

Ageing Australian Unions and the ‘Youth Problem’

David Peetz, Robin Price and Janis Bailey

Introduction

Trade union membership, both in aggregate numbers and in density, has declined in the majority of advanced economies globally over recent decades (Blanchflower, 2007). In Australia, the decline in the 1990s was somewhat more precipitate than in most countries (Peetz, 1998). As discussed in Chapter 1, the introductory chapter, reasons for the decline are multifactorial, including a more hostile environment to unionism created by employers and the state, difficulties with workplace union organisation, and structural change in the economy (Bryson and Gomez, 2005; Bryson et al., 2011; Ebbinghaus et al., 2011; Payne, 1989; Waddington and Kerr, 2002; Waddington and Whitson, 1997). Our purpose in this chapter is to look beyond aggregate Australian union density data, to examine how age relates to membership decline, and how different age groups, particularly younger workers, are located in the story of union decline. The practical implications of this research are that understanding how unions relate to workers of different age groups, and to workers of different genders amongst those age groups, may lead to improved recruitment and better union organisation.

First, we briefly review the literature on young people and unions in Australia. Second, we explain the context for Australian union recruitment and third, we explain our methodology. Fourth, we set out our findings with respect to union membership by age in Australia over the past 20 years. Finally, we provide some examples of strategies adopted by Australian unions, with varying degrees of success, to attempt to rejuvenate the age profile of their membership, and proffer some suggestions for future action.

Australian unions and youth

As Chapter 1 has shown, patterns of unionisation differ significantly by age across the world. In Australia, union density amongst youth, defined as those 15–24 years of age (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2007), is around half that of older workers, and has declined at a faster rate (Bailey et al., 2010: 45). The literature on Australian unions and youth is sparse. We know young Australians have very limited knowledge of what unions do (Bailey et al., 2010; Price et al., 2010), and that Australian

unions rarely focus on young workers as an identity group or single them out for attention (Bailey et al., 2010). Union officials are conscious of the problem of low youth membership, and there is some strategy development aimed at increasing membership amongst new university graduates in teaching and other professional jobs, and in lower-paid jobs such as child care and retail, but strategies are patchy and often short-lived (Bailey et al., 2010). An Australian survey of young people's attitudes towards unions found that young people do not think that they need unions because only 'victims' need unions (Bulbeck, 2008). At the same time, Australian research examining whether young people would join if they had the opportunity, found higher levels of unmet demand for union membership amongst young people than older people in non-union workplaces, with younger workers expressing a much higher (50 per cent) likelihood of joining if asked, than those aged 45 and over (30 per cent) (Pyman et al., 2009), similar to findings in the UK, US and Canada (Bryson et al., 2005), and New Zealand (Haynes et al., 2005). Oliver (2010: 516), in a study focussing on Australian graduates, found that the highest rates of 'latent membership' were in the best organised industries: government and education; and that the most useful strategy would be for 'unions that represent workers in different stages of the life-course collaborating to retain members' and 'minimising the switching costs for young workers as they move through different phases.' In another exploration of the views of Australian graduates, it was found that positive attitudes of those around them – friends more so than parents – cause young people to take a positive view of unions (Griffin and Brown, 2011). This is consistent with other studies cited in Chapter 1, and with social learning theory. The problem is however that youth and indeed parental union membership is so low that few now can be effectively influenced in this way. Young Australians therefore are not actively opposed to, but are ignorant of, unions' role. For their part, some unions are vaguely aware there is a 'youth problem', and a number of officials are highly concerned about it, but it has not been an issue singled out for attention by the Australian union movement.

Chapter 1 has canvassed union responses internationally to the problem of low youth membership. The very rapid decline in youth membership in Australia suggests that a coordinated rather than a piecemeal response is urgently needed in this country. The applicability of strategies adopted elsewhere, and other kinds of union action that might be useful in increasing youth membership, requires research that unpacks how unionisation and age are related. Hence the main purpose of this chapter is to analyse the patterns in Australian union membership over the past 20 years

in a more comprehensive way than has been done in the past. Some initial background on the Australian labour law environment is necessary, to set the scene for the analysis.

