = There is a significant difference between Primary and Secondary respondents for the ranks assigned to the option, Solidarity with teachers
   a: within the overall rankings for Yes and No
   b: within the Yes rankings only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 1</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 2</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 3</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 4</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>1,058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi²</td>
<td>19.169(a)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood ratio</td>
<td>19.360</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.82
Reject Ho. There is a significant difference within the overall rankings for Yes and No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 1</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 2</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 3</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 4</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi²</td>
<td>18.310(b)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood ratio</td>
<td>18.501</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. 0 cells (0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 27.00
Significance level at 0.010
Reject Ho. There is a significant difference within the Yes rankings only
Table D23
Question 3F. Solidarity with teachers in the school or system
9 years or less experience v 10 years or more experience

**Chi² analysis**

| Ho = There is no significant difference between respondents with 9 or less and 10 years or more years’ experience for the ranks assigned to the option, Solidarity with teachers. |
| H1 = There is a significant difference between respondents with 9 or less and 10 years or more years’ experience for the ranks assigned to the option, Solidarity with teachers |
| a: within the overall rankings for Yes and No |
| b: within the Yes rankings only |
| c: in the total of Yes v No responses. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H1 a: Difference within the rankings: Yes and No</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 9 yrs</td>
<td>&gt; 10 yrs</td>
<td>&lt; 9 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi²</td>
<td>134.227(a)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood ratio</td>
<td>121.824</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.40
Reject Ho. There is a significant difference within the overall rankings for Yes and No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H1 b: Difference within the Yes rankings only</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 9 yrs</td>
<td>&gt; 10 yrs</td>
<td>&lt; 9 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi²</td>
<td>40.622(b)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood ratio</td>
<td>40.765</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. 0 cells (0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.89
Significance level at 0.010
Reject Ho. There is a significant difference within the Yes rankings only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H1 c: Difference in the total of Yes v No responses</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 9 yrs</td>
<td>&gt; 10 yrs</td>
<td>&lt; 9 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi²</td>
<td>98.324(c)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood ratio</td>
<td>81.059</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. 0 cells (0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 39.69
Significance level at 0.010
Reject Ho. There is a significant difference in the total of Yes v No responses.
Table D24
Question 3F. Solidarity with teachers in the school or system
Full time v part time
Chi² analysis

Ho = There is no significant difference between full time and part time respondents for the
ranks assigned to the option, Solidarity with teachers.
H1 = There is a significant difference between full time and part time respondents for the
ranks assigned to the option, Solidarity with teachers
a: within the overall rankings for Yes and No
b: within the Yes rankings only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>Part time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.673</td>
<td>2.256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 1</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2.893</td>
<td>9.696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 2</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 3</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 4</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 5</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>2.357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,619</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>1,619</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>4.764</td>
<td>15.969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance Value df Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)  
Pearson Chi²  20.734(a)  6  0.002  
Likelihood ratio  20.671  6  0.002

a. 0 cells (0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.41
Reject Ho. There is a significant difference within the overall rankings for Yes and No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>Part time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 1</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>2.432</td>
<td>7.905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 2</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>1.117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 3</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 4</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>1.291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 5</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: rank 6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>2.560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>4.047</td>
<td>13.156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance Value df Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)  
Pearson Chi²  17.202(b)  5  0.004  
Likelihood ratio  17.254  5  0.004

b. 0 cells (0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.70
Significance level at 0.010
Reject Ho. There is a significant difference within the Yes rankings only
Table D25
Summary of Chi\(^2\) tests of significance between demographic factors
Difference within the rankings: Yes and No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Demographic factor</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Chi(^2)</td>
<td>Likelihood ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving tch conditions</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving tch conditions</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Primary v secondary</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving tch conditions</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not significant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving tch conditions</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving tch conditions</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>0.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>0.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table D26
Summary of Chi² tests of significance between demographic factors
Difference within the Yes rankings only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Demographic factor</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Chi²</td>
<td>Likelihood ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving tch conditions</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving tch conditions</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not significant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving tch conditions</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>0.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving tch conditions</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>0.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>0.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>0.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving tch conditions</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>0.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table D27**  
Summary of Chi² tests of significance between demographic factors  
Difference in the total of Yes v No responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Demographic factor</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Chi²</td>
<td>Likelihood ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving tch conditions</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not significant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving tch conditions</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving tch conditions</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>0.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving tch conditions</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>0.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving tch conditions</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>0.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>0.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>0.530</td>
<td>0.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>0.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>0.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>0.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>Full time v part time</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table D28
**Question 3A: Protection from the employer**
**9 years or less experience v 10 years or more experience**
**Means and Medians – ANOVAs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ho</th>
<th>There is no significant difference between respondents with 9 or less years of experience and respondents with 10 or more years of experience for the mean rank assigned to the option, Protection from the employer.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>There is a significant difference between respondents with 9 or less years of experience and respondents with 10 or more years of experience for the mean rank assigned to the option, Protection from the employer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>9 or less years</th>
<th>10 or more years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>1356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means and Medians</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Group median</th>
<th>Std. error of mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 or less</td>
<td>2.351</td>
<td>1.293</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.190</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>2.839</td>
<td>1.515</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.717</td>
<td>1.477</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.594</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups (combined)</td>
<td>60.476</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.476</td>
<td>28.267</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance level at 0.010

Reject Ho. Respondents with 9 or less years of experience are more likely to assign a higher rank (\( \bar{X} = 2.351 \)) to the option, Protection from the employer, than respondents with 10 or more years of experience (\( \bar{X} = 2.839 \))
Table D29
Question 3B: Improving pay
Primary v Secondary
Means and Medians – ANOVAs

Ho = There is no significant difference between Primary and Secondary respondents for the mean rank assigned to the option, Improving pay.

