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<tr>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>District Education Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNUT</td>
<td>Kenya National Union of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUPPET</td>
<td>Kenya Union of Post Primary Education Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoK</td>
<td>Republic of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSC</td>
<td>Teachers Service Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

The objectives of the study sought to determine the extent to which choice of labour unions is influenced by subscription fee charged by the teachers’ unions’, the economic conditions, group pressure among teachers and the leadership of respective unions. The target population consisted of 116 public secondary schools that are 95 mixed schools, 9 boys’ schools and 12 girls’ schools. The total population included 5392 teachers from both Kenya National Union of Teachers and Kenya Union of Post Primary Education Teachers and also teachers who are not unionized and are yet to join either of the unions. The researcher used stratified sampling procedure. The data was gathered using questionnaires administered to 539 teachers (who made up sample size) in public secondary schools in Nyambene branch, Meru county. Out of these, 435 questionnaires were filled and returned, representing 80.7 percent return rate. Both descriptive and content analyses were used in the data analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data quantitatively by use of frequencies and percentages. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences was used to tabulate the data in terms of working means, standard deviations and percentages to answer the research questions thereby addressing the objectives of the study. The study revealed that the 67 percent who are yet to join teachers union are considering joining KNUT because of the strong union leadership, whereas peer pressure from colleagues was a reason why majority 6 percent of the unionized teachers are considering joining KNUT. The study found that teachers’ economic conditions and union leadership influence teachers’ choice of labour unions. The study concluded that leadership of unions, peer pressure from colleagues and the high union subscription fee and economic condition of teachers influences teachers’ choice of labour union. Based on membership fee and choice of teachers union the study recommended that teachers unions’ membership fee should be made affordable so as teachers who are yet to join can register as members. This will have an effect on trade union density and members’ commitment to the unions’ objectives and strategies. This study recommends that another study could be carried out in other branches to establish whether similar results will be obtained. Further the study recommends that it is important to analyze the leadership style employed by the union leaders as they (leadership styles) have the potential of influencing the unionized teachers to join a particular union or not.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Membership in the trade unions was vital. A higher trade union density increased the trade unions bargaining strength. Bryson (2002) states that higher union density is associated with an increased likelihood that employees think that “unions make a difference of what it is like to work here”. From a historical perspective, unions were formed when industrialization forced workers into positions of dependency or which their earnings, working conditions and job security were largely beyond their control as individuals (Barker, 2007). As a result, workers increasingly bonded together to prevent exploitation and to promote their interests. Originating in Europe, trade unions became popular in many countries during the Industrial Revolution, when the lack of skills necessary to perform most jobs shifted employment bargaining power almost completely to the employers' side, causing many workers to be mistreated (Barker, 2007).

Graham and Bennett (2008) define a trade union is his living and working environment Schnabel & Wagner, (2007). The frustration-aggression approach explained union membership as a result of individual frustration, dissatisfaction or alienation at their work place. (Klandermans, 1986 as quoted by Schnabel & Wagner, 2007). Rational choice approach explained unionization as the product of a process, weighing costs and benefits of
participating, expectations about the degree to which the union were able to realize these motives. Klandermans, (1986) as quoted by Schnabel and Wagner, (2007). Teachers joined trade unions for different reasons with the view that union bargaining would improve their welfare.

Randall (2007) argued that union bargaining raised teachers' compensation, improved their working conditions, and enhanced their employment security—while also raising the cost of providing public education by upwards of 15 percent. It therefore meant that a trade union was an association of employees; it thus represented the employee’s interests to employers. A trade union fought for better working conditions and remuneration for its members. Trade unions also advocated sound relations between employers and employees through the promotion and protection of freedom of association, collective bargaining agreements and dispute resolution. More specifically, trade unions negotiated for wages, work rules, complaint procedures, rules governing hiring, firing and promotion of workers, benefits, workplace safety and policies. Trade unions, through its leadership, bargained with the employer on behalf of union members and negotiated collective bargaining with employers. Also trade union represented workers at disciplinary and grievance hearings. Often, the union representative would be a workplace representative who was also a co-worker.
However, regardless of employees’ motives for joining trade unions, what was clear that employees joined unions for specific reasons. It was apparent that while some employees had joined the trade unions, others had not and or, had considering joining a particular trade union. Kenya had got 285,145 teachers and out of these, 261,453 teachers belonged to either of the two teachers’ unions. KNUT had got 219,453 members (www.knut.co.ke).

KUPPET had got 32,000 members (www.kuppet.co.ke) and so a gap of 27,516 members of teachers who had not unionized or were in the process of joining unions. Nyambene branch consisted of four districts and had got a total of 5,392 teachers and out of these, 3,995 teachers belonged to either of the teachers’ unions and there was the gap of one thousand three hundred and ninety seven (1397) teachers who had not unionized. It was from the above basis that this study set out to investigate the factors influencing teachers choices of trade unions in Public Secondary Schools in Nyambene Branch.

According to Waddington and Whist on (2007) the collective reason why people joined unions comprised of mutual support, improved pay and conditions, peer pressure and the belief in union as organization. Concerning trade union membership of trade unions section 32 of the Labour Relations Act, 2007, (Republic of Kenya) provided that only persons above the age of 18 could join a trade union. However, it allowed for a person aged 16 to be a member under special circumstances. According to Fanaroff (2003) as cited in
Gobler, Kristen and Warnich (2005), employees would be motivated to join a union for inter alia job security, negotiating better wages and benefits, better working conditions, fair and just supervision, mechanism to be heard and the need to belong. Through collective bargaining and lobbying for labour legislation, union leaders enhanced their members’ standard of living and improved many conditions that surrounded their work.

Decenzo (2010) states that employees join unions for higher wages and benefits, for greater job security, influence over work rules and compulsory membership. Graham and Bennett (2008) also shared in the view that employees joined trade unions to try to improve their working conditions, gain some control over working environment, pressure from the current union members. There were many theories which explained the reason why an employee would choose to unionize. The rational choice theory or expectancy theory, also lied at the heart of many economic explorations proposed that rational employees were most likely to join a union when they perceived that the sum of union-induced benefits outweighing the cost involved in union-joining (Deery & Cieri, 2001). The Marxist theorists Marx & Engels (1977) explained union membership orientation in terms of workers’ frustration with the existing system and their political will to overthrow the exploitative order. The dominant approach, adopting economic analysis, had identified factors such as the level of unemployment, governmental policies and the structure of industry which influence the union-joining decisions.
In 1957, the colonial government allowed an umbrella teachers’ grouping, the Kenya National Union of Teachers, KNUT, which was registered as a trade union in 1959. Apart from negotiating higher wages for teachers, KNUT’s major success was the establishment of the Teachers Service Commission.(www.knut.co.ke). The strengths of unions depended on their abilities to mobilize its members towards a common goal. Gallager and Fullager (2005) state that the strength of a union depends, in part, upon its ability to mobilize members not only in strikes but also in policing the effective agreement, filing grievances and also serving in the capacity of union stewards or committee members. Unions’ bargaining strength was enhanced by the percentage of all workers they represented, and leads to a higher union wage premium (Freeman and Medoff 1981 as quoted by Forth and Millward (2002).

Teaching had become a big industry in Kenya, employing many people throughout the country. However, with the large number of the educated joining the teaching profession, poor pay and lack of motivation, the teaching profession does not enjoy high status in the society as it did before (Bogonko 2002). Where the vast majority of workers in a given industry were covered by collective bargaining, union-negotiated wages had less impact on the employer's cost competitiveness than in instances in which competing employers had ready access to non-union labour. This was because above-market wage costs were faced by all competitors. This explained the reasons why unions kept on urging the nonunionized who were qualified to join their
unions as union strengths lie in the numbers that a union had. In Kenya the need for a labour organization for teachers arose out of the need for teachers to have unified terms and conditions of services. For many years teachers were paid different wages, depending on who was the employer. Teachers in missionary schools were paid different salaries from those in Government employment or local authorities even when they had similar qualifications (www.knut.co.ke).

Teachers join trade unions for different reasons with the view that union bargaining will improve their welfare. Randall (2007) argues that union bargaining raises teachers' compensation, improves their working conditions, and enhances their employment security—while also raising the cost of providing public education by upwards of 15 percent.