The Australian legislative environment

The Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth) currently regulates the wages and conditions of most Australian employees. There is a set of National Employment Standards (NES) for all employees, including the young. Further, so-called ‘Modern Awards’ set a minimum floor separately for each industry or occupation and, where they have sufficient power, unions negotiate collective agreements upwards from the award standards. These broad provisions – largely won by unions themselves over the twentieth century via a system of conciliation and arbitration – continue to provide, by international standards, reasonable wages. That said, wage inequality in Australia has been rising, and the wages of employees at the bottom have declined or stagnated (Watson, 2014). Awards and agreements – overseen by an independent body, the Fair Work Commission (FWC) – also offer employees a range of protections in areas such as maximum hours of work, various kinds of leave, penalty rates for work at unsociable hours and on weekends, and wage loadings of around 25 per cent for so-called ‘casuals’ who do not get leave. However, the caveat here is that the many young workers in typical un- or semi-skilled ‘youth jobs’ such as retail and hospitality, particularly those working in small businesses, are subject only to modern awards and do not get the benefits of collective bargaining. This is because unions, for a variety of reasons, including falling union density and decentralisation of the IR system (Peetz and Bailey, 2012), have faced challenges to organising – and the resource costs of bargaining – in such workplaces. For instance, award-dependent employees in 2012 were a mere 16.1 per cent of the overall workforce; but 44.8 per cent of employees in ‘accommodation and food services’ – an area which is youth-dominated – were award-dependent (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2013).

While unions face a difficult environment, with membership amongst all groups declining, as analysed in this chapter, some aspects of the IR system assist unions to bargain. For instance, unions do not need to go through a recruitment and certification process, as in the US, in order to bargain, which means that they are able to obtain collective agreement coverage more easily than in some international jurisdictions.

Methodology

Our methodology analyses union membership density in Australia over a 20-year period with respect to both age and gender. Our estimates of density take as their starting point the estimates provided by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) in its annual (until recently) employment benefits and trade union membership publication (now ABS Cat No 6310.0) based on an August survey. These estimates suffer from a major drawback for fine-grained analysis, namely that the sample nature of the survey means that estimates for small sub-groups such as the various five-year age groups are highly variable. To remove the erratic elements in the data to reveal the underlying trends, we adopt a trending method based on weighted averages of estimates (Peetz, 2005). This is the same approach used by the ABS when it applies trend estimates to labour force and national accounts data to remove the influence of random error. In our data, we apply a 7-point Henderson moving average (Shiskin et al., 1967; Doherty, 2001), which takes account of not only the observation for the year in question but also those occurring up to three years before and three years after that particular point in time. For this reason we use data to 2010, as the last three years' data are subject to revision.

Union membership and density by age

Trade union density estimates for each age group, for each year from 1991 to 2010, show that there is a fairly consistent hierarchy. In every year, the lowest densities amongst workers are experienced in the 15–19 and 20–24-year age groups, with the 15–19 group always the lowest (see Figure 4.1). The second is that, at initial glance, there appears to be a fairly consistent trend across all age groups. That is, in almost every age group, trend density fell between 1991 and 2001, and fell again between 2001 and 2010. For example, amongst 40–44-year-olds, density fell by about a third, from 43.9 per cent to 28.9 per cent, between 1991 and 2001; it then fell by another quarter, to 21.9 per cent, by 2010. In all age groups the drop between 2001 and 2010 is less than the drop between 1991 and 2010, even after allowing for the one extra year in the earlier period. (The one exception is the very small 65 years and above age group.)

However, closer inspection reveals a more complex story. Overall, trend density amongst many age groups appears to have stabilised or better in recent years. Density looks to have stabilised over the last three years in the 25–29, 30–34, 40–44, and 50–54-year age groups, and to have increased over the last three years in the 55–59 and 60–64-year age groups. In contrast, density appears to be

continuing to fall in the 20–24-year age group (from 11.1 per cent in 2007 to 10.4 per cent in 2010) and in the 15–19-year age group (from 9.6 per cent in 2007 to 7.6 per cent in 2010).

Figure 4.1 Trade union density by age, Australia, trend estimates, 1991–2010

Source: Calculated from ABS Cat No 6310.0, 63100TS0001, table 2, April 2012, http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/subscriber.nsf/log?openagent&63100_trade%20union%20membership%20time%20series.xls&6310.0&Data%20Cubes&E73C60FDEC745618CA2579EC00153E64&0&August%202011&27.04.2012&Latest; using methodology in Peetz (2005).

