

Unions and Union Membership in New Zealand: Annual Review for 2002

Robyn May*, Pat Walsh, Raymond Harbridge*** & Glen Thickett******

Introduction

This paper reports the results of Victoria University's Industrial Relations Centre's survey of trade union membership for 2002 in New Zealand. The survey carries on from our earlier surveys, conducted by the Industrial Relations Centre since 1991. As with the 2000 and 2001 reports, 2002 also reports an increase in union membership. Union membership for the year to December 2002 rose 1.5 percent, with the number of unions rising to 174. Union density has dropped slightly to 21.7 percent due to union recruitment not matching the strong labour force growth over the year.

Methodology

When the Employment Contracts Act 1991 (ECA) ended the practice of union registration, it not only removed the distinct legal status of trade unions but it also brought to an end the official collection of data on trade union membership. In the absence of official data, the Industrial Relations Centre at Victoria University of Wellington began to undertake voluntary surveys of trade unions in December 1991, and these surveys continue to the current date. Notwithstanding their voluntary status, the surveys have always had a high compliance rate. In addition to information on aggregate membership, our surveys have also sought information on gender and industry breakdown (at two digit industry level) and organisational affiliations. We have recently included an additional question on whether unions collect statistics on the ethnic background of their membership.

The Employment Relations Act 2000 (ERA) requires unions to submit an annual return of members to the Registrar of Unions, stating the number of members as at 1 March of each year. The return to official collection of data on union membership began in 2001. In 2002 the Department made public the membership of each of the registered unions at 1 March 2002 (DOL 2002)

For our survey this year we included only those unions deemed to be registered as at 31/12/02, as per the Department of Labour website of registered unions (see www.ers.dol.gov.nz-union-registration). At the end of 2002 registered unions numbered 175. One union, the Medlab Bay of Plenty union subsequently advised us they had merged with the Northern Chemical workers, reducing the number to 174. In February, each of the registered unions was sent a survey requesting information on membership numbers as at 31 December 2002. Two further follow

* Robyn May, Senior Research Fellow, Victoria University

** Pat Walsh, Professor of Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations, Victoria University

***Raymond Harbridge, is Professor of Management and Head of School, La Trobe University, Melbourne.

****Glen Thickett, Research Fellow, Victoria University

315 May, Walsh, Harbridge and Thickett

up mail-outs resulted in a total of 135 returns. Details on the remaining 39 unions were established by using last year's return verified by the Registrar's figures, or telephone contact where possible, and any media information (DOL 2002).

The Employment Relations Act and trade union registration

The objects of the Act with respect to the recognition and operation of unions are:

- To recognise the role of unions in promoting their members' collective interests
- To provide for the registration of unions that are accountable to their members
- To confer on registered unions the right to represent their members in collective bargaining
- To provide representatives of registered unions with reasonable access to workplaces for purposes related to employment and union business.

In pursuit of these objectives, the ERA establishes a union registration system, and grants registered unions bargaining rights together with rights of access to workplaces (specified in sections 19-25). To gain registration, a union must have more than 15 members, and provide a statutory declaration that it complies with the requirements of s14 of the Act regarding rules, incorporation and independence from employers. The Act requires the statutory declaration to stipulate that the union is 'independent of, and is constituted and operates at arm's length from any employer' (s14(1)d). The Registrar of Unions may rely on the statutory declaration to establish entitlement to registration. Only registered unions may negotiate collective agreements, and collective agreements apply only to union members whose work falls within the agreement's coverage clause and to new workers whose work falls within the agreement's coverage clause for the first 30 days of their employment.

Results: Union numbers and membership

The 174 registered unions identified in our survey had a combined membership of 334,783 as at 31 December 2002. This represents an increase of 4,864 or 1.5 percent over the course of the year.