The strengths of unions depend on their abilities to mobilize its members towards a common goal. Gallager and Fullager (2005) state that the strength of a union depends, in part, upon its ability to mobilize members not only in strikes but also in policing the effective agreement, filing grievances and also serving in the capacity of union stewards or committee members. Unions' bargaining strength is enhanced by the percentage of all workers they represent, and leads to a higher union wage premium (Freeman & Medoff 1981 as quoted by Forth & Millward 2002). Membership in the trade unions is vital. A higher trade union density increases the trade unions bargaining strength.
Bryson (2003) states that higher union density is associated with an increased likelihood that employees think that “unions make a difference of what it is like to work”. Where the vast majority of workers in a given industry are covered by collective bargaining, union-negotiated wages have less impact on the employer's cost competitiveness than in instances in which competing employers have ready access to non-union labour. This is because above-market wage costs are faced by all competitors. This explains the reasons why unions keep on urging the nonunionized that are qualified to join their unions as union strengths lie in the numbers that a union has.

In Kenya the need for a labour organization for teachers arose out of the need for teachers to have unified terms and conditions of services. For many years teachers were paid different wages, depending on who was the employer. Teachers in missionary schools were paid different salaries from those in Government employment or local authorities even when they had similar qualifications (www.knut.co.ke). In 1957, the colonial government allowed an umbrella teachers’ grouping, the Kenya National Union of Teachers, KNUT, which was registered as a trade union in 1959. Apart from negotiating higher wages for teachers, KNUT’s major success is the establishment of the Teachers Service Commission (www.knut.co.ke)

In 1998, the Kenya Union of Post Primary Education Teachers, KUPPET, was registered for teachers in secondary schools, colleges and other post primary institutions (www.kuppet.co.ke). Therefore the factors that influence the
teachers’ choice of labour unions come into consideration as some teachers deliberately refuse to be unionized while there could be other teachers who prefer a particular union to the other.

Due to competition for numbers the membership of teachers labour unions is such an important factor that the rivalry between the teachers unions has intensified with the labour unions competing for more members so as to increase their strength. The Kenya Union of Post Primary Education Teachers which earlier on drew its members from post primary institutions has had to amend its constitution in order to allow primary school teachers who have acquired degrees to become members (KUPPET Press release on 1st, November, 2012). This shows that the above union is no longer basing its consideration on the level in which teachers work but on the qualification of the teachers themselves.

Teaching has become a big industry in Kenya, employing many people throughout the country. However, with the large number of the educated joining the teaching profession, poor pay and lack of motivation, the teaching profession does not enjoy high status in the society as it did before (Bogonko 2002). Due to competition for numbers the membership of teachers labour unions was such an important factor that the rivalry between the teachers unions had intensified with the labour unions competing for more members so as to increase their strength. The Kenya Union of Post Primary Education Teachers which earlier on drew its members from post primary institutions
had to amend its constitution in order to allow primary school teachers who had acquired degrees to become members (KUPPET Press release on 1
\textsuperscript{1} November 2012). This showed that the above union was no longer basing its consideration on the level in which teachers worked but on the qualification of the teachers themselves.

There were many reasons as to why an individual worker would want to join a union and to choose one union from two competing unions. Nzuve and Singh (2010) state that factors that may make an individual worker to join a union are; dissatisfaction with management, need for social outlet, need for avenue of leadership, forced unionization, social pressure from co-workers. Checci, (2005). also states that employees join trade unions due to job security, for better wages, for improvement of working conditions, for fair and just supervision, for a sense of power and for a sense to belong. Fay (2006) also agrees that individuals are what they are because of the social role in which they belong; the result is that the individual could only be understood by placing him or her in a social context as quoted by Brooks (2005). Therefore the factors that influence the teachers’ choice of labour unions came into consideration as some teachers deliberately refused to be unionized while there could be other teachers who preferred a particular union to the other.

\textbf{1.2 Statement of the problem}

Nzuve and Sing (2010) states the reasons why a worker may not want to join a union which includes…”it costs money to be a member of a trade union, the
thought that trade unions are unnecessary, the belief that one will get the same
benefits since collective bargaining covers all members in similar or
equivalent grades, individual conviction”. This was the same problem stated
by Schnabel and Wagner (2007) which states that many services that unions
provide such as higher wages and better conditions of work accrue both to
union and non-union members in the work place. This brought the problem of
free rider Meaning some employees were not unionized and yet they were
reaping the benefits of the bargaining process of unions. This brought about
the need to perform a research in Nyambene Branch Meru County based on
factors influencing teachers choice of labour unions in publics secondary
schools.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the factors influencing teachers
choice of labour unions in public secondary schools in the four districts of
Nyambene Branch.

1.4 Objectives of the study

i. To determine extent to which the subscription fee charged by the teachers’
unions’ influenced teachers’ choices of the unions in Nyambene Branch.

ii. To assess the extent to which teachers’ expected economic benefits
influenced their choice of labour unions.

iii. To examine how peer pressures among teachers influence teachers’ choice of
labour unions in Nyambene branch.
iv. To examine the extent to which the leadership of respective labour unions influence teachers’ choices of labour unions.

1.5 Research questions

i. To what extent does the subscription fee levied by the labour unions influence the teachers’ choices for the unions?

ii. How do teachers’ economic conditions influence their choices of labour union?

iii. To what extent does peer pressure influence the teachers’ choice of labour unions?

iv. How does the leadership of teachers’ labour unions influence their choice of labour unions?

1.6 Significance of the study

The findings of this study would be important in several ways. First, they provide greater insights to the leadership of various teachers’ unions as it highlights the various factors influencing the teachers’ choice of labour unions. The findings of this study were also important to un-unionized teachers as it informed their decisions to join specific unions.

1.7 Limitations of the study

Limitations were aspects of research that would influence the research findings but which the researcher had no control over (Mugenda and Mugenda 2003). In this study, the respondents feared giving out information
as some of them considered confidential. However the researcher should assure the respondents that their identity would be confidential.

1.8 Delimitation of the study

The study was conducted in public secondary schools in Nyambene Branch. Private secondary schools were not included because teachers in these schools do not belong to any recognized trade unions in the four sub-counties of Nyambene Branch.

1.9 Basic assumptions of the study

In conducting this research, it was assumed that;

i. Respondents would cooperate and give reliable and honest information when responding to items in the questionnaire.

ii. All teachers had joined or were about to join a trade Union of their choice.

iii. The labour union’s subscription fee, teachers’ economic conditions, the peer pressure and the union leadership influenced teachers choice of labour unions.

iv. Labour unions’ leadership and the group pressure by teachers influence teachers’ choice of labour unions.

v. The factors which influenced employees in other sectors to join labour unions also applied to teachers and teaching profession.
1.10 Definition of significant terms

**Economic conditions:** refer to the profit a person would get after joining a trade union, in terms of salary, allowances and leaving experienced by the teachers which compelled them to join the labour unions so that their states could be improved (Handley, 2009).

**Employer:** refers to any person, public body, firm, corporation or company, who or which had entered into a contract of service to employ any individual, and includes the agent, foreman, manager or factor of such person, public body, firm, corporation or company (Labour Relations Act, 2007).

**Labour Unions:** refer to an organization of employees whose principal purpose was to regulate relations between employees and employers, including any employer’s organization.

**Peer pressure:** refers to the influence that one gets when with one’s peers and the tendency was to always perform the same tasks as the peers so as not to be seen to be remaining behind (Premack & Hunter, 2008).

**Subscription fee:** refers to the amount of money that employees payed to the labour unions in order to become members of the labour union.

**Teachers’ Union:** refers to the organizations representing teachers’ interests to other parties. They are two in number namely; The Kenya National Union of Teachers (KNUT) and The Kenya Union of Post Primary Education Teachers (KUPPET).

**Union leadership:** refers to the influence that the holders of union’s offices had on the members of the labour union. Employees normally looked upon
the holders of the offices for guidance on certain industrial matters hence they provided leadership to the members (Snyder, Verderber, & Morris, 2006).

**Unionisable employee:** refers to employees eligible for membership of a trade union, in the case for teachers, Unionisable teachers means that the qualified teachers who were eligible for membership of the either trade union (Sangma, 2005).

### 1.11 Organization of the study

The research project is organized into five chapters. Chapter one deal with the introduction, consisting of the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objective of the study, research questions, significance of the study, imitation of the study, delimitation of the study, basic assumptions of the study, definition of significant terms.

Chapter two contain review of related literature consisting of the introduction of the literature review, labour unions’ membership fee, teachers’ economic conditions, group pressure and a sense of belonging, labour unions’ leadership, and summary of literature review, theoretical and conceptual framework.

