

The potential for award coverage of such workers arises because the Rule Book of the New Zealand Harbour Board's Union allows memberships to all employees permanently employed by Harbour Boards. Strictly speaking this could include senior administrative officers including the general manager and the chief engineer of Harbour Boards, an anomaly which has been referred to on previous occasions by the Waterfront Industry Tribunal. The existing National Harbour Board's award however covered only those workers who were specified in schedules to that award. Those schedules included lower paid clerical workers but did not clearly include clerical workers of the kind now sought to be covered.

The Arbitration Court pointed out that it has previously been ruled that when a Union seeks to obtain an award in an area where there has not previously been one a heavy onus rests upon it to justify the making of the award (see re **Canterbury Shop Employees** 44BA 751, **New Zealand Electrical Employees** case 49BA 478, **Canterbury Freezing Works** case 59BA 414 and **Taranaki Hydatids Inspectors** case 65BA 2559).

Evidence was laid at the hearing that a substantial proportion of persons who might be covered by the new award preferred to remain without such coverage and preferred not to join the Union. The Court found that the Union had not made it clear exactly which employees it wished to cover by the new award. Nor was it entirely clear as to which Harbour Board employees were covered by the existing national award. Accordingly, the Court ruled that the claims as filed lacked sufficient detail as to which employees it was designed to cover and for that reason the present proceedings should not be continued and an award should not be made. The Court however urged the parties to confer with the purpose of dispelling the confusion that exists in respect of the coverage of the existing award.

GERARD CURRY and JIM FARMER

## REVIEWS

Alan J. Geare, Joyce J. Herd and John M. Howells *Women in Trade Unions: A Case Study of Participation in New Zealand*. Victoria University of Wellington, Industrial Relations Centre, Industrial Relations Research Monograph No. 6, January 1979, pp. 73.

This book comprises a sortie into hitherto unexplored research territory in New Zealand. As such it has been eagerly awaited by unionists, womens studies specialists and students of industrial relations. It does not claim to be a theoretical study or a rigorous piece of experimental research, but a "Case Study" (title) whose "main purpose is to provide basic background data" (preface).

It is not proper to make severe technical demands of a study with such modest claims. On the other hand even basic data is only as good as the questions asked and the methods used. There are some definite shortcomings in these areas which require mention to put the data in perspective. There are also some missed opportunities which should be drawn to the attention of future

researchers for possible action.

With these reservations, the authors must be congratulated on the immense amount of detailed hard work they have put into their research and for focussing our attention on many vital issues affecting women in unions. These issues are best discussed in the more qualitative parts of the book, especially the interviews with women unionists, several footnotes to that section, and Chapter 5, "Conclusion".

It is, for example, in the footnotes to the chapter based on interviews with women union leaders that strong comments of rank and file women appear on active male discrimination against them. The responses from the structured questionnaire set out in tables would not have allowed us to guess at this factor.

The survey data are obtained from four sources: postal questionnaires sent to 90 union secretaries (mostly male of whom 49 responded) of unions with 100 or more members of whom between 30 and 100% were women; self-filled questionnaires sent rank and file members (male and female) of "a reasonably representative sample" of eight of these unions; interviews with 25 women union leaders, and 16 postal questionnaires sent to less prominent women leaders. The first two sets of responses were compared to each other to highlight differences in the perceptions of secretaries and rank and file members on levels of participation and reasons for these.

"The major theme is a simple one, namely, to examine the barriers that keep working women from participating more fully in their trade union organisation." Behind this statement lies an assumption that women do not participate fully *enough*, and that it is desirable that they do so more. While I heartily concur with the value judgement, I feel it would have assisted those less committed had the authors discussed the idea of women's participation in the context of relevant theory. For example, theory on union participation relates it to the structure, goals and effectiveness of unions. Theory on union democracy relates participation to power structures and members' effectiveness in influencing the union's actions. Readers could have been acquainted with the main points of this theory and allowed to make up their own minds on the desirability of women's participation.

The questionnaires could have explored some of this territory instead of being based on a single model (that of a U.S. research team, Barbara M. Wertheimer and Anne H. Nelson) which stressed barriers to participation. A model based on barriers assumes a state of positive motivation before the barriers are encountered. The results showed that 69% of women and 65.6% of men among the rank and file believed "There is a general lack of interest in union affairs". This suggests that an exploration of motivation could have been more fruitful.