Moreover, the relative decline in density amongst young workers has been disproportionately large. In 1991, the age group with the lowest density was the oldest (and smallest): 65+ year-olds had density about a quarter lower than 15–19-year-olds. By 2010, the age group with the lowest density was the youngest: 65+ year-olds now had density three quarters higher than 15–19-year-olds, and indeed a third higher than 20–24-year-olds.

Across the middle and older working age groups (30–34 to 60–64), density typically fell by a little over a third, from 1991 to 2001. But in the youngest age groups (15–19, 20–24 and 25–29), it fell by over a half. From 2001–2010, across the middle and older age groups, density fell by, on average, around one fifth (albeit with greater variation), but it fell by nearly a third amongst the 15–19 and 20–24-year age groups. In total, over two decades from 1991 to 2010, density dropped by half amongst the middle and older age groups but by two thirds amongst the 15–19 and 20–24-year age groups. The differences between age groups, we should point out, are graduated rather than sudden. As Figure 4.2 shows, the proportionate drop in density declines as the age group increases in a fairly monotonic way for much of the age range.

Figure 4.2 Decline in density 1991–2010 as a proportion of initial density in 1991, by age group, trend estimates

Source: See Figure 4.1.

Of course, one reason why the drop is proportionately greater for younger age groups is that the density was lower to begin with. But this does not obviate the implications for the union movement: the relative ageing of the unionised workforce.

Over this period, there have also been demographic changes in the composition of the workforce, in particular the ageing of the workforce as well as its overall growth. So changes in density within age groups do not necessarily align with changes in membership. Figure 4.3 shows changes in

membership over the two decades from 1991 by age group. In some age groups the drop in density has been more than offset by the growth in the labour force within that age group. In stark contrast, the number of union members aged 15–19 fell 63 per cent, from 136,400 to 50,800; and the number aged 20–24 also fell by 63 per cent, from 304,200 to 113,500. While the number of union members has been increasing over the last three years in the majority of age groups, it continues to fall in the 15–19-year age group.

Figure 4.3 Trade union membership by age group, 1991–2010

Source: See Figure 4.1.

This suggests that the union movement is ageing. In one sense this is what we would expect in a labour force that is itself ageing. However, what is notable is that union members are ageing faster than the rest of the workforce.

Figure 4.4 shows a notable gender dimension to this. Because women have tended to leave the labour force before men, the average age of women in the labour force has traditionally been lower than that of men. But more recently the rate at which women have been leaving the labour force early has declined, meaning that the average age of female employees has been growing faster than the average age of male employees – and so the average age gap between the two has narrowed. When we look specifically at union members, though, we see that the ageing of female unionists is particularly marked. In 1990 the average age of male unionists was 37.7 years, 2.4 years older than women unionists' average age of 35.2 years. But by 2010, when the average age of male unionists had risen to 42.1 years, they were now 1.2 years younger than female unionists, who averaged 42.3 years of age.

Figure 4.4 Average age (trend) by gender, unionists and employees, 1990–2010

Source: See Figure 4.1.

Figure 4.5 helps explain the broad forces underlying this shift. In 1990 there was a large gender unionism gap between men (average density of 44.7 per cent) and women (34.7 per cent) and we can see that there was higher male density in all age groups above 25. By 2010, male density had dropped considerably more than female density in those age groups, so that amongst age groups in the 25–34-year range, female and male densities were similar, and in most age groups above 40 years, female density was higher. One reason may be that union decline has disproportionately happened in male-dominated industries that have themselves been in decline (such as manufacturing), whereas industries

and occupations such as health, including nursing, where members are often female and older, have had the best membership outcomes. (Indeed, professionals now have the second highest density amongst all occupational groups.)

Amongst young people, however, the trend has gone the other way. The gap between male and female density widened between 1990 and 2010, as a result of a greater fall in female than male densities. Amongst 15–19-year-olds, male density dropped by 15 points (from 24.7 per cent to 9.3 per cent), but female density dropped 18 points (from 24.3 per cent to 6.4 per cent). So the relative ageing of female unionists is due to three factors: the growth of female labour force participation in older age groups; the fact that women's density has declined less amongst older workers than men's; and the fact that amongst young workers, female density has fallen more than male density.