H1 = There is a significant difference between Primary and Secondary respondents for the mean rank assigned to the option, Improving pay.

Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>1,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means and Medians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School type</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Group median</th>
<th>Std. error of mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>2.721</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.634</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>3.051</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.020</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.878</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of squares (combined)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>41.439</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.439</td>
<td>32.601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance level at 0.010

Reject Ho. Primary respondents are more likely to assign a higher rank ($\bar{X} = 2.721$) to the option, Improving pay, than Secondary respondents ($\bar{X} = 3.051$).
Table D30
Question 3B: Improving pay
9 years or less experience v 10 years or more experience
Means and Medians – ANOVAs

Ho = There is no significant difference between respondents with 9 or less years of experience and respondents with 10 or more years of experience for the mean rank assigned to the option, Improving pay.

H1 = There is a significant difference between respondents with 9 or less years of experience and respondents with 10 or more years of experience for the mean rank assigned to the option, Improving pay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>9 or less years</th>
<th>10 or more years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>1,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means and Medians</th>
<th>9 or less</th>
<th>10 or more</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 or less</td>
<td>2.720</td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>2.926</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.878</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups (combined)</td>
<td>11.464</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.464</td>
<td>8.882</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance level at 0.010
Reject Ho. Respondents 9 or less years of experience are more likely to assign a higher rank (\( \bar{X} = 2.720 \)) to the option, Improving pay, than respondents 10 or more years of experience (\( \bar{X} = 2.926 \)).
**Table D31**  
*Question 3B: Improving pay*  
*Metropolitan v Country*  
*Means and Medians – ANOVAs*

**Ho** = There is no significant difference between Metropolitan and Country respondents for the mean rank assigned to the option, Improving pay.

**H1** = There is a significant difference between Metropolitan and Country respondents for the mean rank assigned to the option, Improving pay.

### Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Metropolitan</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>1,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Means and Medians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Group median</th>
<th>Std. error of mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>2.823</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.745</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>3.035</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.962</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.878</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups (combined)</td>
<td>13.209</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.209</td>
<td>10.242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance level at 0.010

Reject Ho. Metropolitan respondents are more likely to assign a higher rank ($\bar{X} = 2.823$) to the option, Improving pay, than Country respondents ($\bar{X} = 3.035$)
**Table D32**

**Question 3B: Improving teaching conditions**

**Primary v Secondary**

**Means and Medians - ANOVAs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ho</th>
<th>There is no significant difference between Primary and Secondary respondents for the mean rank assigned to the option, Improving teaching conditions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>There is a significant difference between Primary and Secondary respondents for the mean rank assigned to the option, Improving teaching conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>1,815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Means and Medians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School type</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Group median</th>
<th>Std. error of mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>2.260</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.219</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>2.475</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.437</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.364</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.325</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups (combined)</td>
<td>21.020</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.020</td>
<td>18.633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance level at 0.010

Reject Ho. Primary respondents are more likely to assign a higher rank ($\bar{X} = 2.260$) to the option, Improving teaching conditions, than Secondary respondents ($\bar{X} = 2.475$)
Ho = There is no significant difference between Female and Male respondents for the mean rank assigned to the option, Improving teaching conditions.

H1 = There is a significant difference between Female and Male respondents for the mean rank assigned to the option, Improving teaching conditions.

### Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,323</strong></td>
<td><strong>492</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,815</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Means and Medians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Group median</th>
<th>Std. error of mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.289</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.252</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.565</td>
<td>1.132</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.527</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.364</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.067</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.325</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.025</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of squares (combined)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.230</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.230</td>
<td>24.211</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance level at 0.010

Reject Ho. Female respondents are more likely to assign a higher rank (\( \bar{X} = 2.289 \)) to the option, Improving teaching conditions, than Male respondents (\( \bar{X} = 2.565 \))
Question 3D: Services such as credit facilities, etc.
9 years or less experience  v 10 years or more experience
Means and Medians - ANOVAs

Ho = There is no significant difference between respondents with 9 or less years of experience and respondents with 10 or more years of experience for the mean rank assigned to the option, services such as credit facilities, insurance (health, property, etc.), discount purchasing, professional indemnity, professional development.

H1 = There is a significant difference between respondents with 9 or less years of experience and respondents with 10 or more years of experience for the mean rank assigned to the option, services such as credit facilities, insurance (health, property, etc.), discount purchasing, professional indemnity, professional development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>9 or less years</th>
<th>10 or more years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means and Medians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Group median</th>
<th>Std. error of mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 or less</td>
<td>3.361</td>
<td>1.671</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.377</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>3.859</td>
<td>1.517</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.903</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.754</td>
<td>1.563</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.807</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups (combined)</td>
<td>35.182</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.182</td>
<td>14.640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance level at 0.010
Reject Ho. Respondents with 9 or less years of experience are more likely to assign a higher rank ( \( \bar{X} = 3.361 \) ) to the option, Direct Services, than respondents with 10 or more years of experience ( \( \bar{X} = 3.859 \) )
Table D35
Question 3E: Ideological belief in unions and/or politics
Primary v Secondary
Means and Medians – ANOVAs

**Ho** = There is no significant difference between Primary and Secondary respondents for the mean rank assigned to the option, ideological belief in unions and/or politics.

