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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 30 public secondary schools that are 24 mixed schools, 3 boys’ schools and 3 girls’ schools. The total population included 800 teachers which was 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 are yet to join either of the unions. The data was gathered using questionnaires administered to 240 teachers in public secondary schools in Homa-Bay District. Out of these, 200 questionnaires were filled and returned, representing 82.2 percent return rate. Both descriptive and content analyses were used in the data analysis. 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 6 percent who are yet to join teachers union are considering joining KUPPET because of the slightly lower membership and monthly subscription fee, whereas peer pressure from colleagues was a reason why majority 67 percent of the ununionized 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 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 should be carried out in other districts 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 ununionized teachers to join a particular union or not.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

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 skill necessary to perform most jobs shifted employment bargaining power almost completely to the employers' side, causing many workers to be mistreated (Barker, 2007).

Graham & Bennett (2008) define a trade union as an association of employees formed to protect their interest in the employment situations. A trade union is also defined as an association of employees whose principal purpose is to regulate relations between employees and employers, including any employers’ organisation (Republic of Kenya, 2007).

It therefore means that a trade union is an association of employees, it thus represents the employees interests to employers, a trade union fights for better working conditions and remuneration for its members. Trade unions also advocate
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 negotiate for wages, work rules, complaint procedures, rules governing hiring, firing and promotion of workers, benefits, workplace safety and policies (Republic of Kenya, 2007).

Trade unions, through its leadership, bargains with the employer on behalf of union members and negotiates collective bargaining with employers. Also trade union also represent workers at disciplinary and grievance hearings. Often, the union representative will be a workplace representative who is also a co-worker.

According to Waddington & Whiston (2007) the collective reason why people join unions comprise 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, provides that only persons above the age of 18 can join a trade union. However, it allows for a person aged 16 to be a member under special circumstances.

According to Fanaroff (2003) as cited in Grobler, Kristen & Warnich (2005), employees may 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 enhance their
members’ standard of living and improve many conditions that surround 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 share in the view that employees join trade unions to try to improve their working conditions, gain some control over working environment, pressure from the current union members.

There are many theories which explain the reason why an employee may choose to unionize. The rational choice theory or expectancy theory, also lying at the heart of many economic explorations proposes that rational employees are most likely to join a union when they perceive that the sum of union-induced benefits outweigh the cost involved in union-joining (Deery & Cieri, 2001).

The Marxist theorists Marx & Engels (1977) explain 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, has identified factors such as the level of unemployment, governmental policies and the structure of industry which influence the union-joining decisions (Bain & Price, 2003).

There is also the interactionist approach to union joining that says that an individual is strongly influenced by his social context that is his living and working environment (Schnabel & Wagner, 2007).
The frustration-aggression approach explains 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 explains unionization as the product of a process, weighing costs and benefits of participating, expectations about the degree to which the union will be able to realize these motives. (Klandermans, 1986 as quoted by Schnabel & Wagner, 2007).

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 & 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 here”.

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 non-unionized who 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).
1.2 Statement of the Problem

There are many reasons as to why an individual worker may want to join a union and to choose one union from two competing unions. Nzuve & 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. Khanka (2010) also states that employees join trade unions due to job security, for better wages, for improvement of working conditions, for fair or 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 can only be understood by placing him or her in a social context (as quoted by Brooks(2005).

However, Nzuve & 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 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, individual conviction”. This is the same problem stated by Schnabel & 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 brings the problem of free rider
Those employees who are not unionized and yet they are reaping the benefits of the bargaining process of unions.

However, regardless of employees’ motives for joining trade unions, what is clear is that employees join unions for specific reasons. It is apparent that while some employees have joined the trade unions, others have not and or, are considering joining a particular trade union. Kenya has got 278,000,000 teachers and out of these, 242,000,000 teachers belong to either of the two teachers’ unions. KNUT has got 200,000,000 members (www.knut.co.ke).

KUPPET has got 42,000 members (www.kuppet.co.ke) and so a gap of 36,000 members of teachers who are not unionized or are in the process of joining unions. Homa –Bay district has got a total of 800 teachers and out of this, 550 teachers belong to either of the teachers’ unions and there is the gap of two hundred and fifty teachers who are not unionized. It is from the above basis that this study set out to investigate the factors influencing teachers choices of trade unions in Public Secondary Schools in Homa-Bay District, Kenya.

