

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

‘The class composition of trade union movement in Greece: an empirical investigation’

Ioannis Zisimopoulos

George Economakis

George Androulakis

DP 2019 - 2

DP 2019 – 2

ISSN: 2654-0738

**‘The class composition of trade union movement in
Greece: an empirical investigation’**

Ioannis Zisimopoulos

University of Patras

George Economakis

University of Patras

George Androulakis

University of Patras

The class composition of trade union movement in Greece: an empirical investigation

Ioannis Zisimopoulos

University of Patras, Department of Business Administration, University Campus Rio, 26504
Greece

e-mail: jozismo@upatras.gr, Tel. +302610969833

George Economakis

University of Patras, Department of Business Administration, University Campus Rio, 26504
Greece

e-mail: economak@upatras.gr, Tel. +302610969833

George Androulakis

University of Patras, Department of Business Administration, University Campus Rio, 26504
Greece

e-mail: gandroul@upatras.gr, Tel. +302610997790

Ioannis Zisimopoulos is a Teaching Fellow at the Department of Business Administration of the University of Patras. He studied at the the University of Patras (BA Economics, MBA, 2008, and PhD in Political Economy and Industrial Relations). His work has been published in proceedings of international conferences and academic journals.

George Economakis is an Associate Professor of Political Economy at the Department of Business Administration of the University of Patras. He studied at the Economics Department of the University of Athens (BA Economics, 1984) and Panteion University (MSc in Regional Development, 1988, and PhD in Political Economy, 1998). He has published in many academic journals and has co-authored several books.

George Androulakis is an Associate Professor at the Department of Business Administration. He studied at the Department of Mathematics of the University of Patras (BSc, MSc and PhD in Unconstrained Optimisation Methods). His interests are focused on nonlinear unconstrained optimisation, neural networks training, optimal Runge-Kutta methods, systems of non-algebraic and/or transcendental functions, and quantitative methods.

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the class composition of the trade union movement in Greece. More precisely, we investigate in which social classes the members of trade unions belong and which social classes present higher level of union density within the wage labour. For the determination of social classes, the Marxist theory of the modes of production is adopted. The analysis is based on primary data that collected in the second quarter of 2018 by the method of semi-structured interview. The population is all employees who potentially are members of trade unions, i.e. the wage labour in Greece, and the sample is composed of 651 questionnaires. From the data analysis the hegemony of the new petty bourgeoisie within the trade union movement is derived. The new petty bourgeoisie –and especially that part formed within the state mechanism– is showing higher levels of union density.

Keywords: social classes, wage labor, trade unions, union density, Greece

JEL classification: B51, J21, J51, J82

1. Introduction

In the literature of industrial relations several factors that affect the union density rate have been investigated. The personal characteristics, structural factors, institutional factors and behavioral factors have been investigated as determinants of union density (Van den Berg and Groot 1992, 1994; Freeman and Medoff 1984; Ebbinghaus *et al.* 2011; Schnabel and Wagner 2007; Friedman *et al.* 2006; Meng 1990; Arleen 1995; Ebbinghaus and Visser 1999; Bean and Holden 1992; Chacko and Greer 1982). Nevertheless the impact of class position in union density rate has not been investigated. In this line the first research question of this paper is the impact of social class as a determinant of union density.

Moreover, the left-wing unionists in Greece (members of radical-revolutionary left and of traditional communist party) have recently accused the social-democratic leaders of the General Confederation of Greek Workers (GSEE) of being engaged in enterprises as owners or as managers. This fact raises the question about the class position of the union leaders and, by extension, of the class composition of trade union movement from which these leaders are elected. Thus the second research question of this paper is the class composition of the Greek trade union movement.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 presents the criteria according to which the social classes are defined. In section 3 the social classes within the modes of production are defined, i.e. within the capitalist mode of production (CMP), the simple commodity mode of production (SCMP) and the hybrid mode of production (HMP). In section 4 the social classes that are formulated within the state mechanism (general government) and the state capitalist enterprises are defined. In section 5 we sum up the social classes that are formulated in a social formation and present the (quantitative) limits that in practice could delimitate the modes of production. In the 6th section the social classes that are formed within the wage labour in Greece are determined. In section 7 the methodology adopted for the empirical investigation of trade union's class composition is presented. The 8th section is dedicated to the presentation of the results of the investigation, while in the 9th section there are some concluding remarks.