Figure 4.5 Density (trend) by age group and gender, 1990, 2000 and 2010

Source: See Figure 4.1.

Figure 4.1 also told us that, in the 'normal' course of events, people's union membership is relatively low in their youth and that many people join unions as they get older, not until at least their 30s, possibly later. Or at least, this is how it would look if union density was stable overall, and is the pattern that people followed up until the 1980s. But if we look at current age cohorts (that is, if we follow people's membership behaviour as they age), we see that this pattern has not been followed in recent years. If overall density across the workforce was stable from one point in time to another, then as you followed people in young age cohorts, their density would increase over time (for example, they would join unions as they got older), while for middle aged cohorts density might be more stable. For example, in 1995, density amongst 15–19-year-olds was 18.9 per cent. Fifteen years later, in 2010, that cohort was aged 30–34 years. In 1995, density amongst 30–34-year-olds was 34.0 per cent. So if overall density were to be stable across the labour force between 1995 and 2010, and the same age distribution of density were also to be maintained, then amongst the cohort that was aged 15–19 years in 1995, density would be expected to rise from 18.9 per cent to 34.0 per cent, that is, by 15.1 percentage points (this is the value represented by the far left column in Figure 4.3, amongst 15–19-year-olds).

In fact, however, density in this cohort (15–19-year-olds in 1995 who became 30–34-year-olds in 2010) fell from 18.9 per cent in 1995 to 16.3 per cent in 2010 – a drop of 2.6 percentage points

(the middle column amongst 15–19-year-olds in Figure 4.3). So there was a shortfall in density growth of 17.7 per cent (the right hand column) amongst this age cohort. All age cohorts showed a greater drop in density than this one, but the only age cohort to show a greater shortfall in density growth, compared to that needed to stabilise density, was the next youngest age cohort, those aged 20–24 in 1995.

Amongst those under 30, especially those at the younger end, the problem for unions appears to be mostly that young people have simply not been joining unions in the first place, in the numbers necessary to maintain stable density. We cannot be certain of this without using a longitudinal dataset, as it is also possible that at least some younger workers join a union and then quickly leave, perhaps as they change jobs, since we know that labour turnover is higher amongst younger workers. So it may be more accurate to say that the problem is that young people have not been joining unions as they enter stable jobs. There are different factors involved in people joining and leaving unions (Peetz, 1998), and so the question is not so much about young people and unions and why they leave them, but why they do not join a union (or at least join a union once they get a stable job) in the first place. It is not just about what workers do when they are teenagers, but also what they do (or don't do) as they mature through their 20s.

Discussion and conclusions

These data tell us several things about age patterns in unionism. The unionised workforce is getting older – considerably more so than the workforce as a whole. And this is especially the case amongst female unionists, who are now on average older than male unionists. This partly reflects demographic changes in the labour force, but may also reflect different union outcomes amongst professionals and older workers, compared to outcomes in industries and occupations where younger workers predominate. The dilemma for unions is therefore twofold: they have been losing members amongst middle-aged and older workers – as a result of the social, economic, structural and union-related factors mentioned previously – but they have also been failing to attract young people into joining unions. This is even more so for young female workers than young males. In short, unions have a 'problem' amongst young workers that goes well beyond the traditional pattern whereby people often joined unions in big numbers only as they got older: those young workers are now less likely than before to join when they mature. The consequences of this have already been felt in low density amongst newer age cohorts. If it continues unabated, unions face a bleak future. From a social justice

perspective, too, young workers suffer from a range of distinctive disadvantages, in addition to those faced by all workers (Price et al., 2011). Moreover, young (under age 22) workers are less inclined to take any form of action to resolve problems and, where they did so, are less likely to do so collectively than older groups (Tailby and Pollert, 2011: 514). So a highly marginalised group of workers stands to become even more so if current unionisation trends continue.