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 Homa Bay District, Kenya.
1.4 Objectives of the Study

i. To determine extent to which the subscription fee charged by the teachers’ unions’ influences teachers’ choices of the unions.

ii. To assess the extent to which teachers’ economic conditions influence their choice of labour unions.

iii. To examine how group pressure among teachers influences their choice of labour unions.

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 by the labour unions influence the teachers’ choices for the unions?

ii. How does teachers’ economic condition influence their choices of labour union?

iii. To what extent does group pressure influences 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 would provide greater insights to the leadership of various teachers’ unions as it would highlight the various factors influencing the teachers’ choice of labour unions. The findings of this study would also be important to ununionized teachers as it would inform their decisions to join specific unions based on the findings of the study.

1.7 Limitations of the study

Limitations are aspects of research that may influence the research negatively but which the researcher has got no control over (Mugenda & Mugenda 2003). In this study, the respondents feared giving out information as some of them considered confidential. However the researcher assured the respondents that their identity will be confidential.

1.8 Delimitation of the study

The study was conducted in public secondary schools in Homa Bay district. Private secondary schools were not included because teachers in these schools do not belong to any recognized trade unions.

1.9 Basic assumptions of the study
In conducting this research, it was assumed that;

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

ii. All teachers have joined or are about to join a trade Union of their choice.

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

iv. The factors which influence employees in other sectors to join labour unions also apply to teachers and teaching profession.

1.10 Definition of significant terms

**Economic conditions:** refer to the prevailing economic states experienced by the teachers which compel them to join the labour unions so that their states can be improved (Handley, 2009).

**Employer:** refers to any person, public body, firm, corporation or company, who or which has 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).

**Group pressure:** refers to the influence that one gets when with one’s peers and the tendency is to always perform the same tasks as the peers so as not to be seen to be remaining behind (Premack & Hunter, 2008).
Labour Unions: refers to an organization of employees whose principal purpose is to regulate relations between employees and employers, including any employer’s organization (RoK, 2007).

Subscription fee: refers to the amount of money that employees pay 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 has on the members of the labour union. Employees normally look upon the holders of the offices for guidance on certain industrial matters hence they provide 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 are 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 with 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 how membership fee, teachers economic conditions, group pressure and the leadership of labour unions affect 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 labour unions

Amnion (2008) argues that trade unions’ bargaining power may be linked to membership fee as the latter factor may be linked to trade union density and cohesion of members’ commitment to unions’ objectives and strategies. Nzuve & Singh (2002) also argues that one of the reasons why an individual may not want to join a trade union is that it costs money to be a member of a trade union and the belief that the same benefits will be gotten since the collective agreement covers all workers in the same grades (Premack, & Hunter, 2008).

Duncan & Leigh (2000) states that the appeal of trade unions in market driven economies of the developed countries may depend on the relationship between the bargaining power and the membership fee they charge. Keane (2002) argues that
the strength of a labour union depends on members paying their annual fees to labour unions.

Membership fee may affect the workers decision to join a trade union that is, 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 workers are deterred by the higher fees (Gallagher, 2004). Blanchflower (2010) also states that union induced wage hikes limits the workers entry into the unionized sector. Visser (2002) postulates that higher union membership cost (relative to the benefits) will decrease the probability of membership. Naylor & Cripps (1993) as quoted by Schnabel & Wagner proposes that union density levels are likely to rise as a result of the reduction in union membership costs. This shows the impact that higher union fees has on the overall membership density as it is likely to discourage potential members. Bryson (2003) states that employees desire for unions has been as strong as ever but the cost of union membership has risen relative to the benefits. Further, Employees will only purchase the membership if the perceived benefits outweigh the costs (Farber & Western 2002).

Arise in trade union membership fee reduces trade union density as a result of departure of workers for whom membership fee is higher. When it comes to teachers in Kenya, the two national labour unions recognized by the government charge 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 is five shillings.(www.knut.co.ke), while the Kenya Union of Post Primary Education Teachers (KUPPET), charges 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) This may result in teachers joining a labour union where they feel that the subscription fee is slightly cheaper.

2.3 Teachers’ economic conditions and choice of labour unions

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). As a result, the primary aim for the formation of teachers trade unions was to improve on teachers’ economic status.