Table 1 shows trade union membership since 1985. Union density is defined as the proportion of potential union members who belong to a union (Bamber and Lansbury, 1998). The numerator and denominator in this equation vary from country to country and there is no agreed 'correct' method. What is important is consistency in reporting so as results can be compared year on year. Previously, our surveys have reported density using the total employed labour force as the denominator. This category includes employers, self-employed and unpaid family members, many of whom do not usually represent potential union members. We also report density based on wage and salary earners only and provide figures for previous years as a point of comparison.

Whilst union membership numbers continued to rise in 2002, strong labour force growth has meant that density levels are down slightly on 2001 figures. The growth in the total labour force was 2.4 percent and the growth of wage and salary earners alone for 2002 was 2.8 percent. Union membership increases did not keep pace with this growth.

Table 1: Trade Unions, Membership and Union Density 1985-2002 (selected years)

	Union membership	Number of unions	Potential union membership		Union density	
			Total employed labour force	Wage and salary earners	(1) / (3) %	(1) / (4) %
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Dec 1985	683006	259	1569100	1287400	43.5	53.1
Sep 1989	684825	112	1457900	1164600	47.0	55.7
May 1991	603118	80	1426500	1166200	42.3	51.7
Dec 1991	514325	66	1467500	1153200	35.1	44.6
Dec 1992	428160	58	1492900	1165700	28.7	36.7
Dec 1993	409112	67	1545400	1208900	26.5	33.8
Dec 1994	375906	82	1629400	1284900	23.1	29.3
Dec 1995	362200	82	1705200	1337800	21.2	27.1
Dec 1996	338967	83	1744300	1389500	19.9	24.4
Dec 1997	327800	80	1747800	1404100	18.8	23.3
Dec 1998	306687	83	1735200	1379200	17.7	22.2
Dec 1999	302405	82	1781800	1414100	17.0	21.4
Dec 2000	318519	134	1818400	1454500	17.5	21.9
Dec 2001	329919	165	1860700	1500700	17.7	22.0
Dec 2002	334783	174	1905100	1543200	17.6	21.7

Source: Household Labour Force Survey, Table 3, Table 4.3 (unpublished) Industrial Relations Centre Survey

(Notes: Total employed labour force includes self-employed, employers and unpaid family workers. Column 5 figures in italics are different to those previously reported due to a revision of Labour force figures in 1997 by Statistics New Zealand)

Results: Union size

Prior to 1987, New Zealand had numerous small unions, most of whom were dependent on the protections of the arbitration system. The introduction in the Labour Relations Act 1987 of the requirement that unions have a minimum membership of 1000 ensured that the number of unions dropped dramatically between 1985 and 1989. During the Employment Contracts Act (ECA), when registration provisions were abolished, the number of unions estimated to be in existence varied between 58 (in 1992) and 83 (in 1996). It is possible these figures may have slightly under represented the real numbers of unions, as there was no formal means of identification. However these are the best and only documented estimates available. It is noteworthy that the number of unions remained very stable between 1994 and 1999.

The number of unions has doubled in the last three years (see Table 1 above). A key reason for this is that under the ECA, a large number of collective contracts were negotiated by informal groupings of workers who did not categorise themselves as unions and were not incorporated into our surveys. The ERA requirement that only registered unions can participate in collective bargaining has led to many of these to formalise their status as a registered union to allow them to continue to negotiate their terms and conditions of employment. The low membership threshold for registration at 15 allows these unions to register on a site-by-site basis. As Table 2 shows, the membership of unions with less than 1000 members has risen six-fold since 1991. However this has not substantially altered, the distribution of membership by union size since 1999. Small unions (with less than 1000 members) still only account for 6 percent of overall

317 May, Walsh, Harbridge and Thickett

membership, up from 4 percent in 1999, and large unions (more than 10,000 members) account for 71 percent of all membership, down from 75 percent in 1999. Of the total membership increase since 1999, the 95 new unions (that is unions registered and incorporated after 2000) account for 25 percent of the increase. Overwhelmingly, membership increases are as a result of growth in the large established unions. One consequence of the rise in union numbers is that average union size has declined substantially, down to 1,924 members in 2002, from 7,793 members in 1991 (Harbridge, Hince and Honeybone, 1994)

Closer examination of the new unions, that is those unions whose formal existence is closely linked to the ERA, has found that the majority are enterprise or workplace based, a new phenomenon for New Zealand unionism. Furthermore, these organisations often do not see themselves as unions, this reflects the context of their origins under the ECA. Indeed, a number of them explained on survey returns, 'the ERA forced us to become a union' (Barry and May, 2002:17). These organisations have extremely limited resources and typically exist to negotiate a collective agreement for members and little beyond.