The comments of some women unionists showed that members' motivation interested them more than barriers. Their priority problem was not, "what prevents women from participating?" but "how can we get women more interested in unions".

The questionnaires also took a rather limited view of participation by restricting it to active participation, e.g. "attended a branch meeting of the union", "voted in a union election", "stood for any union post". More passive participation such as "read union journal/newsletter with interest", "raise problems with shop delegate", "would still join union if it was voluntary", was not measured at all. The assumption in the ensuing discussion is that those who did not answer the questions affirmatively were all equally apathetic. A question or

two on attitudes to unions might usefully have sorted them into the hostile, the indifferent and the supporters.

The questionnaire devotes most of the remaining questions to barriers to participation, grouped into those relating to the home, the work life and the union. These are so highly structured that respondents would not be strongly motivated to list other barriers. (A footnote saying that the study provides no supporting evidence for A.E.C. Hare's contention that apathy was caused by compulsory unionism is misleading since the questionnaire was not structured to evoke such evidence.)

These conceptual limitations to the questionnaires would have biased the results to eliminate some of the possible reasons for non-participation, as well as some of the more passive participation which actually took place. The response rates, (nearly 40% for rank and file, over 54% for secretaries) and the basis of selection of the eight sample unions would have introduced further bias. The authors assert "The sample size for each union was chosen with the idea of making the expected error in any calculated percentage less than 10%". Such measurements of error based on sample size assume a truly random sample and fail to account for the other sources of bias I have mentioned. Consequently the main findings have to be taken as strongly indicative rather than conclusive.

One final missed opportunity in this questionnaire was that the indicators of participation were not aggregated to show what percentage of the sample did not participate (actively) at all, and what percentage participated on more than one level.

These limitations suggest there is little point in quoting actual figures from the survey. They do not however negate the strong general findings that "the levels of participation in New Zealand unions are low . . . female participation is undoubtedly lower than that of their male counterparts . . . and women are blatantly under-represented in leadership positions". Nor do they take away the interest of the other main findings: that union secretaries rated union-related barriers much lower than rank and file, for whom they were the most important; that rank and file blamed general apathy, while union secretaries blamed female apathy; that secretaries considered domestic commitments the second highest barrier for women, but women placed them well down the list; that except for job-oriented barriers there is very little difference between men and women in the way that barriers to participation are ranked.

These are only a sample of the thought-provoking findings and I will leave the reader to find the others.

Analytically, I think the authors' most important conclusion was to link women's low participation with their disadvantaged, marginal and segregated labour market status. This conclusion was confirmed by several of the results after being mentioned in the opening chapter. Several questions in the main questionnaire (on part-time status, whether a major family provider, broken service etc) show that this association existed. The researchers, however, missed the chance to probe the nature of the association, i.e. whether union status was a simple reflection of labour market status, or whether other factors intervened. For example this writer has a good deal of word of mouth evidence that male unionists have seen women as undercutting their wages and condi-

tions because of their marginal labour force status. Unionists' wives in their role as housewives have also seen industrial action as undercutting their own conditions. There is some objective truth in both claims, which gives the theoretical issue of roles and the division of labour a more central place than it received in this study.

My comments demonstrate the thought-provoking power of this research and I would certainly recommend that people read the book. My critical remarks represent my choice of condiment to serve with it. Others may choose their own.

Karen Paterson Butterworth  
Wellington.

John Niland *Collective Bargaining and Compulsory Arbitration in Australia*. New South Wales University Press, Kensington 1978, pp. 174.

In recent years Professor Niland has made several valuable contributions to the literature on compulsory arbitration. In this book he again enters the argument on the relative merits of compulsory arbitration compared with collective bargaining. This rather short book (the main text occupying less than 100 pages) seems to have several objects. The first is to compare collective bargaining and compulsory arbitration in an Australian context. Secondly the book seems to be intended as a policy document designed to influence the adoption of a major extension of collective bargaining in Australia. A third object is to present the results of a survey on direct negotiation carried out among New South Wales unions in 1975-76.