The findings regarding Australian union density have a number of practical implications for the future of trade unions. Over three decades ago, Cupper (1980: 45) asserted that his findings ‘particularly when taken in the context of the widespread uncertainty regarding future membership, serve notice to unions that all is not well on the youth front and give direction for remedial action’. This is a view shared by many. Disappointingly, Cupper’s analysis that Australian unions were taking ‘a step in the right direction’ in 1980 has not come to fruition. The data show us otherwise. By drawing on extant research we can posit a range of reasons why unions need to take action and from that provide a range of suggestions.

Research indicates that youth are ignorant when it comes to trade unions. Young people’s ignorance of unions remains a pervasive problem. Cupper’s survey of Year 11 students in technical education revealed that the students knew little of the role of unions, beyond vaguely perceiving them as protective organisations; 20 per cent intended to join one, 14 per cent had no such intention and 66 per cent were undecided. Three decades later, a survey of Queensland secondary school students showed that students knew they could not be forced to join a union (correct 67 per cent, year 9; 74 per cent, year 11) but focus groups revealed students were ignorant of what unions do. In the survey, 15 per cent of students agreed with the statement that workers would be better off in a union, 10 per cent disagreed, and the vast majority (75 per cent) had no opinion (Price et al., 2010) – findings which resonate rather chillingly with Cupper’s. These findings demonstrate that employment relations’ knowledge is only lightly embedded – if at all – in Australian school curricula.

Further, the views of young Australians about unions and their role tend to be shaped by the media. Cupper (1980) argued that newspapers and television provide a distorted picture. The subsequent concentration of Australian media ownership in a neo-liberal environment is likely to have intensified such distortion, in spite of today’s new media and social networking tools that might present an alternative view. In the Queensland study, parents (33 per cent), the internet (19 per cent), teachers

(16 per cent) and employers (13 per cent) were the dominant sources of young people's information on unions and on employment relations more broadly (McDonald et al., 2010: 35). However, unions' own use of social media in general, and with respect to young people in particular, is patchy, despite some exceptions (Bailey et al., 2010).

In relation to unions being an experience good, studies show that although young Australians participate significantly in the labour market (Oliver, 2010), they have limited exposure to unions. A general conclusion of research on unions and youth is that unions need to provide services to differentiate themselves and to market the benefits of union membership. Given that evidence suggests that some young people encounter unions early, primarily in wholesale and retail, unions covering these sectors play an important role in union socialisation and should devote their efforts to young workers (Budd, 2010). Gomez et al. (2004: 239) argue that it is only after a period of employment in a unionised environment when workers have acquired sound information about the value of unionisation that they are able to make informed choices about joining. However, the 'experience good' nature of union membership means that declining unionisation amongst younger workers becomes a self-perpetuating spiral, meaning fewer and fewer individuals experience their benefits. Various practical strategies have been advanced. Budd (2010: 222) advocates a 'life-cycle rather than job-centric representation strategy', consistent with Kochan's (2005: 151) view that unions should adopt a role akin to earlier models of 'mutual benefit societies'. However, suggestions such as 'health insurance, savings programs that build retirement security, life-long education, work-family supports, and social networks and information to find jobs when required' (Kochan, 2005: 151), would require adaptation in Australia, as many of those services are already provided by the state. Further, it is important to promote the notion that unions provide power in the workplace (Peetz, 1998), leading to a broad range of benefits, including collective issues such as improved pay and conditions, assistance with individual problems, and an overall 'voice' at work to counter injustice. Another strategy is to 'influence the formation of a self-concept that is favourable to unionisation' (Gomez et al., 2004: 246) by offering summer internships and university scholarships, and sponsoring parts of the school curriculum to introduce young people to unionisation. Australian unions could adopt a low-cost open source unionism to directly target young people, as advocated by Gomez et al. (2004: 247) and recently advanced by the AFL-CIO in the US (Goodman and Gonzalez, 2013). However, such a strategy has never been seriously considered by Australian unions. In addition, lower youth union subscription rates

could be introduced to provide an incentive for youth to experience unionism. While currently most unions have a sliding scale of fees based on earnings, union fees for those under (say) 25 could be lower still. This is particularly important for youth in low-paid precarious work (Bailey et al., 2010), but might also serve to increase union membership amongst younger professional and technical workers. At the same time, participatory structures to involve young people in decision-making, such as via youth representative bodies in larger confederations, are important (Vandaele, 2012), but these youth bodies need to be supported with budgets, paid staff and voting rights.