A primary goal of any trade unions is to maintain and improve workers’ terms and conditions, particularly workers who are members of the union, through collective bargaining with employers. Whether unions are successful depends, in large part, on their bargaining strength which is 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, 2010).

Unions in the name of fairness, justice and humanity demand fair wages for the labouring class (Oswald 2005). This means that unions aid their members in
improving their economic conditions. Unions may 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 means that, they will be compensated fairly and hence improve their economic conditions.

This runs across many countries, in Australia, pay increase by government tribunals cover nearly all the employees with the unionized employees getting a slight advantage over the unionized employees. According to Kornfield (2002), pay upwards by government tribunals in Australia cover 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 show that union members in Australia enjoy 7-18 percent higher wages than non-union worker and are more likely to have access to pension.

Union members in Australia have longer job tenure than non-union workers and are less likely to quit or suffer layoffs (Nicolson, Ursell & Blyton, 2001a and Kornfield 2002, Gani, 2002). This therefore may be the reason why a given section of employees may choose to unionized because of the advantages that they will have over the non-unionized employees, the advantage being of higher wages by the unionized employee hence the ununionised may be motivated to join a union.
Blanchflower (2000) proposes that several studies showing that trade unions reduce wage inequalities and standardize 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. Workers’ propensity to unionize has 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).

However, according to Dunlop (1968), the setting of wages and fringe benefits in the United States normally occur at the establishment level. Under such circumstances some unionized workers in the unionized establishments may reap the benefits of union bargaining power. This forms the basis of some unionized workers to continue being out of unions since there is no advantage that unionized employees have over them.

Bain & Price (2003) also state that employer attitude and behaviour significantly influences 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 are to be unionized.

On the psychological approach, there is a belief that, among a wide range of occupational groups, workers’ propensity to unionize is 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 & Dewe (2008) assert that there are conceptual problems in using job dissatisfaction to explain continued union membership, as opposed to union joining, since, logically, the reasons for union membership disappear if the sources of dissatisfaction are removed.

All the theoretical precedents suggest that there is a wide range of motives that influence employees’ decision to join a union or to resist joining the labour unions. Each motive may be operative at any one time, although some have been of special significance to employees during some period of their working lives.

There are studies that show that the variables influencing the membership orientation of employees. Most of the researchers have 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 influence 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 have also been identified as affecting an individual’s disposition towards unionization (Farber & Saks, 2000; Handley, 2009).
Oslo 1965 as quoted by Schnabel (2007) also notes that large unions exist because of among other reasons the capability of unions to offer selective incentives in form of private goods and services available only to members.

From the above studies, it is clear that the economic situation being experienced by the employee will be the motivating factor for employees’ unionization with the view of improving their economic conditions.

According to Fanaroff (2003) as cited in Grobler et al. (2006), employees may be motivated to join a union for job security, negotiating better wages and benefits, better working conditions.

Graham & Bennetts (2008) unions have specific objectives: they seek better wages and working conditions for their members. The most obvious reason why workers join unions is that they want something that they cannot get on their own: better wages and working conditions (Visser 2002).

Employees will also join unions depending on the benefit expected from the union. Schnabel and Wagner (2007) state that the larger the monetary and non-monetary benefits of union representation, the more likely are 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 should be.

2.4 Group pressure and a sense of belonging 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 may 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 may ultimately yield to such pressure and decide in favour of joining a union (Pravin 2010). Workers’ decisions to join unions do not occur in a social vacuum but are influenced by the decisions and pressure from family, co-workers, managers, employers, government and union organizers (Hardley, 1992 as quoted by Visser, 2002).

Sociologists suggest that an individual’s social context, both inside and outside the workplace, may 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 may feel an important part. Visser (2006) proposes that many workers join unions in order to occupy a psychologically safe position among members of the group that is, in order not to be isolated or despised as a parasite. This brings in the view that employees at a workplace may feel comfortable if all members belong to a union thus bringing’ in the pressure for the unionized to do so.