Table 2: Membership by union size 1991 – 2002

M'ship range	May 1991			Dec 2001			Dec 2002		
	No.	Members	%	No.	Members	%	No.	Members	%
Under 1000	4	2954	1	131	18616	6	139	19336	6
1000 – 4999	48	99096	16	22	46178	14	22	42424	13
5000 – 9999	8	64268	11	4	29507	9	5	34451	10
10000+	20	436800	72	8	235618	71	8	238572	71
Totals	80	603118	100	165	329919	100	174	334783	100
Av. Size		7539			2000			1924	

Source: Industrial Relations Centre Survey

Table 3: Membership of largest 10 unions (selected years)

	Numbers of unions	Total membership of largest 10 unions	Total union membership	Concentration %
1984/1985	259	292856	666027	44
1990	104	275854	611265	45
1994	82	261186	375906	69
1999	82	234523	302405	78
2000	134	244560	318519	77
2001	165	253452	329919	77
2002	174	255700	334783	76

Source: Industrial Relations Centre Survey, Harbridge, Hince & Honeybone, 1994

Even with the rush of new small unions, the data in Table 3 shows that the concentration of union membership in the top 10 largest unions remains high, dropping only slightly from 78 percent in 1999 to 76 percent in 2002. This tendency for membership to be concentrated in the largest 10 unions was in part a consequence of the 1000 member rule introduced through the Labour Relations Act (LRA) in 1987. The LRA set in motion a process of union amalgamations and mergers that bore fruit in the 1990s, leading to a high degree of union concentration. This

concentration trend was accelerated by the collapse of many unions under the ECA. Between 1984-1991, the largest 10 unions represented around 45 percent of all union members. By 1994 the largest 10 unions represented 70 percent of all union membership (Harbridge, Hince and Honeybone, 1994) and concentration has remained high since.

Results: Union membership by industry

Table 4 examines where gains and losses in membership by industry at the one-digit level (classified according to the Australia New Zealand Standard Industry Classification) have occurred. At this level, membership gains can be seen in two of the fastest growing areas of the labour force where unions have little penetration, the retail sector and the construction sector. This is good news for unions in these hard to organise areas. Further on in our report, however, Table 6 shows that despite membership gains labour force growth in these sectors means that density levels have only slightly improved in retail and have declined in construction.

The biggest membership gains are within the public and community services category. Membership in the government administration and defence category has increased by 12.3 percent and in the health and education sectors (which include private and public employers) by 3.5 percent.

Table 4: Union membership change by industry 2001 – 2002

Industry Group	Dec 2001	Dec 2002	Change 2001-2002 (%)
Agriculture, fishing, forestry etc	2071	2472	-19.4
Mining and related services	1017	907	-10.8
Manufacturing	75071	74060	-1.3
Energy and utility services	5273	4062	-23.0
Construction & building services	4728	4887	3.1
Retail, wholesale, restaurants, hotels	15242	16296	6.9
Transport, storage and communication	32950	32830	-0.4
Finance, Insurance and business services	15534	14385	-7.4
Public and community services	178033	184884	3.8
Govt admin and defence			(12.3)
Education			(3.5)
Health			(3.5)
TOTAL	329919	334783	1.5

Source: Industrial Relations Centre Survey

Table 5 shows where 2002's new union members have come from. The biggest gains have come from the core government, education and health sectors and to a lesser but still significant level, the retail sector. These gains have been almost offset however by heavy losses of membership in the finance sector, manufacturing and energy services. The table also shows that the pattern of concentration of membership in just a few sectors has continued. In fact, the public and community services sector (core government, health and education) and manufacturing account for three quarters of all union members. When transport and storage is added, some 87 percent of all members are accounted for. These workers are concentrated in sectors of the labour force that together account for less than half of the total workforce.