Union campaigns for youth need to acknowledge that work is not always central to young people's identity. Partly therefore, unions must accept some responsibility for the failure to engage with young workers in ways that are appropriate to young people's needs (Peetz, 2010). This resonates with Oliver's (2010) finding that the graduates, who had been union members in their student job, had no strong impression of its value and were no more likely to want union membership than those who had never been members. This would require further investigation, but on the whole, does not augur well for the future of unions.

Australian unions' strategies with respect to young employees, and resource allocation to that end, are patchy. One of the few empirical studies of Australian unions and youth suggested that unions 'need to adopt the communication technologies used by young people, differentiate by price and service product to meet youth-specific needs with an emphasis on positive, low-cost "sampling" experiences, communicate using language, visuals and messages that resonate with young people' (Bailey et al., 2010: 57), but found few examples of effective and sustained strategies and was generally pessimistic about the unions' consciousness of youth issues. For example, youth-related initiatives – such as the Young Unionists Movement initiated by young full-time union staff in Queensland a few years ago – tend to be un- or under-resourced and run out of steam (Bailey et al., 2010: 56). A recent example of social media campaigning with respect to youth relates to a win by Australia's largest union, the Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees Union of Australia (SDA) for retail employees to be paid the adult rate at age 20 rather than the existing 21 years, a move stringently opposed by employers (CCH Australia, 2014). However, this victory was achieved largely through the legislative system rather than social media campaigning. Further, the SDA's general approach is to 'bargain first, recruit later' (Price et al., 2014) – made possible because winning recognition is not required in the Australian workplace. This means that unions like the SDA, on the right in Australia's

union movement, and which probably has the largest ‘youth union’ membership in Australia in terms of both raw numbers and density, does not need to mobilise employees and is in any case ideologically disinclined to do so. Yet given the ageing of the unionised workforce, if the Australian union movement does not take steps to counteract their ageing membership, they will quite literally die out, along with their members.

In sum, we have seen that the Australian unionised workforce is ageing, and ageing rapidly, females more so than males. Given that in the Australian context unions do not need to win recognition, as is the case in many other nations, there is nothing precluding unions from attracting young members. While some examples of youth aligned recruitment and engagement strategies exist, these tend to be ad hoc and ineffectual in reshaping the age profile of the union movement.

References

- ABS (Australian Bureau of Statistics) (2007) *Themes – Children and Youth Statistics*, Canberra: ABS.
- ABS (2013) *Employee Earnings and Hours, Australia*, Cat. No. 6306.0, May 2012, Canberra: ABS.
- Bailey, J., Price, R., Esders, L. and McDonald, P. (2010) ‘Daggy shirts, daggy slogans? Marketing unions to young people’, *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 52 (1): 43–60.
- Blanchflower, D. (2007) ‘International patterns of union membership’, *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 45 (1): 1–28.
- Bryson, A., Ebbinghaus, B. and Visser, J. (2011) ‘Introduction: Causes, consequences and cures of union decline’, *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 17 (2): 97–105.
- Bryson, A. and Gomez, R. (2005) ‘Why have workers stopped joining unions? The rise in never-membership in Britain’, *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 43 (1): 67–92.
- Bryson, A., Gomez, R., Gunderson, M. and Meltz, N. (2005) ‘Youth–adult differences in the demand for unionization: are American, British and Canadian workers all that different?’ *Journal of Labor Research*, 26 (1): 155–167.
- Budd, J. (2010) ‘When do US workers first experience unionization? Implications for revitalizing the labor movement’, *Industrial Relations*, 49 (2): 209–225.
- Bulbeck, C. (2008) ‘Only “victim” workers need unions?: perceptions of trade unions amongst young Australians’, *Labour and Industry* 19 (1–2): 49–71.