The book starts by defining the terms "collective bargaining", "conciliation" and "compulsory arbitration". This is a particularly useful exercise as these terms tend to be misused or misunderstood in discussions. Niland goes on to identify various forms of dispute resolution used in Australia and is particularly concerned to make the point that direct negotiation is not necessarily the same thing as collective bargaining.

The main part of the text concentrates on two themes. First there is an examination of some of the key characteristics of compulsory arbitration, in particular the public interest, the role of the third party neutral, wage equity, protection of the weak and the legalism of the system. The treatment of these topics is rather brief with no more than eight pages being spent on any one topic. This length of treatment allows only the barest outline of the problems involved and certainly no detailed analysis. All that can be done is to raise some of the more important questions. Thus when discussing wage equity Niland argues that comparative wage justice should give way to wages based on industry productivity achieved through collective bargaining. There is however, little discussion of the social or political consequences of such a shift in emphasis, the discussion being restricted to economic considerations that seem to favour productivity based wage levels.

The second main theme is the effectiveness of compulsory arbitration as a method of conflict settlement. To support his argument that collective bargaining is the preferable method of dispute resolution Niland first argues that com-

pulsory arbitration leads to inflexible attitudes and a reliance on the arbitrator to produce a settlement for which the parties can avoid responsibility. These arguments are of course not new. The second argument is that compulsory arbitration does not prevent strikes and that if anything it produces an undesirable and tactically inappropriate strike pattern that revolves around grievances rather than major interest disputes. There is a lengthy chapter on the nature of disputes in Australia which is supported with an appendix detailing the causes of strikes.

The final section of the book discusses the prospects for collective bargaining in Australia and some of the changes needed to encourage a shift towards bargaining. Niland shows there is an increasing tendency towards direct negotiation and argues that changing union attitudes and expertise together with general social changes will accelerate this process. His final argument is that the process be controlled and that the necessary framework be set up to achieve an orderly change rather than a haphazard growth within an inappropriate framework.

Mention must be made of the layout of this book which is somewhat confused. While the main text is a useful contribution to the debate on compulsory arbitration it is overshadowed by the rest of the book. Little more than half of the book consists of text, the rest being devoted to a summary of conclusions and recommendations (placed strangely at the beginning of the book) and various appendices. While some of these are useful (e.g. the management commentaries on the main text and the strike data) others seem to be of only marginal relevance.

In conclusion it can be said that while the book is a useful contribution to the arbitration against collective bargaining debate it is, to some degree, the product of its mixed objectives. The result is a book that in parts is too much of a summary of the arguments and that in parts does not deal in sufficient depth with the implications of what is proposed in the way of policy change.

Gordon Anderson

Victoria University of Wellington.

F. E. Emery *Futures We Are In*. Martinus Nijhoff, Leiden, 1977, pp. 230.

From his writings and frequent visits across the Tasman, Fred Emery and his work on organisation design and industrial democracy are known to a great many New Zealanders. This book offers some insights into Emery's thinking on a wider range of topics.

It is volume 5 in an International Series on the Quality of Working Life, a series which has clearly been considerably influenced by Dr Emery. The present volume has been produced in co-operation with Merrelyn Emery, Geoff Caldwell and Alistair Crombie. Apparently, the study was stimulated by QANTAS which, according to the collaborators, "impressed us with the urgency of an Australian view of the future, even if it turned out to be no different to anyone else's: they provided us with a valuable set of guidelines and questions

about the future''.

The book starts from the proposition that the futures of individual institutions and nations follow to a large extent from the social environment they collectively form, for all who live or participate in them. It argues that this is now a turbulent environment, one that is qualitatively different from the disturbed-reactive environments that emerged with the maturation of industrial society at the end of the nineteenth century.

The rest of the volume is largely an exploration of what this means for people, their institutions and their countries. It explores the passive and active strategies that people in Western societies will be tempted to adopt, mentioning as examples the worlds of 1984, One Dimensional Man, Clockwork Orange, etc.

Most of the book's attention is devoted to examining trends which the authors suggest show that people are already taking their future into their own hands and shaping a course of active adaptation. Emery's ideas on practical ways of dismantling bureaucratic forms of working are discussed, together with the likely social consequences of such changes.