We also ask unions how many of their members work in the private sector and the public sector. We now estimate that almost 53 percent of all union members work in the public sector. This is not quite the equivalent of the public and community services sector as that category includes some private sector employment, particularly in the areas of health, education and other services.

Table 5: Union membership and growth by industry 2002

Industry Group	Union membership 2002	Membership by industry %	Breakdown of new members 2002 %
Agriculture, fishing, forestry etc	2472	0.7	8.3
Mining and related services	907	0.3	-2.3
Manufacturing	74060	22.1	-20.8
Energy and utility services	4062	1.2	-24.9
Construction & building services	4887	1.4	3.3
Retail, wholesale, restaurants, hotels	16296	4.9	21.7
Transport, storage and communication	32830	9.8	-2.5
Finance, Insurance and business services	14385	4.3	-23.6
Public and community services			
Govt admin and defence	33020	9.9	72.9
Education	73854	22.1	51.1
Health and community	60637	18.1	35.0
Other services	17373	5.2	-18.2
TOTAL	334783	100	100% (4864)
Membership private sector	158105	47.2	
Membership public sector	176678	52.8	

Source: Household Labour Force Survey, Industrial Relations Centre Survey

Tables 6 & 7 show that the areas of union stronghold are not the same as those sectors of the labour force that have grown over the last decade. Table 5 depicts how union membership is highly concentrated in just 5 industry sectors and table 6 shows that these sectors are the areas of highest density. The education sector has the highest level of union density at 50 percent, closely followed by government administration and defence, health, transport and storage and then manufacturing. Table 7 shows that overall the labour force has grown by 28.8 percent in the eleven years Dec 1991 to Dec 2002, while union membership has fallen overall by 34.9 percent in that period. Sectors where employment growth has been significantly above average include, finance (growing 82 percent), retail (growing 37 percent) and construction (growing 44 percent). Without exception, these sectors have seen union density fall at rates well above the labour force as a whole. Indeed, in retail and construction, the fall in union density has been exceeded only by mining (the sector with the largest fall in employment during this period) and agriculture which is traditionally weakly unionised. In contrast, the three sectors in which the fall in union density has either been below or just above average across the workforce, public and community services, manufacturing and transport and storage have all experienced above average falls in employment.

Table 6: Density by industry (selected industries) 2001 – 2002

	Approx. density 2001(%)	Approx. density 2002(%)
Manufacturing	25.6	25.7
Construction & building services	4.1	3.8
Retail, wholesale, restaurants, hotels	3.7	3.8
Transport, storage communication	29.5	29.7
Finance, insurance & business services	6.4	5.4
Govt administration & defence	37.4	47.2
Education	51.4	50.0
Health & community services	35.2	36.6

Source: Household Labour Force Survey, Industrial Relations Centre Survey

Table 7: Sectoral changes in employment 1991 – 2002

Industry Group	Labour force Dec 1991 (000)	Labour force Dec 2002 (000)	(Change %)	Percentage decline in union membership 1991-2002
Agriculture, fishing, forestry etc	155.4	160.3	(3.2)	82.6
Mining and related services	5.0	1.7	(-66.0)	80.8
Manufacturing	254.8	287.8	(13.0)	35.4
Energy and utility services	14.2	9.0	(-36.6)	63.5
Construction & building services	88.8	128.1	(44.3)	66.5
Retail, wholesale, restaurants, hotels	310.7	425.3	(36.9)	74.7
Transport, storage and communication	94.7	110.4	(16.6)	37.6
Finance, Insurance and business services	146.7	267.6	(82.4)	55.4
Public and community services (includes Non-public sector employment)	402.9	512.6	(27.2)	10.2
TOTAL	1479.3	1905.1	(28.8%)	34.9 %

Source: Household Labour Force Survey (by NZSIC and ANZSIC)

Results: Gender

The percentage of union members who are female is 51.6 percent. As reported in previous years, female membership in unions remains higher than their participation in the workforce. The percentage of union members who are female has been around 48-50 percent for the last decade. This year's figure is the highest we have reported so far, up slightly on last year's figure of 51.5 percent. The percentage of the total labour force that is female is 45.5 percent (Household Labour Force Survey, Statistics New Zealand 2002).