**H1** = There is a significant difference between Primary and Secondary respondents for the mean rank assigned to the option, ideological belief in unions and/or politics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Yes</strong></td>
<td>636</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>1,361</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School type</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Group median</th>
<th>Std. error of mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>2.731</td>
<td>1.573</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.472</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>2.417</td>
<td>1.473</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.059</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2.564</td>
<td>1.528</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups (combined)</td>
<td>33.527</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.527</td>
<td>14.505</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance level at 0.010

Reject Ho. Secondary respondents are more likely to assign a higher rank ($\bar{X} = 2.417$) to the option, ideological belief in unions and/or politics, than Primary respondents ($\bar{X} = 2.731$).
Table D36
Question 3E: Ideological belief in unions and/or politics
9 years or less experience v 10 years or more experience
Means and Medians - ANOVAs

Ho = There is no significant difference between respondents with 9 or less years of experience and respondents with 10 or more years of experience for the mean rank assigned to the option, ideological belief in unions and/or politics.

H1 = There is a significant difference between respondents with 9 or less years of experience and respondents with 10 or more years of experience for the mean rank assigned to the option, ideological belief in unions and/or politics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>9 or less years</th>
<th>10 or more years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>1,361</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means and Medians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Group median</th>
<th>Std. error of mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 or less</td>
<td>2.845</td>
<td>1.543</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.729</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>1.518</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.144</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.564</td>
<td>1.528</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups (combined)</td>
<td>24.312</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.312</td>
<td>10.487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance level at 0.010

Reject Ho. Respondents with 10 or more years of experience are more likely to assign a higher rank ($\bar{X} = 2.500$) to the option, ideological belief in unions and/or politics, than respondents with 9 or less years of experience ($\bar{X} = 2.845$).
**Table D37**

**Question 3F: Solidarity with teachers in the school and the system**  
**Primary v Secondary**  
**Means and Medians - ANOVAs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>1,896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Means and Medians**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School type</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Group median</th>
<th>Std. error of mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>2.479</td>
<td>1.364</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.275</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>2.691</td>
<td>1.472</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.486</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.585</td>
<td>1.423</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.381</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups (combined)</td>
<td>21.309</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.309</td>
<td>10.579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance level at 0.010

Reject Ho.  
Primary respondents are more likely to assign a higher rank ($\bar{X} = 2.479$) to the option, solidarity with teachers in the school and the system, than Secondary respondents ($\bar{X} = 2.691$).
Table D38  
Question 3F: Solidarity with teachers in the school and the system  
9 years or less experience v 10 years or more experience  
Means and Medians - ANOVAs

Ho = There is no significant difference between respondents with 9 or less years of experience and respondents with 10 or more years of experience for the mean rank assigned to the option, solidarity with teachers in the school and the system.

H1 = There is a significant difference between respondents with 9 or less years of experience and respondents with 10 or more years of experience for the mean rank assigned to the option, solidarity with teachers in the school and the system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>9 or less years</th>
<th>10 or more years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>1,896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Group median</th>
<th>Std. error of mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 or less</td>
<td>3.042</td>
<td>1.448</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>2.495</td>
<td>1.401</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.258</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.585</td>
<td>1.423</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.381</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups (combined)</td>
<td>77.911</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77.911</td>
<td>39.262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance level at 0.010

Reject Ho. Respondents with 10 or more years of experience are more likely to assign a higher rank ($\bar{X} = 2.495$) to the option, solidarity with teachers in the school and the system, than respondents with 9 or less years of experience ($\bar{X} = 3.042$).
Table D39
Question 3F: Solidarity with teachers in the school and the system
Full time v part time
Means and Medians - ANOVAs

Ho = There is no significant difference between respondents who were part time and full time teachers for the mean rank assigned to the option, solidarity with teachers in the school and the system.

H1 = There is a significant difference between respondents who were part time and full time teachers for the mean rank assigned to the option, solidarity with teachers in the school and the system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Full time</th>
<th>Part time</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>1,896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means and Medians</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Group median</th>
<th>Std. error of mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>1.427</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.457</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.397</td>
<td>1.396</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.109</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.585</td>
<td>1.423</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.381</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>20.624</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.624</td>
<td>10.237</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance level at 0.010
Reject Ho. Respondents who were part time teachers are more likely to assign a higher rank ($\bar{X} = 2.397$) to the option, solidarity with teachers in the school and the system, than respondents who were full time teachers ($\bar{X} = 2.643$).
### Summary of ANOVA tests of significance between demographic factors

#### Difference in means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Demographic factor</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving teaching conditions</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving teaching conditions</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Full time v Part time</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>Full time v Part time</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving teaching conditions</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>Primary v Secondary</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>≤9 or ≥10 years of exp.</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>Full time v Part time</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in unions</td>
<td>Full time v Part time</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarity with teachers</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving pay</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other reason</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct services</td>
<td>Full time v Part time</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving teaching conditions</td>
<td>Metropolitan v Country</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from employer</td>
<td>Male v Female</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving teaching conditions</td>
<td>Full time v Part time</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table D41
**Question 4A: No need for protection from the employer**