Chapter three consists of the study methodology, detailing the study design, the study sample and the sampling procedures, data collection instruments and the data analysis techniques. Data analysis and discussion of the study findings is in chapter four. Chapters five include a summary of the research findings, conclusions and recommendations and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter covered related literature on how membership fee, teachers economic Conditions justified in terms of profitability (salaries, leave and allowances) peer pressure and the leadership of labour unions affected teachers’ choices of labour unions. It will also cover the theoretical and conceptual framework of the study.

2.2 Labour unions’ membership fee and choice of the union
Naylor and Cripps (1993) as quoted by Schnabel and Wagner proposed that union density levels were likely to raise as a result of the reduction in union membership costs. This showed the impact that higher union fee had on the overall membership density as it was likely to discourage potential members. Bryson (2003) stated that employee’s desire for unions had been as strong as ever but the cost of union membership had risen relative to the benefits. Further, Employees would only purchase the membership if the perceived benefits outweigh the costs (Farber and Western 2002).

Keane (2002) argued that the strength of a labour union depended on members paying their annual fees to labour unions. Membership fee would affect the workers decision to join a trade union that was; the rise in the membership fee was likely to reduce the breadth of solidarity within the relevant segment of
the labour force as the larger numbers of workers were deterred by the higher fees (Gallagher, 2004). Nzuve and Singh (2002) also argued that one of the reasons why an individual would not want to join a trade union was that it cost money to be a member of a trade union and the belief that the same benefits would be gotten since the collective agreement covered all workers in the same grades (Premack, & Hunter, 2008).

Blanchflower (2007) also stated that union induced wage hikes limited the workers entry into the unionized sector. Visser (2002) postulated that higher union membership cost (relative to the benefits) would decrease the probability of membership. Amnion (2008) argued that trade unions’ bargaining power would be linked to membership fee as the latter factor would be linked to trade union density and cohesion of members’ commitment to unions’ objectives and strategies. Arise in trade union membership fee reduced trade union density as a result of departure of workers for whom membership fee was higher. When it came to teachers in Kenya, the two national labour unions recognized by the government charged their membership and subscription fees with the Kenya National Union of Teachers charging slightly higher than their KUPPET counterparts.

The Kenya National Union of Teachers charges a two percent fee of the basic salary earned by its members as the union subscription fee and the application for membership was five shillings.(www.knut.co.ke), while the Kenya Union of Post Primary Education Teachers (KUPPET), charged new recruits fifty
shilling as the membership fee plus a one point five percent of the basic salary of teachers as the monthly subscription to all members (www.kuppet.co.ke) These would result in teachers joining a labour union where they feel that the subscription fee was slightly cheaper.

2.3 Teachers’ economic conditions and choice of the unions  

**Economic conditions:** refer to the profit a person would get after joining a trade union, in terms of salary, allowances and leaving experienced by the teachers which compelled them to join the labour unions so that their states could be improved (Handley, 2009).

Teaching profession for a long time has been characterized by poor pay and poor working conditions and therefore does not enjoy high status. As a result, the primary aim for the formation of teacher’s trade unions was to improve on teachers’ economic status. However, according to Dunlop (1968), the setting of wages and fringe benefits in the United States normally occurred at the establishment level. Under such circumstances some unionized workers in the unionized establishments would reap the benefits of union bargaining power.

Blanchflower (2007) proposed that several studies showing that trade unions reduced wage inequalities and standardized rates of pay across firms in the USA, UK and several Asian countries. The present study also records a significant difference between unionists’ and non-unionists’ satisfaction with their overall jobs.
According to Kornfield (2002), pay upwards by government tribunals in Australia covered nearly the entire workforce and those awards set equal pay for comparable union and non-union workers, however union members may secure higher compensation through plant level compensation and the results showed that union members in Australia enjoyed 7-18 percent higher wages than non-union worker and were more likely to had access to pension. Union members in Australia had longer job tenure than non-union workers and were less likely to quit or suffer layoffs (Nicolson, Ursell & Blyton, 2001 Kornfield 2002, & Gani, 2002). This therefore would be the reason why a given section of employees may choose to be unionized because of the advantages that they would had over the non-unionized employees, the advantage being of higher wages by the unionized employee hence the ununionized would be motivated to join a union.

In Australia, pay awards by government tribunals cover nearly the entire workforce and those awards set equal pay for comparable union and non-union workers. Union members may however secure higher compensation through plant-level bargaining. This study tries to estimate the magnitude of union effects on compensation by examining changes in the compensation of the employees who enter and leave unions jobs, relative to changes in the compensation of workers who remain in union or non-unions. The result shows that union workers enjoy 7-18 percent higher wages than comparable non-union workers and are also more likely to have access to a pension plan. As quoted by Robert Kornfield (Abstract courtesy JSTOR).
The impact of trade unions on work and Pay

Pay level: - Recent legislation has provided trade unions with a right to recognition by employers in certain circumstances. Research studies showed that trade unions raised pay and constrained employment growth. In (1998) unions did achieve higher pay where bargaining for a sizeable majority of the workforce and where multiple unions were involved.

Work Place Closure: - The complete closure of workplace where jobs are not transferred elsewhere represents a large scale loss of jobs. Many factors influences the likelihood of workplace closing that is its economic performance in the preceding period, but statistical analysis show that closure also depends upon industrial characteristics, the type of workplace, the nature of workforce and how its managed. Workplaces with recognized trade unions were no more likely to close than workplaces without trade unions.

Employment Growth: - employment in the typical unionized workplace declined at a big rate: whilst employment in the average non-union workplace grew. These means union recognition restricted the growth continuing workplaces mainly in the private sectors. This negative effects of unions on employment growth was slightly larger in service industry than in manufacturing industry. However, it was confined to cases in which unions negotiated over wages, but had no role in determining staffing levels or recruitments.
Pay Settlement: Basic pay is adjusted annually for most employees. This is particularly the case where trade unions are involved. Unions appear to affect the process of pay determination more than the outcome.

There was also the interactionist approach to union joining that says that an individual was strongly influenced by his social context that was his living and working environment (Schnabel & Wagner, 2007). The frustration-aggression approach explained union membership as a result of individual frustration, dissatisfaction or alienation at their workplace (Klandermans, 1986 as quoted by Schnabel & Wagner, 2007). Rational choice approach explained unionization as the product of a process, weighing costs and benefits of participating, expectations about the degree to which the union would be able to realize these motives. Klandermans, 1986 as quoted by Schnabel and Wagner, (2007).

Unions would also push for a more generous allocation of overtime for its members (Miller & Mulvey, 2001) or for the reclassification of its members into higher paying occupation categories. If unions push for more allocation of overtime for its members, it meant that, they would be compensated fairly and hence improved their economic conditions. Those managed across many countries, in Australia, pay increased by government tribunals covered nearly all the employees with the unionized employees getting a slight advantage over the unionized employees. Those formed the basis of some unionized workers to continue being out of unions since there was no advantage that
unionized employees had over them. Bain and Price (2003) also stated that employer attitude and behavior significantly influenced workers’ choice to become and remain union members. The greater the extent to which an employer is prepared to recognize a union, the more likely the workers were to be unionized.

According to Fanaroff (2003) as cited in Grobler et al. (2006), employees would be motivated to join a union for job security, negotiating better wages and benefits, better working conditions. Unions in the name of fairness, justice and humanity demanded fair wages for the labouring class (Oswald, 2005). This meant that unions aid their members in improving their economic conditions. On the psychological approach, there was a belief that, among a wide range of occupational groups, workers’ propensity to unionize was significantly related to their dissatisfaction with various facets of the job (Berger 2003; Bluen & Zwam, 2007; Premack & Hunter, 2008). In a critique of this proposition, Guest and Dewe (2008) asserted that there were conceptual problems in using job dissatisfaction to explain continued union membership, as opposed to union joining, since logically, the reasons for union membership disappeared if the sources of dissatisfaction are removed. According to Macaray (2015) employees are motivated to join labour union for several reasons among them are;

**Money,** that union jobs pay significantly more than non-union jobs. From top to bottom, industry to industry, region to region, union wages are going to be
roughly 10-20 percent higher than non-union wages. Which is why companies resist them; they don't want to pay one dime more than they have to.

**Benefits**, pensions, medical insurance, paid vacation, holidays, personal holidays, sick pay, overtime premiums, shift differential etc are generally than those who aren’t unionized.

**Safety.** Union facilities are safer than non-union facilities. A union contract gives employees the immediate right to address an unsafe condition. There's no comparison. Union facilities are far safer.