Ethnicity analysis

In last year's survey we asked a new question about whether the union collected statistics on the ethnic background of membership. This year 32 advised that they did collect statistics on ethnicity, these unions covering 153,888 employees or 46.0 percent of total union members. The aggregate breakdown of that membership by ethnicity, compared to the ethnicity breakdown of the total labour force, was as follows:

Table 8: Ethnicity by sample and labour force

Ethnic group	Survey sample	Total labour force*
NZ European / Pakeha:	76.7%	78.5%
Maori:	11.1%	9.6%
Pacific Peoples:	9.0%	4.7%
Asian:	0.9%	
Other:	2.3%	7.2%
Total	100%	100%

* StatisticsNew Zealand, Household Labour Force Survey, December Quarter 2002, table 5. No breakdown given for Asian working population

Results: Peak body affiliations

Throughout the 1990's New Zealand had two peak union bodies. The largest of these, the New Zealand Council of Trade Unions (CTU) was formed in 1987 to replace the Federation of Labour (FOL) and the Combined State Unions (CSU). In 1993 the Trade Union Federation (TUF) was formed as an alternate body from a core of blue-collar unions. In 2000, TUF merged with the CTU.

We asked each union to report on their peak council affiliation and the results are reported in Table 8 below. Since many of the new unions have no sense of affinity with the wider movement (Barry and May 2002), few of these have affiliated with the CTU. As a result, only 34 of the 174 registered unions are CTU affiliates. More importantly, however, CTU affiliates comprise 88 percent of total union membership and represent 18 of the 20 largest unions in New Zealand.

Table 9: NZCTU affiliation 1991 – 2002

	NZCTU Affiliate unions	Members	Percentage of total m'ship in CTU affiliates
1991	43	445116	86.5
1992	33	339261	79.2
1993	33	321119	78.5
1994	27	296959	78.9
1995	25	284383	78.5
1996	22	278463	82.2
1997	20	253578	77.4
1998	19	238262	77.7
1999	19	235744	78.0
2000	26	273570	85.9
2001	32	289732	87.8
2002	34	293466	87.7

Discussion

The data in this paper represent the state of the union movement as at December 31, 2002, a little more than two years after the enactment of the ERA. The passage of time allows us to begin to assess what the Act's impact has been on unions. An important caveat to this analysis is of course that union membership and density are shaped by a wider set of factors than just the legislative environment. In brief, the outcome for unions is that membership has increased by 10.7 percent since December 1999 but density has barely changed. The increase of membership of 1.5 percent in 2002, in comparison to 3.6 percent in 2001 and 5.4 percent in 2000 supports our analysis last year that a slowing of membership growth was occurring. This slowing of membership growth can be explained by two factors. The first is that the legitimacy effect conferred on unions when the Act was first introduced has declined, and now we are seeing the impact of the provisions of the ERA rather than the symbolic impact of the restoration of union legitimacy. Unions have identified a number of shortcomings in relation to the Act and the opportunity it provides for unions to regenerate. Second, we believe the legacy of the ECA is proving to be a powerful one such that for unions any significant renewal in the current environment will be extremely difficult. The decline in union density since December 2001 reflects labour force growth in areas where union presence is weak and the inability of union recruitment to keep pace with labour force growth in these sectors.