**Overall responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses for all 930 non-members of VIEU who responded</th>
<th>% of responses for Reason A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No &amp; Yes</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null response</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D42
**Question 4B: Adequate wages**

**Overall responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses for all 930 non-members of VIEU who responded</th>
<th>% of responses for Reason B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No &amp; Yes</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null response</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D43

Question 4C: Adequate conditions

Overall responses

4. If you have answered No to question one (i.e. you are not a member of VIEU), please indicate whether any of the suggestions (A to G) was a reason not to join

C: adequate conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses for all 930 non-members of VIEU who responded</th>
<th>% of responses for Reason C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No &amp; Yes</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null response</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D44

Question 4D: No need for any direct or indirect services offered by VIEU

Overall responses

4. If you have answered No to question one (i.e. you are not a member of VIEU), please indicate whether any of the suggestions (A to G) was a reason not to join

D: no need for any direct or indirect services offered By VIEU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses for all 930 non-members of VIEU who responded</th>
<th>% of responses for Reason D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No &amp; Yes</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null response</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D45
Question 4E: Ideological belief regarding unions and/or politics
Overall responses

4. If you have answered No to question one (i.e. you are not a member of VIEU), please indicate whether any of the suggestions (A to G) was a reason not to join E: ideological belief regarding unions and/or politics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses for all 930 non-members of VIEU who responded</th>
<th>% of responses for Reason E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No &amp; Yes</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null response</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D46
Question 4F: No need for solidarity with other teachers in the school or the system
Overall responses

4. If you have answered No to question one (i.e. you are not a member of VIEU), please indicate whether any of the suggestions (A to G) was a reason not to join F: no need for solidarity with other teachers in the school and the system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses for all 930 non-members of VIEU who responded</th>
<th>% of responses for Reason F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No &amp; Yes</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null response</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D47
Question 4G: Any other reason (if other than A to F)
Overall responses

4. If you have answered No to question one (i.e. you are not a member of VIEU), please indicate whether any of the suggestions (A to G) was a reason not to join

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses for all 930 non-members of VIEU who responded</th>
<th>% of responses for Reason G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes : rank 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own reason</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yes</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No &amp; Yes</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null response</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D48
Question 4G: Any other reason
Summary of other reasons given

The 482 “any other reason” responses could be grouped into 12 categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of all 428 own reasons given</th>
<th>% of responses for all 930 non-members of VIEU who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous history with VIEU/unions</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was member: may/intend to rejoin</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union is ineffective</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time / casual</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not asked – thinking of it</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Admin/ leadership team</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral decision</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of another union</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Religious Order</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: own reason</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null response</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D49
Question 4
Overall responses: Yes and No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>null</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>null</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: no need for protection from the employer</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: adequate wages</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: adequate conditions</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: no need for any direct or indirect services offered by VIEU</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: ideological belief regarding unions and/or politics</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: no need for solidarity with other teachers in the school and the system</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: any other reason (if other than A to F)</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D50
Question 4
Overall responses: Yes including ranks and No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>rank 1</th>
<th>rank 2</th>
<th>rank 3</th>
<th>rank 4</th>
<th>rank 5</th>
<th>rank 6</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: no need for protection from the employer</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: adequate wages</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: adequate conditions</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: no need for any direct or indirect services offered by VIEU</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: ideological belief regarding unions and/or politics</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: no need for solidarity with other teachers in the school and the system</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: any other reason (if other than A to F)</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals : Rank 1</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated Rank 1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall total</td>
<td>930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table D51
**Question 4**

**Rank for reason chosen by frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Reason option</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of responses for relevant 930 non-VIEU members who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>G: any other reason (if other than A to F)</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>E: ideological belief regarding unions and/or politics</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A: no need for protection from the employer</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>C: adequate conditions</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>D: no need for any direct or indirect services offered by VIEU</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B: adequate wages</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F: no need for solidarity with other teachers in the school and the system</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D52
**Question 4**

**Mean for each option**

*In alphabetical order*

*Using Yes = 3, Null = 2 and No = 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Null</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: no need for protection from the employer</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>1.9871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: adequate wages</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>1.9183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: adequate conditions</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>1.9925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: no need for any direct or indirect services offered by VIEU</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1.9882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: ideological belief regarding unions and/or politics</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1.9806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: no need for solidarity with other teachers in the school and the system</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>1.7226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: Any other reason (if other than A to F)</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>2.5183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table D53

**Question 4**

Mean for each option

In rank order

Using Yes = 3, Null = 2 and No = 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G: any other reason (if other than A to F)</td>
<td>2.5183</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: adequate conditions</td>
<td>1.9925</td>
<td>0.7029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: no need for any direct or indirect services offered by VIEU</td>
<td>1.9882</td>
<td>0.7043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: no need for protection from the employer</td>
<td>1.9871</td>
<td>0.7217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: ideological belief regarding unions and/or politics</td>
<td>1.9806</td>
<td>0.7494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: adequate wages</td>
<td>1.9183</td>
<td>0.6818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: no need for solidarity with other teachers in the school and the system</td>
<td>1.7226</td>
<td>0.5928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D54

**Question 4**

Measures of central tendency (mean, median, grouped median and mode) for each option