**Dignity.** As a union worker you'll see fewer moody and dictatorial bosses. While you can still (rightly) be fired for job performance, you don't have to tip-toe around in fear of being harassed or terrorized. Also, ironically, because administering a contract requires a higher level of competence, you'll find more efficient bosses in a union shop. Instead of flitting about making questionable, off-the-cuff decisions, they're forced to behave like "professionals."

**Security.** Bosses can't just walk up and fire you because they want to give your job to their wife's nephew. Nor can they lay you off out of sequence, demote you arbitrarily, or prevent you, without sufficient cause, from promoting to the next higher job. For example, African Americans and women didn't get their shot at big-time manufacturing jobs until labor unions gave it to them, a fact that doesn't receive enough recognition.

**Competence.** Union workers tend to be better workers than their non-union counterparts. Before you vehemently object, just take a moment to consider the dynamics. Which job in a community is going to attract the higher caliber
worker -- the one offering decent wages, good benefits and exemplary working conditions? Or the one with low pay, lousy benefits and no air-conditioning?

Activism. You have the opportunity to become a shop steward and represent your fellow workers. Being chosen steward is no glorified popularity contest - not like being elected class president or homecoming queen. Indeed, people on the floor are going to pick a person they deem best qualified to represent their interests. And as a union official whose authority is recognized by labor law, you will forever be a footnote in the history of the labor movement.

There were studies that showed that the variables influenced the membership orientation of employees. Most of the researchers had explored the influence of such background factors as age, sex, educational attainments, family responsibility, marital status, etc. (Bain & Price, 2003; Booth, 2006; Duncan & Leigh, 2000). These factors influenced the unionization decision through their effects on the individual’s demand for union service. Various job-related variables such as nature of job, job tenure, occupational status, wage distribution, working conditions, and skill differentials had also been identified as affecting an individual’s disposition towards unionization (Farber & Saks, 2000; Handley, 2009).

Employees would also join unions depending on the benefit expected from the union. Schnabel and Wagner (2007) stated that the larger the monetary and non-monetary benefits of union representation, the more likely were
employees likely to join a union. In contrast, the lower the cost of substituting services such as social welfare benefits, the lower the demand for union services would be. Oslo 1965 as quoted by Schnabel and Wagner (2007) also noted that large unions existed because of among other reasons the capability of unions to offer selective incentives in form of private goods and services available only to members.

Workers’ propensity to unionize had been found to be negatively related to job satisfaction. The results, therefore, add weight to the psychologists’ view that union joining is a response to frustration and dissatisfaction with various aspects of a job (Guest & Dewe, 2008).

Graham and Bennetts (2008) unions have specific objectives: they seek better wages and working conditions for their members. The most obvious reason why workers joined unions was that they wanted something that they cannot get on their own: better wages and working conditions (Visser, 2002). A primary goal of any trade union was to maintain and improve workers’ terms and conditions, particularly workers who were members of the union, through collective bargaining with employers. However, whether unions were successful, depended in large part on their bargaining strength which was based on their ability to restrict the supply of labour to the employer and on the ability of employers to concede above-market wages (Blanchflower, 2007).
There is a wide range of motives that influenced employees’ decision to join a union or to resist joining the labour unions. Each motive may be operative at any one time, although some had been of special significance to employees during some period of their working lives. From the above studies, it was clear that the economic situation being experienced by the employee would be the motivating factor for employees’ unionization with the view of improving their economic conditions.

2.4 Peer pressure and choice of labour unions

Peer group influence refers to the influence exerted by friends and co-workers on an employee to change his attitudes in order to conform to group customs and norms (Pravin, 2010). In some cases, employees would decide to join unions due to peer pressure and influence. For instance, friends and colleagues may prevail upon a non-union employee to join a union. When the unionized employee puts constant pressure, the employee would ultimately yield to such pressure and decide in favour of joining a union (Pravin 2010). Workers’ decisions to join unions did not occur in a social vacuum but were influenced by the decisions and pressure from family, co-workers, managers, employers, government and union organizers (Hardley, 1992 as quoted by Visser, 2002).

Wadington and Whiston (2007), noted that the reasons why employees joined union could often be separated into those examining union joining decisions from an individual’s perspective or those who joined for collective reasons. Brooks (2005) cites Fay (2006) who stated that individuals were what they
were because of the social role in which they belonged; the result was that an individual could only be understood by placing him or her in a social context. This meant that an individual would be influenced significantly by the group they associated with and would in most cases act according to the group's influence. Sedman and Benard Karsh (1951) also stated that a form of behaviour characteristics of human society was the coercing effect of the group upon individuals members who came to share common expectations of the group. According to Joel and Benard (1951), a large number of union members joined unions merely because others were doing so that was, in line with the majority. That meant that employees joined unions just because their co-workers also belonged to a trade union and so the employees try to keep up with the norm in the work place.

2.5 Sense of belonging and choice of labour unions

Sociologists suggested that an individual’s social context, both inside and outside the workplace, would strongly influence them either to accept or reject the union (Cooke, 2003). One of the basic needs of a human being is the powerful urge to be accepted by society, to belong to and to go along with others. To an overwhelming majority, a union gives a “true society” of which they would feel an important part. Visser (2006) proposed that many workers joined unions in order to occupy a psychologically safe position among members of the group that was, in order not to be isolated or despised as a parasite. Those brought in the view that employees at a work place would feel
comfortable if all members belonged to a union thus bringing’ in the pressure for the un-unionized to do so.

Farber and Saks (2000) stated that new hires in union firms would face strong social pressure to join a union. People would also join unions because of ideological convictions. Schnabel and Wagner (2007) also agreed that workers would be more prepared to join a union if others are joining. Group pressure and the urge to join unions could also be looked at from the Perspective of the national culture of a given section of employees. National culture could also play an important role on the influence it had on the employees labour union joining behaviour. Posthuma (2009) argued that people living in a country with a strong cultural collectivism tend to trust labour union to help protect their rights and interests and were thus more likely to join labour unions. Enrolment and contribution in union activity was seen to be higher for people who place a higher value on the collective good as opposed to individual benefits (Flood 2007) and strong attitudes favoring labour unions biases reasoning leading to a justification of union action (Lynn & Williams 2000).

Schnabel and Wagner (2007) stated that the individual decision to join a union is strongly influenced by his social context, that was his living and working environment and that the traditions and the prevailing opinions were more important and the general beliefs were formed about unions even before the employment relationship was entered into. The prevailing union density in an individual’s establishment and the contact with the union at the work place
would inform an individual to join a union or not. Bryson (2003) stated the reasons why employees joined unions was that “my friends and colleagues were already members” and the reputation that an employee earns in the eyes of her peers. (Brooth 1985 as quoted by Bryson 2003. In addition if friends and colleagues were members of a particular trade union, they can provide information about the benefits of membership which would not be obvious where you know nobody in membership. (Bryson and Gomez 2003).

However, Graham et al (2008) stated that despite the pressure from current union members, an employee was less likely to join a union if he or she is an isolated worker, feels his or her status was high or has a conscientious or a religious objection.

2.6 Labour unions’ leadership and choice of labour unions

Barling, Fullagar and Kelloway (2002) found that attitudes towards both local unions and its officers were highly correlated with union loyalty. Members could choose not to belong to a trade union or in some cases join another trade union which they perceived as more likely to meet their expectations, so union leaders needed to demonstrate that their (union) achieved organizational objectives to ensure they were seen by their stakeholders as effective organizational leaders. According to Metochi (2002), union leader’s behavior would had both a direct and significant effect on willingness to participate in trade unions activities and an indirect effect through member attitudes. There was a significant link between leadership behavior and member attitudes.
According to Fullagar (2002), Kelloway & Barling (2003) as cited by Metochi (2002) the effects of leadership behavior on union members had a great impact on the perception that members had on the union. It cited transformational leadership to examine potential contribution of leadership characteristics in influencing the union’s socialization process and attitudes to organized labour. Metochi (2002) also found that transformational leadership by the union officials also had a significant impact on either both socialization into a union or general union attitude.

Keane (2002) suggested that the strength of labour unions depended on three factors namely, members regularly paying their annual fees to the labour union, members willing to participate in the activities arranged by the labour union and the size of the labour union itself. The characteristics of labour union leaders were also associated with the loyalty among members and the willingness of members to join and work for the labour unions Metochi (2002). That was, these characteristics were prone to influence the strength of labour unions. Jandaravitoon (2001) stated that the conviction of union leaders to pay more attention to public interest than individual interest also influenced members’ commitment to labour unions.