Unions have identified two major areas of concern in the ERA and are lobbying government to achieve changes when the ERA is amended later this year. The first concern is the weak support in the ERA for multi-employer bargaining. The support which the ERA does offer multi-employer bargaining is that it has repealed the ECA prohibition on strikes in support of multi-employer bargaining. This gave employers an effective veto over any proposal for multi-employer bargaining. However, the ERA offers little else by way of explicit promotion of multi-employer bargaining. There has been a growth of multi-employer bargaining in the public sector, chiefly in health and education but not in the public service, and little increase in the private sector (see Thickett et al, 2003). Multi-employer bargaining is the most efficient and resource effective bargaining unions can undertake. Previous analysis has shown that union density increases in New Zealand tend to follow a growth in collective bargaining coverage. Hence growth in multi-employer bargaining remains critical to any sustainable renewal of the union movement (see Harbridge, Walsh & Wilkinson, 2001). The other issue for unions is that of 'free-riding'. The ERA provides that individual workers employed in an organisation covered by a collective agreement automatically receive the entitlements of the collective agreement for the first 30 days of their employment, and at the end of that period remain free to negotiate an individual employment agreement. The reality at most workplaces is any individual agreement will simply be a mirror of the collective. A combination of the worker's option to 'join the union, join the agreement' and the employer's desire to minimise transaction costs and maximise a sense of equity means that in most cases there are strong pressures for a single set of terms and conditions, and they will be those negotiated by the union. For some employers, arguably, there is the added benefit of undermining the union's authority by automatically passing on benefits to non-members. The EPMU recently called for a return to some form of compulsory unionism as a way to counter the concern that many workers were choosing not to belong to a union, knowing they would get the benefit of union negotiations regardless. It is likely that the ERA review will address this issue in some way but it is unlikely that the solution will be that proposed by the EPMU.

Second, the legacy of their past, which includes the ECA but is rooted in a much longer term historical development, remains a huge challenge that is proving very difficult for unions to overcome purely through their own efforts. The individualisation of the employment relationship under the ECA remains thus far unchallenged by the ERA. Less than one quarter of New Zealand workers are employed under the provisions of a collective agreement, although an unknown number have their pay and conditions determined by an agreement negotiated collectively. Where collective bargaining does occur it is more likely to be workplace based rather than industry based, leaving many unions, especially in the private sector locked into an inefficient site-by-site bargaining mode. A critical factor for the future of the New Zealand union movement is that evidence is beginning to emerge of a collapse of collective bargaining in the private sector (see Thickett et al. 2003). Collective bargaining is increasingly a public sector phenomenon, and multi-employer bargaining is likewise far more common in the public sector. A further legacy of the ECA was that the period spawned a generation of workers under the age of 30, who have no knowledge or understanding of unions and for whom individualised employment relationships are normal and expected (see Diamond and Freeman, 2001). Similarly, a generation of private sector firms established since 1991 are overwhelmingly likely to be non-unionised. Perhaps the most serious legacy of the ECA is the huge under-resourcing faced by unions, partly a problem of small size but also chiefly a consequence of membership collapse during the period.

These two factors impact strongly on the trends we have previously observed and that continue in this year's membership figures. Unions remain highly concentrated in the public sector and in manufacturing and whilst these two sectors account for around a third of the labour force they are not sectors of growth into the future. Those sectors growing at a faster rate than the labour force overall are finance, insurance and business services and the retail, wholesale, restaurant, accommodation sector, and the construction sector, and these are sectors where unions have only a limited presence. Even where unions have been able to make gains, as they did in the retail sector, the impact of these gains has been quickly stripped away by strong labour force growth.

The striking trend of the last few years' data is the dominance of the public sector. We now find that collective bargaining is five times more common in the public sector than the private sector (see Thickett et al 2003); that 53 percent of all unionists work in the public sector; and the three highest sectors of union density are in the public sector. Likewise, multi-employer bargaining is far more common and increasing in the public sector (Thickett et al. 2003) and unsurprisingly the public sector is well represented in dispute statistics (Statistics New Zealand 2002). The public sector share of overall collective bargaining has increased to 50 percent, in line with the public sector share of union membership (Thickett et al. 2003). In many respects, membership increases in the public sector were anticipated. The combination of pre-existing high levels of membership and density with labour force growth and encouragement of multi-employer bargaining by government has meant fertile ground for public sector unions. Likewise high profile campaigns for improvements in pay and conditions in the health and education sectors in particular have given those unions a visibility that has strongly assisted recruiting efforts. The growth in public sector unionism has not been matched by the private sector, indeed public sector growth has only just kept overall membership numbers edging forward, such has been the scale of decline in the private sector.