Yes responses only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Reason option</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Grouped median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A: no need for protection from the employer</td>
<td>2.2246</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1223</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B: adequate wages</td>
<td>2.5856</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5426</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C: adequate conditions</td>
<td>2.4513</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3972</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D: no need for any direct or indirect services offered by VIEU</td>
<td>2.5378</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4530</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E: ideological belief regarding unions and/or politics</td>
<td>1.7262</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4697</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F: no need for solidarity with other teachers in the school / system</td>
<td>3.5857</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5143</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D55
Question 4
Measures of central tendency (mean, median, group median and mode) for each option in rank order. Yes responses only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Median Value</th>
<th>Median Rank</th>
<th>Grouped median Value</th>
<th>Grouped median Rank</th>
<th>Mode Value</th>
<th>Mode Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E: ideological belief regarding unions and/or politics</td>
<td>1.7262</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4697</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4697</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4697</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: no need for protection from the employer</td>
<td>2.2246</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1223</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1223</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1223</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: adequate conditions</td>
<td>2.4513</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3972</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3972</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3972</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: no need for any direct or indirect services offered by VIEU</td>
<td>2.5378</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4530</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4530</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4530</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: adequate wages</td>
<td>2.5856</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5426</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5426</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5426</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: no need for solidarity with other teachers in the school and the system</td>
<td>3.5857</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5143</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5143</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5143</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D56
Question 4
Means for each option comparing those achieved by using Yes, Null and No responses with those achieved using Yes responses only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Using Yes, Null and No responses</th>
<th>Using Yes responses only and the ranks within the Yes response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: adequate conditions</td>
<td>1.9925</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: no need for any direct or indirect services offered by VIEU</td>
<td>1.9882</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: no need for protection from the employer</td>
<td>1.9871</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: ideological belief regarding unions and/or politics</td>
<td>1.9806</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: adequate wages</td>
<td>1.9183</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: no need for solidarity with other teachers in the school and the system</td>
<td>1.7226</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table D57
Question 4.
Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test
Each option, A to F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Rank (lowest sum of the ranks)</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>No need for protection ... Adequate wages</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Protection &gt; Wages</td>
<td>-4.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Positive ranks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>780</td>
<td>Ties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>930</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reject Ho:</strong> respondents are more positive regarding the 1\textsuperscript{st} than the 2\textsuperscript{nd} option in the pair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>No need for protection ... Adequate conditions</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Protection = Conditions</td>
<td>-0.330</td>
<td>0.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Positive ranks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>783</td>
<td>Ties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>930</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accept Ho:</strong> there is no difference between the values of each option in the pair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td>No need for protection ... No need for services ...</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Protection = Services</td>
<td>-0.304</td>
<td>0.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Positive ranks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>757</td>
<td>Ties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>930</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accept Ho:</strong> there is no difference between the values of each option in the pair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4</td>
<td>No need for protection ... Ideological belief regarding unions ...</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Protection = Belief</td>
<td>-0.810</td>
<td>0.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>Positive ranks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>631</td>
<td>Ties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>930</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accept Ho:</strong> there is no difference between the values of each option in the pair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5</td>
<td>No need for protection ... No need for solidarity ...</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Protection &gt; Solidarity</td>
<td>-10.834</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Positive ranks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>720</td>
<td>Ties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>930</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reject Ho:</strong> respondents are more positive regarding the 1\textsuperscript{st} than the 2\textsuperscript{nd} option in the pair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6</td>
<td>Adequate wages Adequate conditions</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Conditions &gt; Wages</td>
<td>-4.808</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Positive ranks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
<td>Ties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>930</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reject Ho:</strong> respondents are more positive regarding the 2\textsuperscript{nd} than the 1\textsuperscript{st} option in the pair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 7</td>
<td>Adequate wages No need for services ...</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Services &gt; Wages</td>
<td>-3.201</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Positive ranks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>741</td>
<td>Ties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>930</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reject Ho:</strong> respondents are more positive regarding the 2\textsuperscript{nd} than the 1\textsuperscript{st} option in the pair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 8</td>
<td>Adequate wages Ideological belief regarding unions ...</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Belief &gt; Wages</td>
<td>-3.649</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Positive ranks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>632</td>
<td>Ties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>930</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reject Ho:</strong> respondents are more positive regarding the 2\textsuperscript{nd} than the 1\textsuperscript{st} option in the pair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>Option</td>
<td>Rank (lowest sum of the ranks)</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Adequate wages</td>
<td>Negative ranks 140</td>
<td>Wages &gt; solidarity</td>
<td>-8.462</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive ranks 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ties 761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No need for solidarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Adequate conditions</td>
<td>Negative ranks 97</td>
<td>Conditions = Services</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive ranks 98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ties 735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No need for services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Adequate conditions</td>
<td>Negative ranks 148</td>
<td>Conditions = Belief</td>
<td>-1.069</td>
<td>0.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive ranks 168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ties 614</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological belief regarding unions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Adequate conditions</td>
<td>Negative ranks 175</td>
<td>Conditions &gt; Solidarity</td>
<td>-11.128</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive ranks 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ties 736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No need for solidarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>No need for services</td>
<td>Negative ranks 146</td>
<td>Belief = Services</td>
<td>-0.910</td>
<td>0.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive ranks 163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ties 621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological belief regarding unions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>No need for services</td>
<td>Negative ranks 177</td>
<td>Services &gt; Solidarity</td>
<td>-11.015</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive ranks 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ties 732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No need for solidarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ideological belief regarding unions</td>
<td>Negative ranks 213</td>
<td>Belief &gt; Solidarity</td>
<td>-10.729</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive ranks 41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ties 676</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No need for solidarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reject Ho: respondents are less positive regarding the 1st option than the 2nd option in the pair.