Waddington & Whiston (2007), notes that the reasons why employees join unions can often be separated into those examining union joining decisions from an individual’s perspective or those who join for collective reasons. Brooks (2005) cites Fay (2006) 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. Sedman & Benard Karsh (1951) also state that a form of behaviour characteristics of human society is the coercing effect of the group upon individuals members who come to share common expectations of the group. According to Joel & Benard (1951), a large number of union members join unions merely because others are doing so that is, in line with the majority. That means that employees join unions just because their co-workers also belong to a trade union and so the employees try to keep up with the norm in the work place.

Farber & Saks (2000), states that new hires in union firms may face strong social pressure to join a union. People may also join unions because of ideological convictions. Schnabel & Wagner (2007) also agree that workers may be more prepared to join a union if others are joining.

Group pressure and the urge to join unions can also be looked at from the perspective of the national culture of a given section of employees. National culture can also plays an important role on the influence it has on the employees labour union joining behaviour. Posthuma (2009) argues that people living in a country with a strong cultural collectivism tend to trust labour union to help protect their rights and interests and are thus more likely to join labour unions.
Enrolment and contribution in union activity is 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 et al (2007) states that the individual decision to join a union is strongly influenced by his social context, that is his living and working environment and that the traditions and the prevailing opinions are more important and the general beliefs are formed about unions even before the employment relationship is entered into. The prevailing union density in an individual’s establishment and the contact with the union at the workplace may inform an individual to join a union or not. Bryson (2003) states the reasons why employees join unions is that “my friends and colleagues are 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 are members of a particular trade union, they can provide information about the benefits of membership which may not be obvious where you know nobody in membership. (Bryson and Gomez 2003).

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

2.5 Labour unions’ leadership and choice of labour unions
Leadership may be defined as a position of power held by an individual in a group, which provides him with an opportunity to exercise interpersonal influence on the group members for mobilising and directing their efforts towards certain goals. The leader, at the centre of a group's power structure, keeps the group together, infuses life into it, moves it towards its goals and maintains its momentum (Vaghese, 2010).

According to Cole (2004), leadership is a dynamic process whereby an individual in a group is 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, Vaghese (2010) states that leadership provides the directions and goals for a particular union. The leader's task is 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.

Keane (2002) suggested that the strength of labour unions depends 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 are also associated with the loyalty among members and the willingness of members to join and work for the labour unions Metochi (2002). That is, these
characteristics are prone to influence the strength of labour unions. Jandaravitoon (2001) states that the conviction of union leaders to pay more attention to public interest than individual interest also influence members commitment to labour unions.

It is also important to analyze the leadership style employed by the union leaders as they (leadership styles) have the potential of influencing the unionized employee to join that particular union or not. Some leadership styles are generally admired by the employees while others are shunned. Cregan & Christina(2005) cites transformational leadership as the basis of strong union commitment. Transformational leadership encourages loyal membership by charismatic idealistic behavior. Hansen (2008) emphasizes transformational leader’s ability to transform organizational culture.

According to Fullagar et al 2002, Kelloway & Barling 2003 as cited by Metochi (2002) the effects of leadership behavior on union members has a great impact on the perception that members have on the union. It cites 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) indicates that active leaders promote participation both directly and indirectly through their influence on members’ attitude towards the union. There is a wide support for the view that the local leaders behavior is vital for fostering attitudes towards the unions (Thacker, Fields & Barclay, 2000). Such attitudes will be translated to participation in union activities Nicholson, Ursell & Blyton (2001).

Thacker, Fields & Barclay (2000) suggest that if management encourages social integration among workers, adopts a helpful approach towards them, provides such conditions as would improve their economic, social, psychological and physical conditions and, above all, presents such a picture as would lead the workers to think that management is caring for them, the workers will maintain a favorable attitude towards management and, consequently, union leaders will 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 may either never start, or, once started, may be rejected by employees.

Barling, Fullagar & Kelloway (2002) found that attitudes towards both local unions and its officers were highly correlated with union loyalty. Members can choose not to belong to a trade union or in some cases join another trade union which they perceive as more likely to meet their expectations, so union leaders
need to demonstrate that they (union) achieve organizational objectives to ensure they are seen by their stakeholders as effective organizational leaders.

It is also important to analyze the leadership style employed by the union leaders as they (leadership styles) have the potential of influencing the unionized employee to join that particular union or not. Some leadership styles are generally admired by the employees while others are shunned. Cregan & Christina (2005) cites transformational leadership as the basis of strong union commitment. Transformational leadership encourages loyal membership by charismatic idealistic behavior. Hansen (2008) emphasizes transformational leader’s ability to transform organizational culture.