The bleak news for unions, and their most important strategic challenge for the medium-term future, is that they are doing best in declining sectors of the economy and worst in the growing

sectors. Historically, New Zealand unions have looked first to sympathetic governments for solutions to their strategic challenges, and only secondly to reliance on their own capabilities. In a context when union capability is at an historically low ebb, it is understandable that unions have once again turned to government. However, the historical lesson for unions is that the legislative fix only works if it is sustainable in the long-term under governments of different persuasions. It is not obvious that legislative measures of the kind that would restore union fortunes now and quickly would gain long-term bi-partisan support. Unions will need to reassess their own strategic direction and determine a path forward grounded in their own capabilities and that offers a sustainable future. It is likely that this future will be very different from the past.

References

- Bamber,G & Lansbury,R (1998) *International and Comparative Employment Relations* SAGE London
- Barry,M & May,R (2002) 'United we stand, Multiplied we fall: New unions and the New Zealand Employment Relations Act', in McAndrew, I and Geare, A (eds) *AIRAANZ 2002: Proceedings of the 16th Association of Industrial Relations Academics of Australia and New Zealand Conference*, Queenstown, 5-9 February, Volume 2, pp 11-18, AIRAANZ
- Department of Labour (2002) ERA Info, Volume 8, July 2002, DOL
- Diamond,W & Freeman,R (2001) *Liking the Workplace you have: The Incumbency effect in preferences towards unions*, Working Paper 1125, CEP, London School of Economics
- ERS Website (2001) www.ers.dol.gov.nz-union-registration.
- Harbridge,R, Hince,K & Honeybone,A (1994) Unions and Union Membership in New Zealand: Annual review for 1993 *New Zealand Journal of Industrial Relations*, 19 (2) pp 175-180
- Harbridge, R, Walsh, P and Wilkinson, D (2001) Determinants of Union Growth in New Zealand: Ending the Decline, Paper presented to Union Growth Conference, University of Toronto, 2001
- Thickett,G, Harbridge,R, Walsh,P & Kiely,P (2002) *Employment Agreements: Bargaining Trends and Employment Law Update 2001/2002*, Industrial Relations Centre, Victoria University of Wellington
- Thickett, G, Harbridge, R, Walsh, P & Kiely, P (2003) *Employment Agreements: Bargaining Trends and Employment Law Update 2002/2003* (forthcoming) Industrial Relations Centre, Victoria University of Wellington
- Statistics New Zealand (2002) *Household Labour Force Survey*

Appendix

Public/Private sector employment breakdown using Quarterly Employment Survey

	Public sector			Private sector			Total
	female	male	Total (000s)	female	male	total	Total (000s)
Feb 1991	163.6	138.1	301.7	391.8	506.2	898.0	1199.7
Feb 2001	160.7	100.1	260.8	563.0	626.9	1189.9	1450.7
Feb 2002			268.2			1231.7	1499.9
Feb 2003			284.3			1271.4	1555.7
% change 1991-2003			-6%			+42%	+30%
B/down 91			25%			75%	100%
B/down 01			18%			82%	100%
B/down 02			18%			82%	100%
B/down 03			18%			82%	100%

Source: Quarterly Employment Survey

See: 'Differences between the QES and HLFs' (Statistics New Zealand) for an explanation of why the HLFs and the QES report different figures. The above figures represent 'filled jobs', ie. people, but establishments employing less than the equivalent of two full time persons are not measured. Hence the private sector figure is likely to be understated.