Accept Ho: there is no difference between the values of each option in the pair.

Table D57 continued

Question 4.

Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test

Each option, A to F
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Table D58
Question 4
t tests.

Paired differences between the means for each option, A to F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>No need for protection from the employer</td>
<td>1.9871</td>
<td>0.0688</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>3.309</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate wages</td>
<td>1.9183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>No need for protection from the employer</td>
<td>1.9871</td>
<td>-0.0054</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>0.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate conditions</td>
<td>1.9925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td>No need for protection from the employer</td>
<td>1.9871</td>
<td>-0.0011</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>-0.271</td>
<td>0.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No need for any direct or indirect services offered by VIEU</td>
<td>1.9882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4</td>
<td>No need for protection from the employer</td>
<td>1.9871</td>
<td>0.0065</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological belief regarding unions and/or politics</td>
<td>1.9806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5</td>
<td>No need for protection from the employer</td>
<td>1.9871</td>
<td>0.2645</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>11.211</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No need for solidarity with other teachers in the school and the system</td>
<td>1.7226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6</td>
<td>Adequate wages</td>
<td>1.9183</td>
<td>-0.0742</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>-4.979</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate conditions</td>
<td>1.9925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 7</td>
<td>Adequate wages</td>
<td>1.9183</td>
<td>-0.0699</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>-3.047</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No need for any direct or indirect services offered by VIEU</td>
<td>1.9882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 8</td>
<td>Adequate wages</td>
<td>1.9183</td>
<td>-0.0623</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>-2.142</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological belief regarding unions and/or politics</td>
<td>1.9806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D58 continued
Question 4
t tests.
Paired differences between the means for each option, A to F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 9</td>
<td>Adequate wages</td>
<td>1.9183</td>
<td>0.1957</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>8.478</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No need for solidarity with other teachers in the school and the system</td>
<td>1.7226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 10</td>
<td>Adequate conditions</td>
<td>1.9925</td>
<td>0.0043</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>-0.188</td>
<td>0.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No need for any direct or indirect services offered by VIEU</td>
<td>1.9882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 11</td>
<td>Adequate conditions</td>
<td>1.9925</td>
<td>0.0119</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological belief regarding unions and/or politics</td>
<td>1.9806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 12</td>
<td>Adequate conditions</td>
<td>1.9925</td>
<td>0.2699</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>11.556</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No need for solidarity with other teachers in the school and the system</td>
<td>1.7226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 13</td>
<td>No need for any direct or indirect services offered by VIEU</td>
<td>1.9882</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological belief regarding unions and/or politics</td>
<td>1.9806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 14</td>
<td>No need for any direct or indirect services offered by VIEU</td>
<td>1.9882</td>
<td>0.2656</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>11.518</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No need for solidarity with other teachers in the school and the system</td>
<td>1.7226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 15</td>
<td>Ideological belief regarding unions and/or politics</td>
<td>1.9806</td>
<td>0.2580</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>10.498</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No need for solidarity with other teachers in the school and the system</td>
<td>1.7226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D59
Question 5
Frequencies

5. If you have answered No to question one, have you ever been a member of VIEU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D60
Follow-up Interview Question
Frequencies

Would you be willing to participate in a short individual (max 15 minute) or group focus follow-up interview on these issues, with the researcher? The interview would be recorded for the benefit of transcript. However, you would not be identified as an individual in the transcript. If “Yes” please supply your contact arrangements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,555</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- 581 respondents answered Yes. Of these 554 then provided sufficient follow-up details (by email or telephone number) to be contacted. 27 respondents did not provide any contact details making follow-up impossible.
- Where respondents answered No to the ‘willingness to be followed up’ question but then provided follow up details, they were simply recorded as a No. These responses were not used as part of any follow up processes. This occurred on 8 occasions (although on 4 the 8 of these occasions, the details were not sufficient to be able to make contact).
Appendix E

NOTES ON DATA RECORDING

- 3,597 responses were received.
- 42 responses were rejected because they did not have all of demographic data completed (personal background information – Primary/Secondary, Male/Female, ≤9 or 10+ years’ experience, Full time/Part time, Melbourne/Country)

leaving 3,555 responses that could be recorded.

- Data was recorded as provided except for the following
  1. where respondents provided rankings for both questions 3 (reasons to join) and 4 (reasons not to join) then only one set of rankings were entered.
     i. If the respondent answered Yes to Question 1 (Are you currently a member of VIEU?) then the reasons to join were entered (5 occasions).
     ii. If the respondent answered No to Question 1 (Are you currently a member of VIEU?) then the reasons not to join were entered (7 occasions).
  2. where respondents answered Yes to Question 1 (Are you currently a member of VIEU?) then provided rankings only for question 4 (reasons not to join) instead of 3 (reasons to join) then the rankings were entered as under 3 (reasons to join). This occurred on 3 occasions.
  3. where respondents answered No to Question 1 (Are you currently a member of VIEU?) then provided rankings only for questions 3 (reasons to join) instead of 4 (reasons not to join) then the rankings were entered as under 4 (reasons not to join). This occurred on 2 occasions.
  4. where respondents answered Yes to question 1 (Are you currently a member of VIEU?) and then responded Yes to question 5 (If you have answered NO to question one, have you ever been a member of VIEU?), then the answer was not recorded (this occurred on 20 occasions with Yes being the answer on all occasions).