According to Fullagar et al 2002, Kelloway & Barling 2003 as cited by Metochi (2002) the effects of leadership behavior on union members has a great impact on the perception that members have on the union. It cites 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.

Kelloway & 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.

According to Metochi (2002), union leader’s behavior will have both a direct and significant effect on willingness to participate in trade unions activities and an indirect effect through member attitudes. There is a significant link between leadership behavior and member attitudes.

2.6 Summary of literature review

The study reviewed the factors influencing employees’ choice of labour unions. It has focused on the extent in which the labour unions’ subscription fee influences the choice which employees make when choosing labour unions. It has 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 contributes to trade union power. Metochi (2002) also argues that trade union leadership has a significant role for the aggregate membership growth. The leadership style mostly admired by the union members has been explored. Kelloway & Barling (2003) also cites transformational leadership style as a basis for unions’ loyalty and commitment in trade union activities. Cregan(2005) also cite transformational leadership style as a basis of attracting union loyalty. Vaghese(2010) proposes that leadership of labour unions
provide directions to the members. Metochi (2002) states that the characteristics of
leaders of a union have an impact on the membership and is likely to influence
members willing to join the labour union. Jandaravitoon (2001) looks at the
conviction of union leaders to pay more attention to public interest as opposed to
individual interest has an impact on the labour union strength. Barling’, Fullagar &
Kelloway (2002) have looked at leadership in terms of the attitudes it has on the
union members and the potential members. Attitude towards both union and its
officers are highly correlated with union loyalty. However, Bain & Price (2003)
argue that while union leadership has an obvious influence on which union
succeeds in organizing a group of workers, they feel that the impact of union
leadership is insignificant.

On group pressure and unionization, many studies concur that individuals join
trade unions so as not to be seen to be remaining behind. Schnabel et al (2007).
Posthuma (2009) cites cultural collectivism that individuals with strong national
culture tend to trust unions and are likely to be unionized Posthuma therefore
talks about beliefs among the employees that the employees put in their unions.
Kornfield (2003) argues that new hires may face strong social pressure to join
unions. Pravin (2010) also agrees that employees join unions as a result of peer
pressure by being prevailed upon by friends and colleagues. This is also the
argument that Bryson (2003) takes that employees join unions because friends and
colleagues are members of a particular union.
Visser (2002) looks at union joining from a psychological perspective. That many workers join unions in order to occupy a psychologically safe position among the colleagues so as not to be seen as parasites that is employees benefiting from union activities when they are not members of unions. Fay (1996) states that an individual can only be understood by placing him in his social context. Schnabel et al. (2007) also argue in the same line that workers join unions if others are also joining.

However, Graham et al (2008) states that because of pressure from current union members, still an employee is less likely to join a union if he or she is an isolated worker or has a religious conviction or feels his/her status is high. Bryson (2003), also argues that there has been a move towards individualism and away from the collectivistic forms of industrial relations which underpins unionization (Phelps 1990; Storey 1996 as quoted by Bryson (2003). This may in turn affect the workers attachment to unionism. It is therefore on this basis that the study sets out to investigate the gap, that is: whether union leadership influences the decision of employees to join the unions.

On labour union’s membership fee, Amnion (2008) looks at the trade union bargaining power being linked to the membership fee they charge. This has got an overall effect on the trade union density as higher membership fee is likely to discourage potential members from joining. Nzuve et al. (2010) also states the reason why an employee may not want to be a member of a trade union: that it
costs money to be a member. This is also likely to have an effect on density of the trade unions. Duncan and Leigh (2000) also agree that there is a relationship between the bargaining power of a trade union and the membership fee they charge. Blanchflower (2010) also states that union induced wage hikes reduce workers’ entry into the unions.

The membership fee charged by KUPPET and KNUT have also been explored with the former charging one point five percent of the basic salary while the latter charges two percent of the basic salary. This shows that membership to KUPPET is slightly cheaper than that of KNUT. It is therefore on this basis that the researcher set out to investigate whether the factors discussed influences teachers’ choice of labour unions.