It was also important to analyze the leadership style employed by the union leaders as they (leadership styles) had the potential of influencing the un-unionized employee to join that particular union or not. Some leadership styles were generally admired by the employees while others were shunned.
Cregan & Christina (2005) cited transformational leadership as the basis of strong union commitment. Transformational leadership encouraged loyal membership by charismatic’s idealistic behavior. Handley (2009), emphasized transformational leader’s ability to transform organizational culture.

According to Fullagar (2002), Kelloway & Barling 2003 as cited by Metochi (2002) the effects of leadership behavior on union members had a great impact on the perception that members had on the union. It cited transformational leadership to examine potential contribution of leadership characteristics in influencing the unions socialization process and attitudes to organized labour. Metochi(2002) also found that transformational leadership by the union officials also had a significant impact on either both socialization into a union or general union attitudes.

Metochi (2002) indicated that active leaders promoted participation both directly and indirectly through their influence on members’ attitude towards the union. There was a wide support for the view that the local leaders behavior was vital for fostering attitudes towards the unions (Thacker, Fields & Barclay, 2000). Such attitudes would be translated to participation in union activities Nicholson, Ursell & Blyton, (2001). Thacker, Fields and Barclay (2000) suggested that if management encouraged social integration among workers, adopted a helpful approach towards them, provides such conditions as would improve their economic, social, psychological and physical
conditions and, above all, presented such a picture as would lead the workers to think that management was caring for them, the workers would maintain a favorable attitude towards management and, consequently, union leaders would have little hold on the rank and file. The results proved helpful to management, desirous of remaining non-unionized, in adhering to the motivational requirements of the employees and in resolving their problems so that unionization would either never start, or, once started, would be rejected by employees.

Kelloway and Barling (2003) found that the shop stewards transformational leadership characteristics significantly predicted unions’ loyalty and participation in trade union activities and further that attitudes towards both local union and its officers were highly correlated with union loyalty. It was also important to analyze the leadership style employed by the union leaders as they (leadership styles) had the potential of influencing the un-unionized employee to join that particular union or not. Some leadership styles were generally admired by the employees while others were shunned. Cregan and Christina (2005) cited transformational leadership as the basis of strong union commitment. Transformational leadership encouraged loyal membership by charismatic idealistic behavior. Handley, (2009), emphasized transformational leader’s ability to transform organizational culture.
According to Cole (2004), leadership was a dynamic process whereby an individual in a group was not only responsible for the group’s results, but actively seeks the collaboration and commitment of all the group members in achieving the group goals in a particular context and against the background of a particular national culture. With regard to labour union leadership, Visagie, (2012) stated that leadership provided the directions and goals for a particular union. The leader's task was to make the union effective, by improving the terms and conditions of employment of the worker and also by being concerned with the liability of the enterprise. Leadership would be defined as a position of power held by an individual in a group, which provided him with an opportunity to exercise interpersonal influence on the group members for mobilizing and directing their efforts towards certain goals. The leader, at the center of a group's power structure kept the group together, infused life into it, moved it towards its goals and maintained its momentum (Visagie, (2012)).

2.7 Summary of literature review

The study reviewed the factors influencing employees’ choice of labour unions. It had focused on the extent in which the labour unions’ subscription fee influenced the choice which employees made when choosing labour unions. It had also looked at the teachers’ economic conditions as the basis of the choice of the labour union, the group pressure and the leadership of the unions as the factors influencing employees’ choice of labour unions.
On leadership, Barnet (1921), Bain & Price (2000) as cited by Riley (2007), trade union leadership also contributed to trade union power. Metochi (2002) also argued that trade union leadership had a significant role for the aggregated membership growth. The leadership style mostly admired by the union members had been explored. Kelloway and Barling (2003) also cited transformational leadership style as a basis for unions’ loyalty and commitment in trade union activities. Cregan (2005) also cited transformational leadership style as a basis of attracting union loyalty. Visagie, (2012) proposed that leadership of labour unions provided directions to the members.

Metochi (2002) stated that the characteristics of leaders of a union had an impact on the membership and was likely to influence members willing to join the labour union. Jandaravitoon (2001) looked at the conviction of union leaders to pay more attention to public interest as opposed to individual interest had an impact on the labour union strength. Barling, Fullagar and Kelloway (2002) had looked at leadership in terms of the attitudes it had on the union members and the potential members. Attitude towards both union and its officers were highly correlated with union loyalty. However, Bain & Price (2003) argued that while union leadership had an obvious influence on which union succeeded in organizing a group of workers, they felt that the impact of union leadership was insignificant.
On group pressure and unionization, many studies concurred that individuals join trade unions so as not to be seen to be remaining behind. Schnabel (2007). Posthuma (2009) cited cultural collectivism that individuals with strong national culture tend to trust unions and were likely to be unionized. Posthuma therefore talked about beliefs among the employees that the employees put in their unions.

Kornfield (2003) argued that new hires would face strong social pressure to join unions. Pravin (2010) also agreed that employees joined unions as a result of peer pressure by being prevailed upon by friends and colleagues. That was also the argument that Bryson (2003) took that employees joined unions because friends and colleagues were members of a particular union.

Visser (2002) looked at union joining from a psychological perspective. That many workers joined unions in order to occupy a psychologically safe position among the colleagues so as not to be seen as parasites that was employees benefiting from union activities when they were not members of unions. Fay (1996) stated that an individual can only be understood by placing him in his social context. Schnabel et al (2007) also argued in the same line that workers joined unions if others were also joining. However, Graham et al (2008) stated that because of pressure from current union members, still an employee was less likely to join a union if he or she was an isolated worker or had a religious conviction or felt his/her status was high. Bryson (2003), also argued that there had been a move towards individualism and away from the
collectivist forms of industrial relations which underpins unionization (Phelps1990; Storey1996 as quoted by Bryson (2003). That would in turn affect the workers attachment to unionism. It was therefore on that basis that the study sets out to investigate the gap that was: whether union leadership influenced the decision of employees to join the unions.

On labour union’s membership fee, Amnion (2008) looked at the trade union bargaining power being linked to the membership fee they charged. That had got an overall effect on the trade union density as higher membership fee was likely to discourage potential members from joining. Nzuve et al (2010) also stated the reason why an employee would not want to be a member of a trade union: that it cost money to be a member. That was also likely to had an effect on density of the trade unions. Duncan and Leigh (2000) also agreed that there was a relationship between the bargaining power of a trade union and the membership fee they charged. Blanchflower (2010) also stated that union induced wage hikes reduced workers’ entry into the unions.

The membership fee charged by KUPPET and KNUT had also been explored with the former charging one point five percent of the basic salary while the latter charged two percent of the basic salary. That showed that membership to KUPPET was slightly cheaper than that of KNUT. It was therefore on this basis that there searcher set out to investigate whether the factors discussed influenced teachers’ choice of labour unions.
2.8 Theoretical framework

The study was anchored on expectancy theory advanced by Vroom, (2002). The theory postulated that the level of motivation that an individual felt for doing a particular activity depended upon the extent to which results were expected to contribute to her own particular needs and goals. A key point of that theory is that an individual’s behavior is formed not on the objective reality but on his or her subjective perception of that reality. Vroom focused on the factors involved in stimulating an individual to put effort into something since that was the basis for motivation. He concluded that there were three such factors namely; expectancy, instrumentality and valence.

The expectancy theory was relevant to this study since it was the desired outcome that results from joining a labour union that becomes the motivation behind joining. The desired outcome that an employee might yearn for in joining a labour union include; improvement on the employees’ economic conditions and the general welfare of the employee. An individual would be motivated to join a labour union if for example, the individual felt that the membership fee was slightly cheaper, an individual would also join a labour union if the group pressure at the work place was of the opinion that joining that particular union was the norm and therefore the expected outcome was being at par with the colleagues. An employee would also join a labour union if the expected outcome was the identification with the leadership of the labour union.
2.9 Conceptual framework

The choice to join or not to join a particular labour union was conceptualized as a product of interrelated factors such as membership fee, economic conditions, the peer pressure and the leadership of labour unions. The factors underwent a process by the employee making a decision to join a labour union or not and the output was the choice to join a specific union by the employee.
As indicated in figure 2.1 above, the variables acted on the employee independently which lead to the employee to make a decision as to join a labour union or not. Leadership of the labour union, the peer pressure from fellow employees, The employees economic conditions and the labour unions’ monthly subscription fee, leads to the employee to make a decision to join or not to join one labour union compared to the other and the product was the choice of the preferred labour union based on the variable(s) considered.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter discusses the research design and details of the target population, sample size and sampling procedures, research instruments, instrument reliability and validity, data collection procedure and data analysis techniques.