- Where respondents answered No to the ‘willingness to be followed up’ question but then provided follow up details, they were not used as part of any follow up processes. This occurred on 8 occasions (although on 4 the 8 of these occasions, the details were not sufficient to be able to make contact).
## Appendix F

### QUESTION 3: ANY OTHER REASON - BREAKDOWN.

Of the 84 “any other reason” responses ranked 1

1. 27 were associated with one of the Reasons A to F but expressed in a parallel way.
   
   (a) 11 were related to Reason A – Protection from the employer:

   - 876 Do not trust the Catholic Education System to bring Justice to its employees
   - 2661 Security
   - 714 Cover myself being part time - conditions A and C I guess
   - 3264 Part-time teachers need protection!
   - 645 New Industrial Climate in Australia over the Howard Government Years
   - 871 Protection from government initiatives - need to stand up to the government
   - 1590 NEW Industrial laws are very frightening particularly for those in "non-professional" employment
   - 1063 Industrial relation laws
   - 1685 Retrospective legislation assistance
   - 1851 Concerned about work changes under Federal Gvt. Legislation
   - 1919 Protection from Work Safe

   (b) 1 was related to Reason B – Improving pay:

   - 3056 Parity with State teachers

   (c) 4 were related to Reason C – Improving teaching conditions:

   - 2144 Support with reporting demands
   - 2498 Maintaining conditions, support for wage/condition negotiations
   - 3066 Having a voice regarding professionalism/ideology of teaching
   - 3407 To improve teaching as a profession / lift the standard of teachers in the eye of the community

   (d) 0 were related to Reason D – Direct services

   (e) 2 were related to Reason E – Ideological belief in unions and/or politics:

   - 3434 Involved in forming the union (originally ATVCSS) and served on executive
   - 2991 Previously AEU member

   (f) 9 were related to Reason F – solidarity with teachers:

   - 240 Support the members who have "brokered" deals that benefit the profession
   - 255 Justice. Not fair to take the benefits of union gains without paying the cost
   - 421 If you take the benefits its only seems fair to participate
   - 770 Social Justice - don't need help but support others who do
   - 1239 Unions are generally supportive of social justice issues – e.g., APHEDA
   - 1701 If I weren't a member, I would feel it is unfair to reap the benefits when union members take action
   - 1954 A sense of fairness, union members sacrificing pay when on strike and I then benefit from it
   - 2514 To take on the responsibility of assisting in gaining conditions eg. Long service leave etc., and reasonable class sizes etc.
   - 2581 If you are going to reap the reward, you should belong to the union

2. 36 were associated with protection from parents and students or litigation concerns.

   - 19 Protection from parent litigation
   - 74 Primarily legal protection in case of lawsuit by parent or employer
   - 309 Legal protection
   - 408 Protection from law suits
   - 520 Males need access to legal help
   - 541 Assistance with possible legal action in these times of legal liability
   - 575 Protection from student and their parents-guardian
• 679 Public liability insurance
• 897 Legal representation
• 915 Support if needed from parents, etc.
• 954 Protection from parents
• 1035 Support/assistance in any work-related issues
• 1036 Protection from anything - support of the union
• 1039 Protection from parents
• 1280 Protection from parents/students
• 1281 Protection from student/parent litigation
• 1343 Protection against litigation
• 1347 Protection from parent conflict
• 1401 Indemnity insurance
• 1637 Protection from parents
• 1908 Legal support if required
• 2077 Professional indemnity - protection against litigation
• 2179 Legal representation if needed
• 2236 Legal support
• 2366 Protection from legal costs from those who may sue
• 2470 Professional indemnity insurance
• 2494 Professional indemnity insurance
• 2501 Protection against legal action or support
• 2619 Legal protection and support
• 2959 Protection/advice in case of problems with student legalities/court cases
• 3109 Extremely problematic parent and child and didn’t know what she would do
• 3117 Legal support if ever needed is available
• 3288 Financial Support in event of legal action
• 3335 Protection and support in legal issues
• 3433 Protection from parents
• 3468 Protection in case of an accident in science area

3. With the remainder being individual, miscellaneous reasons:

• 126 To seek advice
• 285 Had a dream that I should join
• 359 Felt it was just appropriate
• 405 I have a work cover injury
• 555 To have a say with union decisions
• 1020 To have a voice - can’t agree with much of what the union does so can’t criticise something I’m not a part of
• 1083 I joined because I wanted to know what the union was doing.
• 1231 As an unsure graduate people I respect advised me to join.
• 1430 I was encouraged by others at the time
• 1488 Because after 3 years, I had still not gained an ongoing position. However once I joined VIEU I was given an ongoing position
• 1615 Pressure from peers
• 1835 Believed there would be support at leadership level - rarely
• 2011 People told me to
• 2226 1st year teacher
• 2248 Union leader influenced me nicely
• 2420 Joined at inception to have input and not be hijacked
• 2683 Seemed the right thing to do
• 3358 I am a graduate teacher and decided to join
• 3547 Suggestion from parent
Appendix G

TABLES AND STATEMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH CHAPTER 7 AND THE INSPECTION STAGE’S STATISTICAL ANALYSES

The four statements were

**Statement 1**
Preferably, VIEU should work collaboratively with the employers to progress matters and avoid adversarial approaches whenever possible.