2.7 Theoretical framework

2.7.1 Expectancy Theory

The study will be anchored on expectancy theory advanced by Victor Vroom in 1964 found in his book *Work and Motivation*. The theory postulates that the level of motivation that an individual feels for doing a particular activity depends upon the extent to which results are expected to contribute to her own particular needs and goals.

A key point of this 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 this is the basis for motivation. He concluded that there were three such factors namely; expectancy, instrumentality and valence.

The expectancy theory is relevant to this study since it is 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; an improvement on the employees economic conditions and the general welfare of the employee. An individual will be motivated to join a labour union if for example, the individual feels that the membership fee is slightly cheaper, an individual will also join a labour union if the group pressure at the work place is of the opinion that joining that particular union is the norm and therefore the expected outcome is being at par with the colleagues.

An employee may also join a labour union if the expected outcome is the identification with the leadership of the labour union.
2.8 Conceptual framework

Figure 2.1: Factors influencing teachers’ choices of labour unions

As indicated in figure 1, choice to join or not to join a particular labour union is conceptualized as a product of interrelated factors such as membership fee, economic conditions, the group pressure and the leadership of labour unions. The factors undergo a process by the employee making a decision to join a labour union or not and the output is the choice to join a specific union by the employee. The variables act 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 group 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 is the choice of the preferred labour union based on the variable(s) considered.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter discussed 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 will be solved (Orodho & Kombo, 2002). The study used Descriptive Survey Research Design. This is a method where data is collected by interviewing or administering a questionnaire to a sample of individuals. The method can be used in collecting information on people’s attitudes, opinions, habits or any of the variety of education or social issue (Orodho & Kombo, 2002). In this study, questionnaires were administered to the public secondary school teachers to state the reasons why they joined their respective labour unions. Descriptive research design 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

35
According to Mugenda & Mugenda (2003), a population is a complete set of individuals, cases or objects with some common observable characteristics. The target population consisted of 30 public secondary schools that are 24 mixed schools, 3 boys’ schools and 3 girls schools (DEO Homa Bay District, 2011). The total population will include 800 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 are 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 (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). A sample is a subset of a population that is used to represent the entire group as a whole (Best & Kahn, 2002). Since this study cannot cover all the 30 secondary schools in Homa Bay District, a sample was selected to take part in the study.

According to Mugenda & Mugenda (2003), a minimum sample of 10 to 30 percent is recommended for a study. Homa Bay District has 30 Public Secondary schools. Out of the 30 secondary schools, the researcher will target 30 percent of the target population which will give a sample size of 240 teachers. The researcher sampled 8 teachers per school through stratified sampling because the
eight teachers selected belong 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 questionnaire in the study which is considered to be the most suitable instrument for descriptive research design. According to Orodho (2002), questionnaires require less time, are less expensive and permits collection of data from a wide geographical area. In the study, only one questionnaire for the teachers will be used.

Teachers’ questionnaire was divided into two parts. The first part had a question 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.

3.5.1 Validity of the Instrument

Validity is a measure of how well a test measures what it is supposed to measure (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). According to Orodho (2002), to ensure content validity, a researcher needs to first appraise the instrument. A pilot study was conducted. Five schools randomly selected, five teachers participated in the pilot study. The schools and the respondents to be used were part of the main study. Pilot study helped to highlight items in the research instrument that are ambiguous and inappropriate in order to improve quality and validity.
3.6 Data collection procedures

The researcher sought permission from the National Council for Science, Technology and Innovation through University of Nairobi. The permit was shown to the District Education Officer (DEO) in Homa Bay District. After the permission is granted, the researcher applied to the secondary schools in the district through their head teachers to be allowed to use their institutions for the study. After permission was granted by the authority of various schools in the district, questionnaires were hand delivered to the respondents. The respondents were asked to complete the questionnaires themselves. Unclear items in the questionnaires were clarified for both the teachers. Arrangements on possible date of collecting questionnaires and date will be made.

3.7 Data Analysis Techniques

Both quantitative and qualitative data analysis were used in the study. According to Nachmias & Nachmias (2006), qualitative analysis involves obtaining detailed information about phenomena being studied and establishing patterns and trends from the gathered information. Quantitative analysis is based on numerical measurement of specific aspects of a given phenomena (Thomas, 2003). Questionnaires will be edited and sorted out for completeness, returns, and coding. Computer software that uses a Statistical Package for Social Sciences
(SPSS) was used. 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 was 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 240 respondents in collecting data with regard to the factors influencing teachers’ choice of labour unions in public secondary schools in Homa Bay District, Kenya.