- CCH Australia (2014) Retailers must pay full rates to 20 year olds. 25 March 2014, available at <http://www.cch.com.au/au/News/ShowNews.aspx?PageTitle=Retailers-must-pay-full-rates-to-20-year-olds&ID=40904&Type=S&TopicIDNews=9&CategoryIDNews=0> (accessed 19 June 2014).
- Cupper, L. (1980) 'Unions and youth: a step in the right direction', *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 22 (1): 36–53.
- Doherty, M. (2001) 'The Surrogate Henderson Filters in X11', *Australia & New Zealand Journal of Statistics*, 43 (4): 385–392.
- Ebbinghaus, B., Göbel, C. and Koos, S. (2011) 'Social capital, "Ghent" and workplace contexts matter: comparing union membership in Europe', *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 17 (2): 107–124.
- Gomez, R., Gunderson, M. and Meltz, N. (2004) 'From playstations to workstations: young workers and the experience-good model of union membership', in A. Verma and T. Kochan (eds) *Unions in the 21st Century: An International Perspective*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan: 239–249.
- Goodman, A. and Gonzalez, J. (2013) 'In historic move, AFL-CIO expands ranks with vote to include non-union, immigrant, low-wage workers', 12 September 2013, available at http://www.democracynow.org/2013/9/12/in_historic_move_afl_cio_expands. (Accessed 15 June 2014).
- Griffin, L. and Brown, M. (2011) 'Second hand views? Young people, social networks and positive union attitudes', *Labour and Industry*, 22 (1–2): 83–101.
- Haynes, P., Vowles, J. and Boxall, P. (2005) 'Explaining the younger–older worker union density gap: evidence from New Zealand', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 43 (1): 93–116.
- Kochan, T. (2005) *Restoring the American Dream: A Working Families' Agenda for America*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- McDonald, P., Bailey, J., Pini, B. and Price, R. (2010) Social Citizenship and Employment for Secondary School Students: report to partner organisations, 12 May, available at <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/32249/>, Accessed 15 May 2010.

- Oliver, D. (2010) 'Union membership among young graduate workers in Australia: using the experience good model to explain the role of student employment', *Industrial Relations Journal*, 41 (5): 505–519.
- Payne, J. (1989) 'Trade union membership and activism among young people in Great Britain', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 27 (1): 111–132.
- Peetz, D. (1998) *Unions in a Contrary World*, Melbourne and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peetz, D. (2005) 'Trend analysis of union membership', *Australian Journal of Labour Economics*, 8 (1): 1–24.
- Peetz, D. (2010) 'Are individualistic attitudes killing collectivism?' *Transfer*, 16 (3): 383–398.
- Peetz, D. and Bailey, J. (2012) 'Dancing alone: the Australian union movement over three decades', *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 54 (4): 525–541.
- Price, R., Bailey, J. and McDonald, P. (2010) 'Knowledge is not power, but it's a start: young people and employment entitlements', Paper presented to 22nd AIRAANZ conference, Trades Hall, Sydney, 3–5 February 2010.
- Price, R., McDonald, P., Bailey, J. and Pini, P. (2011) 'A majority experience: young people's encounters with the labour market', in R. Price, P. McDonald, J. Bailey and P. Pini (eds) *Young People and Work*, Farnham: Ashgate: 1–17.
- Price, R., Bailey, J. and Pyman, A. (2014) 'Varieties of collaboration: the case of an Australian retail union', *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25 (6): 748–761.
- Pyman, A., Teicher, J., Cooper, B. and Holland, P. (2009) 'Unmet demand for union membership in Australia', *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 51 (1): 5–24.
- Shiskin, J., Young, A. H. and Musgrave, J.C. (1967) 'The X11 Variant of the Census Method II Seasonal Adjustment Program', Technical Paper 15, Washington, DC: Bureau of the Census, US Department of Commerce.
- Tailby, S. and Pollert, A. (2011) 'Non-unionized young workers and organizing the unorganized', *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 32 (3): 499–522.
- Vandaele, K. (2012) 'Youth representatives' opinions on recruiting and representing young workers: a twofold unsatisfied demand?' *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 18 (3): 203–218.

- Waddington, J. and Kerr, A. (2002) 'Unions fit for young workers?' *Industrial Relations Journal*, 33 (4): 298–315.
- Waddington, J. and Whitson, C. (1997) 'Why do people join unions in a period of membership decline?' *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 35 (4): 515–546.
- Watson, I. (2014) 'Wage inequality and neoliberalism: insights from quantile regression', Unpublished Paper, April 2014, available at http://ianwatson.com.au/pubs/watson_wage_inequality_8april2014.pdf (accessed 19 May 2014).