**Statement 2**
Being part of the union gives me a say in issues (educational and industrial) at both the school level and at the system level.

**Statement 3**
It is important to me that VIEU listens to my point of view and is willing to change its policies as a result.

**Statement 4**
It is important to me that VIEU has a ‘big picture’ view and addresses broad social justice issues (eg the common good to foster a more inclusive and just society) and not just address industrial relations issues.

The six options were

- **A: Strongly disagree**
- **B: Broadly disagree**
- **C: Somewhat disagree**
- **D: Somewhat agree**
- **E: Broadly agree**
- **F: Strongly agree**

**Table G1**
Chi² test for the 4 statements in the 2nd survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Broadly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Somewhat agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Broadly agree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Strongly agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Chi²</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.485</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reject Ho. There is a significant difference between ratings (Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree) for the 4 statements.
**Table G2**  
Chi² test for the Agree and Disagree grouped statements in the 2ⁿᵈ survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance Value | df | p
--- | --- | ---
Pearson Chi² | 118.182 | 3 | <0.0001

Reject Ho. There is a significant difference between the grouped Agree and Disagree ratings for the 4 statements.

**Table G3**  
Chi² test for the difference between paired statements 1 & 4 in the 2ⁿᵈ survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Broadly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Broadly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Broadly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Broadly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Broadly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Broadly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 4</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance Value | df | p
--- | --- | ---
Pearson Chi² | 13.059 | 5 | 0.0228

Accept H1. There is a significant difference Statements 1 and 4 for the ratings given to each of the 6 options.
Table G4
Chi² test for the difference between paired statements 2 & 4 in the 2nd survey

Ho  =  There is no significant difference Statements 2 and 4 for the ratings given to each of the 6 options.
H1  =  There is a significant difference Statements 2 and 4 for the ratings given to each of the 6 options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Broadly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Broadly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Broadly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Broadly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Broadly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Broadly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 4</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Chi²</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.072</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accept H1. There is a significant difference Statements 2 and 4 for the ratings given to each of the 6 options.

Table G5
The 2nd survey’s four statements
Means – Medians – Standard deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 1</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 2</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 3</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 4</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table G6

**Chi$^2$ test for the difference between respondents across the 2nd survey’s four statements for those who chose reason C and those who chose reasons A, B, D, E or F on the 1st survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed (C)</th>
<th>Expected (based on A, B, D, E &amp; F)</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1 S2 S3 S4</td>
<td>S1 S2 S3 S4</td>
<td>S1 S2 S3 S4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2 2 1 3</td>
<td>2.3 0.3 0.6 0.9</td>
<td>0.03 10.40 0.33 5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Broadly disagree</td>
<td>0 1 0 0</td>
<td>0.6 2.0 0.3 0.6</td>
<td>0.57 0.49 0.28 0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>2 1 1 1</td>
<td>0.6 1.1 1.7 2.0</td>
<td>3.63 0.02 0.29 0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Somewhat agree</td>
<td>2 1 4 5</td>
<td>1.1 3.1 2.8 2.3</td>
<td>0.66 1.44 0.48 3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Broadly agree</td>
<td>7 9 5 3</td>
<td>6.8 5.4 7.7 3.1</td>
<td>0.01 2.43 0.92 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Strongly agree</td>
<td>4 3 6 5</td>
<td>5.7 5.1 4.0 8.2</td>
<td>0.49 0.86 1.04 1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17 17 17 17</td>
<td>17 17 17 17</td>
<td>5.38 15.64 3.34 11.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi2</td>
<td>35.414</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accept H1. There is a significant difference across the 4 statements between ratings for respondents who chose reason C and those who chose reasons A, B, D, E & F.

### Table G7

**Chi$^2$ test for the difference between respondents across the 2nd survey’s four statements for those who chose reason F and those who chose reasons A to E on the 1st survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed (F)</th>
<th>Expected (based on A, B, C, D &amp; E)</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1 S2 S3 S4</td>
<td>S1 S2 S3 S4</td>
<td>S1 S2 S3 S4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2 0 0 0</td>
<td>1.5 0.6 0.6 1.1</td>
<td>0.19 0.55 0.55 1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Broadly disagree</td>
<td>1 2 0 0</td>
<td>0.2 1.1 0.2 0.4</td>
<td>3.60 0.72 0.18 0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>0 0 1 1</td>
<td>0.7 0.9 1.1 1.3</td>
<td>0.74 0.92 0.01 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Somewhat agree</td>
<td>0 1 2 0</td>
<td>1.1 2.0 2.2 2.4</td>
<td>1.11 0.52 0.02 2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Broadly agree</td>
<td>4 6 6 0</td>
<td>5.0 4.1 4.8 2.6</td>
<td>0.19 0.93 0.30 2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Strongly agree</td>
<td>5 3 3 11</td>
<td>3.5 3.3 3.1 4.2</td>
<td>0.63 0.03 0.01 10.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12 12 12 12</td>
<td>12 12 12 12</td>
<td>6.46 3.68 1.08 17.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi2</td>
<td>28.484</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accept H1. There is a significant difference across the 4 statements between ratings for respondents who chose reason F and those who chose reasons A to E.
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