4.1.1 Response rate

From the data collected, out of the 240 questionnaires administered, 200 were filled and returned, which represents 82.9percent response rate.

Figure 4. 1: Response rate
Mugenda & Mugenda (2003) observed that a 50 percent response rate is 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 82.3 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 4.1: Distribution of respondents by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results depicted in table 4.1 revealed that a majority of the respondents were males comprising 54 percent while 46 percent were females.
### 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 Homa Bay District in Kenya. The findings are as presented in table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In a Union</th>
<th>Not in a Union</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>125</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results depicted in table 4.2 revealed that a majority 76 percent of male teachers belonged to a union compared to 32 percent of female teachers. Also the results show that majority 59 percent of female teachers are not members of labour unions.
According to Berger, Olson, & 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 Bracket</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results depicted in table 4.2 revealed that most of the respondents were aged 35-44 years comprising 45 percent while 25 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.

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

**Figure 4.2: Teaching experience of the respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 years and above</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 5 years</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 - 5 years</th>
<th>5-10 years</th>
<th>11-15 years</th>
<th>16-20 years</th>
<th>Over 21 yrs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a Union</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in a Union</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>191</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results depicted 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, 32 (16.0 percent) of the teachers belonging to a labour union have been
teaching for a period ranging between 5 – 10 years, 28 (14.0 percent) of the teachers belonging to a labour union have been teaching for over 20 years, 20 (10.0 percent) of the teachers belonging to a labour union have been teaching for a period ranging between 16 – 20 years while 4 (2.0 percent) of the teachers belonging to a labour union have been teaching for a period less than 5 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 over 5 years are more likely to be members of a labour union of their choice.

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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic qualifications</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGDE</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other diploma</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results depicted in table 4.3 showed that most of the respondents were Bachelor of Education degree holders comprising 66.8 percent while 16 percent had postgraduate diploma in education, 11 percent had diploma while 6 percent had masters level of education. 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>116</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in a Union</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>156</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>191</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results depicted in table 4.3 showed that most of the teachers 116 (58.3 percent) who are unionized are permanently employed, 25 (12.6 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 (66percent) indicated that they are members of KNUT while 34percent indicated they belong to KUPPET.
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 as presented in Table 4.6.

**Table 4.6: 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 fee</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction with the leadership of unions</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer pressure from colleagues</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Conditions</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results depicted in table 4.6 revealed that majority of the respondents (40 percent) have not joined because of dissatisfaction with the leadership of the respective labour unions, 27 percent indicated peer pressure from colleagues, 20 percent indicated is because of the economic conditions while 18 percent indicated because of the relatively high union subscription fee.
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 peer influence from colleagues, 20 percent indicated it is because they identify with the union’s leadership, 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 it is because of the perceived improvement on economic conditions is the key reason why teachers are considering joining KUPPET.

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 Vishwesvaran and Deshpande (2003), 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.
Table 4. 7: Factors affecting teachers’ choice of labour union

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For an improvement on economic conditions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A slightly lower membership fee</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer influence from colleagues</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You identify with the union’s leadership</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**  
200  
100%

The study also sought to establish whether 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.

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 yes labour union officials are managing the union for their own personal gains.

This finding disagrees with Guest & 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 the USA (Kochen, 1979), 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 study inquired whether the respondents joined their current labour union just because their workmates are in the same union.

**Figure 4.5: Peer influence on the respondents**

Results revealed in figure 4.5 showed that majority 88percent indicated no while 12percent indicated yes.
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 they will act according to the group’s influence. This study infers that teachers in Kenya do not join labour unions because of the influence from the peers.

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 to 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 4.8: 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 means of 4.8 and 4.7 respectively. Also the study revealed that membership fee affects teachers’ choices for labour unions as shown means 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

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 Homa Bay District, 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 choices of trade unions in Public Secondary Schools in Homa-Bay District, Kenya. This is was because Homa Bay District has got a total of eight hundred teachers and only five hundred and fifty 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). This study sought to establish whether teachers, economic conditions influence 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 establish whether peer influence affects teachers’ choice of labour unions.