The book also turns its focus on to the international scene, and the major nations and national groupings are judged in terms of their ability to cope with the general condition of social turbulence.

As this outline of its themes indicates, **Futures We are In** is not another addition to the growing library of 'pop' futureology. It is a serious work of social forecasting which includes a detailed discussion of the methodologies employed by its authors. The casual, or less scientifically inclined reader will probably skip over the more technical and jargon-laden parts of the text. From personal experience, I know that this can be done without losing the thread of Emery's arguments.

For those with a concern about the future contexts and ideologies in which industrial relations systems and their constituents will have to operate, it is a book which offers fascinating directions as well as intriguing, if not troubling, questions.

From another viewpoint, this work has a special interest as the most recent addition to Fred Emery's central and continuing concern for matters of organisational design, social ecology and systems theory. But it is a very wide treatment, with only half a dozen pages specifically headed 'Probable Futures in Work'.

In these pages, Emery makes ten predictions:

1. The major change will be in the quality of work, with Western industries almost inevitably 'debureaucratising' and moving towards democratic forms of work organisation;
2. People will once again start entering the work force, fulltime, at about 15 years of age;
3. The concept of a life time career is unlikely to survive past 1980;
4. The contractual form of employment will increasingly shift to the salaried form of contract and away from the hourly labour form;

5. The working week will in the leading Western countries move toward the four day, 35 to 36 hour week;
6. Annual leave will move to a four week pattern but this will be temporary, with a push towards five weeks leave;
7. Western societies are likely to come much closer to McLuhan's suggestion that work will be learning;
8. The recent upsurge in the return of married women to work will almost certainly continue;
9. The distinction between work and leisure will become increasingly hazy, in people's behaviour, not just in their minds;
10. The concept of a fixed retiring age about 60 to 65 will very likely be scrapped.

None of these may sound very radical, but the arguments supporting such propositions are well worth considering. They left me, as indeed did the whole book, with an uneasy feeling that there is a lot to be learned before societies like New Zealand can really begin to grapple with the futures we are already in.

Richard Rudman

Wellington

## PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

- ANTHONY, P.D. *The Ideology of Work*. Tavistock, London, 1977.
- BROOKS, Brian *The Practice of Industrial Relations in New Zealand*. Commerce Clearing House (New Zealand), Auckland, 1978.
- DEEKS, John, ROTH, Herbert, FARMER, James, SCOTT, Graham *Industrial Relations in New Zealand*. Methuen, Wellington, 1978.
- FRIEDMAN, Andrew L. *Industry and Labour : Class Struggle at Work and Monopoly Capitalism*. Macmillan, London, 1977.
- GEARE, Alan J., HERD, Joyce, J. and HOWELLS, John M., *Women in Trade Unions: A Case Study of Participation in New Zealand*. Victoria University of Wellington, Industrial Relations Centre, Industrial Relations Research Monograph No. 6, 1979.
- JENKINS, Clive and SHERMAN, Barrie, *Computers and the Unions*. Longman, London, 1977.
- KEMP, Tom *Historical Patterns of Industrialization*. Longman, London, 1978.
- KRIMPAS, G.E. *Labour Input and the Theory of the Labour Market*. Duckworth, London, 1975.
- McLENNAN, Roy ed. *Participation and Change in the New Zealand Workplace*. Fourth Estate, Wellington, 1978.
- NILAND, John *Collective Bargaining and Compulsory Arbitration in Australia*. New South Wales University Press, Sydney, 1978.
- PARKIN, Michael and ZIS, George eds. *Inflation in Open Economics*. Manchester University Press, 1976.
- Sharing Out the Work : Conference Papers and Reports, July 1978*. Centre for Continuing Education, Australian National University, Canberra, 1978.
- SMITH, I.T. *Mazengarb and Smith's Industrial Relations and Industrial Law*. Butterworths, Wellington, 4th edn, 1975.
- SZAKATS, Alexander *Introduction to the Law of Employment*. Butterworths, Wellington, 1975.
- TURKINGTON, Don J. Ed. *Industrial Relations Teaching and Research in Australia and New Zealand: Proceedings of the Australia and New Zealand Conference of Teachers of Industrial Relations, 10-12 May 1978*. Industrial Relations Centre, Victoria University of Wellington, 1978.