3.2 Research design
A research design is a plan showing how the problem of investigation would be solved (Orodho, 2003). The study used Descriptive Survey Research Design. That was a method where data was collected by interviewing or administering a questionnaire to a sample of individuals. The method was used in collecting information on people’s attitudes, opinions, habits or any of the variety of education or social issue (Orodho, 2003). In that study, questionnaires were administered to the public secondary school teachers to state the reasons why they joined their respective labour unions. Descriptive research designed allowed the researcher to collect opinions from the respondents so as to state the factors which influenced their choices of their respective labour unions.

3.3 Target population
According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), a population is a complete set of individuals, cases or objects with some common observable characteristics.
The target population consisted of 116 public secondary schools that were 95 mixed schools, 9 boys’ schools and 12 girls schools (DEO Tigania East, Tigania West, Igembe Central and Igembe south, 2015). The sub-counties total population would include 5392 teachers which is inclusive of teachers belonging to either Kenya National Union of Teachers or Kenya Union of Post Primary Education Teachers and also teachers who are not unionized and were yet to join either of the unions.

3.4 Sample size and sampling procedures

Sampling is the act, process or technique of selecting suitable sample or a representative part of a population for the purpose of determining parameters or the characteristics of the whole population Orodho, (2003). A sample is a subset of a population that is used to represent the entire group as a whole Barker, (2007). Since that study could not cover all the 116 secondary schools in Nyambene branch, a sample was be selected to take part in the study.

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), a minimum sample of 10 to 30 percent was recommended for a study. Nyambene branch had 116 Public Secondary schools. Out of the 116 secondary schools, the researcher targeted 10 percent of the target population which would give a sample size of 539 teachers. The researcher sampled a number of teachers proportionate to the population targeted through stratified sampling because the teachers selected belonged to different labour unions and some of them had not even joined either of the unions and were in the process of joining.
3.5 Research instruments

The researcher used a questionnaire in the study which was considered to be the most suitable instrument for descriptive research design. According to Orodho (2003), questionnaires required less time, were less expensive and permitted collection of data from a wide geographical area. In the study, only one questionnaire for the teachers would be used.

Teachers’ questionnaire was divided into two parts. The first part with items on the background information such as age, gender, academic qualification, professional qualification and the labour union affiliation. The second part contained information on the factors considered by teachers in choosing a labour union such as subscription fee, union leadership and peer pressure.

3.6 Validity of the instrument

Validity is a measure of how well a test measured what it was supposed to measure Orodho, (2003). According to Orodho (2003), to ensure content validity, a researcher needed to first appraise the instrument. A pilot study would be conducted. Six schools per sub-county randomly selected, seven teachers to participate in the pilot study. The schools and the respondents to be used will be part of the main study. Pilot study would help to highlight items in the research instrument that are ambiguous and inappropriate in order to improve quality and validity.
3.7 Reliability of the instrument.

Neil (2009) cites reliability as the measure of accuracy of a test or measuring instrument obtained by measuring the same individuals twice and computing the correlation of the two sets of measures. It was the extent to which an experiment, test, or measuring procedure yields the same results. After conducting the pilot study with the six schools per sub-county, the researcher was at least to repeat sample groups to reduce the chance of an abnormal sample group skewing the results. The use of multiple sample groups would smooth out these extremes and generates a more accurate spread of results. The test-retest method was to be used for testing reliability in this case. It would involve issuing the questionnaires to the seven teachers in the six schools in the four sub-counties.

3.8 data analysis techniques

Both quantitative and qualitative data analysis would be used in the study. According to Nachmias and Nachmias (2006), qualitative analysis involved obtaining detailed information about phenomena being studied and establishing patterns and trends from the gathered information. Quantitative analysis was based on numerical measurement of specific aspects of a given phenomenon (Thomas, 2003). Descriptive statistics was used to analyze the data quantitatively by use of frequencies and percentages. The open ended questions provide a qualitative data that was analyzed. The presentation of the data would be in the form of frequencies, tables and percentages.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents analysis and findings of the study as set out in the research methodology. The data was gathered exclusively from questionnaire as the research instrument. The questionnaire was designed in line with the objectives of the study. To enhance data quality of data obtained, Likerts type questions were also included whereby respondents indicated the extent to which the variables were practiced. The study targeted 539 respondents in collecting data with regard to the factors influencing teachers’ choice of labour unions in public secondary schools in Nyambene Branch, Meru County, Kenya.

4.1.1 Response rate

From the data collected, out of the 539 questionnaires administered, 435 were filled and returned, which represents 80.7 percent response rate.
Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) observed that a 50 percent response rate was adequate, 60 percent good and above, while 70 percent rated very good. This implies that based on this assertion, the response rate in this case of 80.7 percent is therefore very good. This response rate is considered satisfactory to make conclusions for the study.
4.2 Demographic characteristics

4.2.1 Gender

This section aimed at establishing the gender of the teachers to ascertain the age group of the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results depicted in table 4.1 revealed that the majority of the respondents were males comprising 54 percent while 46 percent were females. The higher number of responses in male gender is attributed to the fact that in Meru men were considered superior in everything and thus even education. Male folks were taken to schools while female were left at home to tender for cows or cook for their homes. There was also a high school dropout rate due to early pregnancies resulting to very few females completing their schooling. The educated female fork also tended to be married outside the community leaving the uneducated behind. As a result of this many schools tend to have male teachers.
4.2.2 Gender and teachers’ unionization

This section aimed at establishing the gender of the teachers and whether they belonged to a labour union to ascertain whether there was any relationship between gender and unionization among secondary school teachers in Nyambene Branch, Meru County, Kenya. The findings are as presented in table 4.2

Table 4.2: Gender and unionization of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>In a Union</th>
<th>Not in a Union</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results depicted in table 4.2 revealed that the majority 87 percent of male teachers belonged to a union compared to 87.6 percent of female teachers. Also the results show that only about 19.4 percent of female teachers are not members of labour unions, as compared to 12.8 percent of male teachers who are not unionized.

According to Berger, Olson, and Boudreau (2003) no significant relationship exists between sex and belonging to trade unions. However, while analyzing the results, one can infer that males are more prone to unionization. The
greater reluctance of women to join unions can be attributed to their stronger domestic allegiance, the dominance of men in the union and women being historically less committed to the industrial pattern of living.

4.2.2 Age of the respondents

This section inquired on the age of the respondents to ascertain the age bracket that majority of the teachers fall. The findings are as presented in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Age of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Brackets</th>
<th>In a Union</th>
<th>Not in a Union</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>129</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>199</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results depicted in table 4.2 revealed that most of the respondents were aged 35-44 years comprising 48 percent while 24 percent were aged 25-34 years. 15 percent were aged 45-54 years while 8 percent were aged 21-24 years. This implies that majority of the teachers are aged 35-44 years and thus are mature and as well energetic to deliver in their teaching career.

The majority responses is attributed to the fact in the earlier recruitment by the government before 2007 it was based on the people or students who had completed college in the same year which would be that they belong in a certain age bracket. These days it is different in that recruitment is done in terms of replacements and therefore very few teachers are employed. Today the vacancies on teaching announced by the government / teachers service commission (TSC) are too minimal as compared to the previous years when the whole lot that completed the profession colleges were recruited to the service.

4.2.3 Teaching experience

This section aimed at establishing the teaching experience of the respondents. The findings are as presented in figure 4.2.
Results depicted in figure 4.1 showed that majority of the respondents had 5-10 years of experience while 27 percent had 11-15 years of experience. This graph depicts that 11 percent had less than 5 years experience. The results are an indication that majority of the respondents had worked in the teaching field for enough duration of time and therefore had enough experience in responding to the issues sought by this study.

4.2.4 Teaching experience and teachers’ membership to a labour union

This section aimed at establishing the teaching experience of the teachers and their enrolment to labour unions and ascertains whether there was any relationship existing between teaching experience and membership to labour unions.
Table 4.4 Teaching experience and teachers’ membership to a labour union

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>In a Union</th>
<th>Not in a union</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 21 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>366</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>435</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results depict in table show that majority 35 (17.5 percent) of the teachers belonging to a labour union have been teaching for a period ranging between 11–15 years. The results also show that majority of the teachers 43 (21.6 percent) who are yet to join a labour union have been teaching for less than 5 years. The study infers that teachers with experiences of over 5 years are more likely to be members of a labour union of their choice. This is so because those teachers with a high teaching experience have had a chance to interact with the unions and are able to interpret the importance of being a union member.
### 4.2.5 Academic qualifications

In this section, the aim was to establish the academic qualifications of the respondents. The findings are as presented in Table 4.4

#### Table 4.5: Academic qualifications of the teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic qualifications</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ed</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGDE</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other diploma</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>435</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results depicted in table 4.3 showed that most of the respondents were Bachelor of Education degree holders. This is an indication that majority of the respondents had acquired the relevant skills/academic qualifications to serve in this field. Unionization is, interestingly, found to be unrelated to education and tenure.