The study was guided by the following specific objectives: To determine extent to which the subscription fee charged by the teachers’ unions’ influences teachers’ choices of the unions, to assess the extent to which teachers’ economic conditions influence their choice of labour unions, to examine how group pressure among teachers influences their choice of labour unions and finally to examine the extent to which the leadership of respective labour unions influence teachers’ choices of labour unions. The membership fee paid by KUPPET members is slightly cheaper than that of KNUT. It is therefore on this basis that the researcher set out to investigate whether the membership fee charged by the teachers’ union influences their choices of unions.

Homa Bay District has 30 Public Secondary schools. Out of the 30 secondary schools, the study targeted 30 percent of the target population which gave a sample size of 240 teachers. The study sampled 8 teachers per school through
stratified sampling technique. The study found that most respondents have not joined because of dissatisfaction with the leadership of unions, peer pressure from colleagues and the high union subscription fee.

On the basis of teachers’ level of education, the study found that most of the teachers are holders of Bachelor of Education degree comprising 66.8 percent while 16 percent are holders of postgraduate diploma in education, 11 percent are holders of diploma while 6 percent are holders of masters degree in education. This is an indication that majority of the teachers in public secondary schools in Homa Bay have acquired the relevant skills/academic qualifications to serve in their profession. However, unionization is, interestingly, found to be unrelated to education and tenure (Angle & Perry, 2006).

The study also revealed that majority (17.5 percent) of the teachers belonging to a labour union have been teaching for a period ranging between 11 – 15 years, 16.0 percent of the teachers belonging to a labour union have been teaching for a period ranging between 5 – 10 years, 14.0 percent of the teachers belonging to a labour union have been teaching for over 20 years, 10.0 percent of the teachers belonging to a labour union have been teaching for a period ranging between 16 – 20 years while 4 (2.0 percent) of the teachers belonging to a labour union have been teaching for a period less than 5 years. The study further revealed that majority of the teachers 21.6 percent who are yet to join a labour union have been
teaching for less than 5 years. This findings implies that majority of the teachers who are not unionized are young teachers in the teaching profession.

The study revealed that those who are yet to join teachers union are considering joining KUPPET because of the slightly lower membership fee. This goes in line with Nzuve & Singh (2002) also argues that one of the reasons why an individual may not want to join a trade union is that it costs money to be a member of a trade union and the belief that the same benefits will be gotten since the collective agreement covers all workers in the same grades. 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.

Also the study found that peer pressure from colleagues was a reason why majority of the respondents are considering joining KNUT. According to Joel Sedman & 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 & Whiston (2007) observations that the reasons why employees join unions is for collective reasons.

The study also found that teachers’ economic conditions influence teachers’ choice of labour unions in public secondary schools in Homa Bay District. According to Graham & Bennetts (2008) the economic situation being
The study found that union leadership influence teachers’ choice of labour unions in public secondary schools in Homa Bay District. 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).

5.3 Conclusions

The study also concludes that the teachers who are not unionized are young teachers in the teaching profession. They have been in the teaching profession for less than 5 years. The reason why they have not joined either of the union (KUPPET or KNUT) is attributed to dissatisfaction with the leadership of unions, peer pressure from colleagues and the high union subscription fee in the case of KUPPET membership fee which is slightly higher than KNUT.

The study also concludes both unions are managed in a satisfactory manner by the union’s official however, teachers join labour union not on the basis that they are well run but because their workmates are in the same union. Lastly the study
concludes that union leadership and group pressure highly affect teachers’ choices for labour unions.

5.4 Recommendations

i. 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 research

The purpose of the study was to investigate the factors influencing teachers’ choice of labour unions in public secondary schools in Homa Bay District, Kenya. This study concludes that dissatisfaction with the leadership of unions, peer pressure from colleagues and the high union subscription fee are some of the factors affecting teachers’ choice of labour unions. This study recommends that another study should be carried out in other districts 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.
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Appendix A: Letter of Introduction

GABRIEL OKENDO OUMA,
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 Homa Bay District, 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,
Ouma Gabriel Okendo.
Appendix B: Questionnaire for Teachers

This questionnaire guide is meant to collect information on the Factors Influencing Teachers’ Choices of Labour Unions in Homa Bay District, 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 (  ) BOG (  )
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>Group 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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