The results do, however, support the view that workers’ propensity to unionize is higher at the beginning and during the period of stability in their working lives. Workers may have high hopes of the unions at the time of joining them but after a longer exposure to employment and better understanding of the forces at work, they perceive the union’s helplessness in various areas. Reality guides them not to expect from their union what it
cannot do. With regard to the influence of education on unionization decision, there is considerable evidence on record (Beng, 2000; Handley, 2009) that because of its positive impact on promotion prospects and enrichment of quality of work life, a high level of education lowers the need for unionization. Also, workers with a higher level of education would tend to be more individualistic. They would see their personal advancement as depending more on movement from their jobs rather than collective action (Handley, 2009).

4.2.5 Terms of employment and membership to a labour union

This section inquired on the terms of employment of the respondents to ascertain whether it had any relationship with membership to a labour union. The findings are as presented in Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Permanent</th>
<th>BOG</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a union</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in a union</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>388</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>426</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results depicted in table 4.3 showed that most of the teachers 340 (92.8 percent) who are unionized are permanently employed and pensionable, 26 (7.1 percent) are employed by the board of governors.
4.2.6 Respondents’ membership to teachers’ union

Further, the study sought to find out which teachers union the teachers belonged. From the study results, majority of the respondents (66 percent) indicated that they are members of KNUT. Many have joined KNUT because of the union’s leadership which they say is focused on teachers’ welfare and peer pressure’s influences too has contributed to this.

The table below shows these factors;

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNUT</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUPPET</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.7 Reason for not joining teachers’ union

This section of study aimed at inquiring the reason why the respondents had not joined teachers’ union. The findings are presented in Table 4.6.
Table 4.8: Reasons for not joining teachers’ unions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High union subscription</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction with the leadership of unions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer pressure from colleagues</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic conditions</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results depicted in table 4.6 revealed that out of the 69 respondents not in the union majority of the respondents (47.8 percent) have not joined because of dissatisfaction with the high union subscription fee of the respective labour unions. The study revealed that those who are yet to join teachers union are considering joining KNUT. The study further sought to find out the reason why the respondents considered joining KNUT. Results depicted in table 4.7 revealed that majority of the respondents (67 percent) are considering joining KNUT because of the satisfaction with unions leadership, 20 percent indicated it is because of peer influence from the colleagues, 7 percent indicated it is because of the slightly lower membership fee. Further, the study revealed that a slightly lower membership fee and lastly a few (6 percent) indicated that the perceived improvement on economic conditions is the key reason why teachers are considering joining KNUT.
These results are in marked contrast to some of the explorations which lay great emphasis on sociological, psychological and political motives (Brett, 2000). In a survey of a number of teachers unions in India by Deshpande, and Viswesvaran, (1992), the respondents were asked to state the main reasons for which non-unionists did not join unions. They were found to be somewhat hesitant in endorsing completely the above views of teachers. Most of the teachers emphasized the migratory character of the teachers, the temporary nature of their jobs, illiteracy and fear of victimization as factors operating on teachers’ decision not to join a trade union.

**Factors affecting teachers’ choice of labour union**

The study also sought to establish if the union is managed in a satisfactory manner by its officials. All the respondents indicated that the union is well managed. Further, the study inquired on whether labour union officials are managing the union for their own personal gains.

**Table 4.9: Factors affecting teachers’ choice of labour union**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For an improvement on economical conditions</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A slightly lower membership fee</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer influence from colleagues</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You identity with the union’s leadership</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>435</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results depicted from this table shows that the union leaders are more concerned about teachers’ welfare and this attracts more teachers to the union.

**Figure 4.3: Labor union officials and management**

Results revealed in figure 4.3 showed that majority of the respondents 98 percent indicated that the labour union officials are not managing the union for their own personal gains while 2 percent indicated that labour union officials are managing the union for their own personal gains.

This finding disagrees with Guest and Dewe (2008) observations that the main reason for some workers not joining any union was the workers’ dissatisfaction with the functioning of the unions. They felt that unions in general are not functioning or doing any good, and that they had no faith in their activities, leadership and sincerity. Many workers were found to view
unions primarily as instruments by which union leaders attempt to achieve their own personal goals, whether intrinsic or extrinsic. These results are similar with the findings obtained in Australia (Deery & Cieri, 2001), Singapore (Beng, 2006) and Western Europe as a whole (Visser, 2008) which suggest that employees who held a negative image of unions and their leaders were significantly less likely to be unionized.

Further, the respondents were asked whether they are satisfied with the manner in which their union officials conduct the bargaining process. Results revealed in figure 4.3 showed that majority 98 percent indicated yes while 2 percent indicated no. The results therefore indicate that the union members have confidence with the union leadership mainly because of the leaders persistence follow up of the issues concerning teachers remuneration, allowances and other benefits.

**Respondents’ satisfaction with union officials bargaining process**

The study inquired whether the respondents joined their current labour union just because their workmates are in the same union.
Figure 4.4: Respondents’ satisfaction with union officials bargaining process

The results show that in Figure 4.4 out of the total respondents, 98 percent responded with a no while the rest or 2 percent responded with a yes on the question of satisfaction with union’s officials bargaining process implying that the 98 percent joined willingly without any interference from their workmates. The rest 2 percent were influenced by their peers.

Figure 4.5: Peer influence on the respondents
Results revealed in figure 4.5 showed that majority 88 percent were never influenced by their colleagues to join the labour unions. They rather joined due to benefits accruing from the bargaining power of the respective unions.

Brooks (2005) cites Brewster (2003) who states that individuals are what they are because of the social role in which they belong; the result is that an individual can only be understood by placing him or her in a social context. This means that an individual will be influenced significantly by the group they associate with and will in most cases act according to the groups influence. This study infers that teachers in Kenya do not join labour unions because of the influence from the peers. The findings in figure 4.5 showed that the majority of the respondents joined the unions willingly with no interference from their colleagues. The findings are directly related to the findings in figure 4.4 where the respondents joined the unions willingly without any interference from their workmates.

4.3 Factors influencing the teachers’ choices of labour unions

Table 4.7 tabulates the findings based on the respondents extent of agreement with the statements related the factors affecting the teachers’ choices of labour unions. The study used a scale of 1-5 where 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3= neutral; 4= agree; 5=strongly agree.
Table 4.10: Factors influencing the teachers’ choices of labour unions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership fee</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic conditions</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group pressure</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union leadership</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results depicted in table 4.7 revealed that most respondents strongly agreed that union leadership and group pressure affect teachers’ choices for labour unions as shown mean of 4.8 and 4.7 respectively. Also the study revealed that membership fee affects teachers’ choices for labour unions as shown mean of 4.1 and lastly economic conditions affect teachers’ choices for labour unions as shown means of 3.9.

These results contrast to some of the explorations which lay great emphasis on sociological, psychological and political motives (Bluen & Zwam, 2007; Booth, 2006; Brett, 2000). This is, presumably, because unionism in the industrially advanced West has gone beyond purely economic motives. As unionism has become stabilized there, members expect their unions to provide them with opportunities for leadership, to work for their social and psychological satisfaction and enrich their quality of work life.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter is derived from the analysis of data collected, the following discussions, conclusions and recommendations were made. The responses were based on the objective of the study which was to investigate the factors influencing teachers’ choice of labour unions in public secondary schools in Nyambene Branch, Meru County, Kenya.

5.2 Summary of findings

Nzuve & Singh (2010) cited that the reasons why a worker may not want to join a union could be it costs money to be a member of a trade union, the thought or idea that trade unions are unnecessary, the belief that one will get the same benefits since collective bargaining covers all members in similar or equivalent grades. The study set out to investigate the factors influencing teachers’ choice of labour unions in public secondary schools in the four districts of Nyambene Branch. This was because Nyambene Branch has got a total of five thousand, three hundred and ninety two teachers and only three thousand nine hundred and ninety five teachers belong to either of the teachers’ unions (KUPPET and KNUT).

Workers economic conditions have been cited as a factor that influences workers choice of joining a trade union. Teaching profession for a long time
has been characterized by poor pay and poor working conditions and therefore does not enjoy high status (Bogonko 2002). The study sought to assess the extent to which teachers’ economic conditions influenced their choice of labour unions. Further, Peer group influence has also been cited as a factor that determines a workers choice of a trade union (Pravin, 2010). This study therefore sought to examine how peer pressure among teachers influence teachers’ choice of labour unions in Nyambene branch.

The study was guided by the following specific objectives: To determine extent to which the subscription fee charged by the teachers’ unions’ influenced teachers’ choices of unions; To assess the extent to which teachers’ economic conditions influenced their choice of labour unions; To examine how peer pressures among teachers influence teachers’ choice of labour unions; and To examine the extent to which the leadership of respective labour unions influence teachers’ choices of labour unions. The leadership offered by KNUT is much stronger as compared to that of KUPPET. It is therefore on this basis that the researcher set out to investigate whether the leadership offered by KNUT to teachers influences their choices of unions.

The first objective was to determine the extent to which the subscription fee charged by the teachers’ unions’ influenced teachers’ choices of unions. The study found that 66 percent of the respondents are members of KNUT because of the union’s leadership which they say is focused on teachers’
welfare. The study found that out of the 69 respondents not in the union, majority of the respondents (47.8 percent) have not joined because of dissatisfaction with the high union subscription fee of the respective labour unions.

The study revealed that those who are yet to join teachers union are considering joining KUPPET because of the slightly lower membership fee. This findings implies that membership fee affect the teachers decision to join a trade union because the rise in the membership fee is likely to reduce the breadth of solidarity within the relevant segment of the labour force as the larger number of teachers are deterred by the higher fees.

The second objective was to assess the extent to which teachers’ economic conditions influenced their choice of labour unions. The study found that few (Mean = 3.9) respondents agreed that economic conditions influence teachers’ choices for joining labour unions. For the teachers who are not in any union, 27 percent indicated that economic conditions make them not to join any union. However, 6 percent of the respondents in unions indicated that the perceived improvement on economic conditions is the key reason why teachers are considering joining KNUT.

According to Graham and Bennetts (2008) the economic situation being experienced by the employee is the motivating factor for employees’ unionization with the view of improving the economic conditions. The
study found that union leadership influence teachers’ choice of labour unions in public secondary schools in Nyambene Branch. According to Metochi (2002) active leaders promote participation both directly and indirectly through their influence on members’ attitude towards the union. The respondents indicated that the union is well managed. According to Thacker, Fields & Barclay (2000) leaders’ behavior is vital for fostering attitudes towards the unions. Such attitudes will be translated to participation in union activities (Nicholson, Ursell & Blyton, 2001).

The third objective was to examine how peer pressures among teachers influence teachers’ choice of labour unions. The study found that peer pressure from colleagues was a reason why majority of the respondents are considering joining KNUT. According to Joel Sedman and Benard Karsh (1951), a large number of union members join unions merely because others are doing so that is, in line with the majority. This finding agrees with Waddington and Whiston (2007) observations that the reasons why employees join unions is for collective reasons.

The last objective was to examine the extent to which the leadership of respective labour unions influence teachers’ choices of labour unions. The findings indicated that 67 percent of the respondents who have not joined any union considering joining KNUT because of the satisfaction with unions leadership. The results showed that KNUT union leaders are more concerned about teachers’ welfare and this attracts more teachers to the union.
5.3 Conclusions

The study concluded that majority of teachers are members of KNUT because of the union’s leadership which they say is focused on teachers’ welfare. It concluded that teachers who are not in the union have not joined because of dissatisfaction with the high union subscription fee of the respective labour unions. It concluded membership fee affect the teachers’ decision to join a trade union because the rise in the membership fee is likely to reduce the breadth of solidarity within the relevant segment of the labour force as the larger number of teachers are deterred by the higher fees.

The study concluded that that few teachers agreed that economic conditions influence teachers’ choices for joining labour unions. It concluded that the perceived improvement on economic conditions is the key reason why teachers might consider joining KNUT. The study concluded that peer pressures among teachers influence teachers’ choice of labour unions. Peer pressure from colleagues was a reason why teachers are considering joining KNUT. The study finally concluded that teachers who have not joined any union consider joining KNUT because of the satisfaction with unions’ leadership. This is because KNUT union leaders are more concerned about teachers’ welfare and this attracts more teachers to the union.
5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made;

i. The study revealed that 47.8% have not joined because of dissatisfaction with the high union subscription fee of the respective labour unions. Based on membership fee and choice of teachers union the study recommends that teachers unions’ membership fee should be affordable so as teachers who are yet to join can register as members.

ii. Further, the study recommends that leaders of the union should portray leadership styles that have the potential of influencing the unionized teachers to join either KUPPET or KNUT.

5.5 Suggestion for further studies

The purpose of the study was to investigate the factors influencing teachers’ choice of labour unions in public secondary schools in Nyambene Branch, Meru County, Kenya. Based on the findings of the study, the researcher concludes that;

i. This study recommends that another study should be carried out in other districts to establish whether similar results will be obtained.

ii. Further the study recommends that it is important to analyze the leadership style employed by the union leaders as they (leadership styles) have the potential of influencing the un-unionized teachers to join a particular union or not.
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APPENDICES
Appendix A: letter of introduction

PENINAH NKIROTE KABERIA,
UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING,
P.O. BOX 92,
KIKUYU.

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: COLLECTION OF DATA

I am a student in the department of Educational Administration and Planning, School of Education, University of Nairobi, doing a Masters Degree in Education(Corporate Governance). I am collecting data on my project work on Factors Influencing Teachers’ Choices of Labour Unions in Public Secondary Schools in Nyambene Branch, Meru County, Kenya.

I therefore request for your co-operation and assistance in filling this questionnaire. Your identity will be confidential and the information you give will be used for the purpose of this study only.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully,
Peninah Nkirote Kaberia
Appendix B: questionnaire for teachers

This questionnaire guide is meant to collect information on the Factors Influencing Teachers’ Choices of Labour Unions in Nyambene Branch, Meru County, Kenya. Therefore your honest response is very vital for the study. Please respond to all the items in this questionnaire.

Please tick (✓) where appropriate or fill the necessary information as required.

SECTION ONE

1. What is your gender? Male ( ) Female ( )

2. What is your highest level of formal education?

‘A’ level ( ) Diploma ( ) University graduate ( ) Other specify____________________________

3. What is your highest professional qualification?

Diploma ( ) B.ED ( )

Other specify________________________________________________________

4. Indicate your experience in years as a teacher

1-5 ( ) 6-10( ) 11-15 ( ) 16-20 ( ) Over 20 ( )

5. What is your term of employment

Permanent ( ) BOM ( )
SECTION TWO

6. Do you belong to any of the teachers’ unions?

Yes ( ) No ( )

In the process of joining ( )

(a). If Yes, which union do you belong to?

KNUT ( ) KUPPET ( )

(b). If No, please indicate why you have not joined

i. High union subscription fee ( )

ii. Dissatisfaction with the leadership of unions ( )

iii. Peer pressure from colleagues ( )

iv. Specify other reasons ________________________________

(c). If you are in the process of joining,( )

Which labour union are you considering joining?

KNUT ( ) KUPPET ( )

(ii) What are the reasons for your decision?

a. A slightly lower membership fee ( )

b. For an improvement on economic conditions ( )

c. Peer influence from colleagues ( )

d. You identify with the union’s leadership ( )

e. Specify other reasons ________________________________
iii. If you are in the process of joining, are you under pressure by your colleagues to join a labour union in which they belong?

Yes ( )  No ( )

7. (a) In your own opinion, is the labour union managed in a satisfactory manner by its officials?

Yes ( )  No ( )

(b) If No give reasons _________________________________

_________________________________________________

c) Do you believe that your labour union officials are managing it for their own personal gains?

Yes ( )  No ( )

d) Are you satisfied with the manner in which your union officials conduct the bargaining process?

Yes ( )  No ( )

e) Are you always satisfied with the outcome of the bargaining processes by your labour union officials?

Yes ( )  No ( )

i) If No, give reasons for your dissatisfaction with the outcomes……………………………………………………………………

8. Did you join your current labour union just because your workmates were in the same union?
Yes ( )  No ( )

i) If No, what were your reasons for joining your current labour union?

………………………………………………………………………..

9. Please respond to the following statement by ticking in the appropriate gap to signify: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (UD), Disagree (DA), and Strongly Disagree (SD)

The following factors influence the teachers’ choices of labour unions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank You
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