2. Mode of production, production relations, social classes: the economic and the political-ideological criterion of class determination

Our analysis is based on three preconditions.¹ The first is that the basic criterion of class determination is economic: the position in production relations. The second precondition is that social classes may be also formed as a part of the functional exercise of social (economic, political, ideological) power of the ruling class. The third precondition is that there can be no class definition at the political and ideological level which is inconsistent with the definition at the economic level (Milios and Economakis 2011: 228).

Based on the above preconditions, social classes are distinguished into 'fundamental' and 'non-fundamental' or 'intermediate' social classes.

'[T]here are three relations, which together constitute the relations of production: *ownership, possession* and the *use* of the means of production'. The particular combination of the relations of production constitutes the 'matrix' of (every) mode of production. It is necessary to note that '[u]se of the means of production is defined as the exclusive performance of the function of labour,..., [o]wnership...consists in the control of the means, objects and results of the productive process', and possession of the means of production is 'the management

¹ The theoretical framework of the paper is based on Economakis *et al.* 2015 and Zisimopoulos & Economakis 2018.

(direction) of the production process and the power to put the means of production to use...[O]wnership as an economic relation exists in a relation of homology (coincidence-correspondence) with possession' (Economakis 2005: 13). The 'fundamental' social classes are formed within the modes of production, as the 'carriers' of the relations of production. Non-fundamental social classes consist of those social classes that are not 'carriers' of production relations in a mode of production, or those social classes that are not formed within the modes of production –and thus cannot be defined on the basis of the economic criterion– but are constituted within the framework of the state's function. (Economakis 2005: 14; Milios and Economakis 2011: 228).

3. The social classes within the modes of production: CMP, SCMP, HMP

There are two preconditions for the emergence of the CPM, one 'elementary' and one 'specifically capitalist' feature.

The 'elementary feature' of the matrix of the capitalist mode of production is the 'homology of the relation of ownership and possession in the class "carrier" of ownership (real ownership) by separation of free-immediate-producers² from possession of the means of production. Real ownership connotes that the free workers work to the benefit of the class "carrier" of ownership' (exploitation relationship, surplus-value production and extraction, remuneration from variable capital, i.e. 'productive labour'³) (Economakis 2005: 14).

The 'specifically capitalist' feature of the matrix of the capitalist mode of production is the total disengagement of the real owner of the means of production from the need to work directly (or to exert the function of labour), or in other words the total disengagement from the use relation. The 'specifically capitalist' feature results from the change in the quantitative scale of production, and thus from the change of the volume of capital employed by an individual employer. The volume of capital determines thus the volume of wage labour (number of wage-earners employed) (Economakis 2005: 14-15).

On the basis of the above analysis, we can conclude that the two fundamental social classes that are formed within the CMP are the 'capitalist class' (the owners of the means of production and the top managers), as the exploiting class 'carrier' of the real ownership relation, and the 'working class', as the exploited class 'carrier' of the use relation (see Economakis 1999).

Within the CMP, the 'new petty bourgeoisie' is formed as a non-fundamental social class. This social class consists of a special kind of wage earners (lower level managers, supervisors) who, despite the fact that they are also exploited as the working class, are neither 'carriers' of the use relation nor 'carriers' of the real ownership relation, but, nevertheless, they exert power that is assigned by the capitalist class (Milios and Economakis 2011; see also Poulantzas 1976).

² The 'free-immediate-producer' is the free worker (producer) 'in the double sense': the free expropriated individual (Marx 1990: 272-273). On the one hand, 'free' producers as individuals means 'emancipation of producers from feudal or Asiatic relations', and on the other hand, 'expropriated' producers means 'separation [of producers] from the means of production (and subsistence) that they possessed under... [feudal or Asiatic] historical conditions' (Milios and Economakis 2011: 228-229).

³ 'Productive labour' from the standpoint of the capitalist production process is the labour paid from variable capital, that is the labour that produces surplus value – the exploited labour under capitalism (see Marx 1969, 1981, 1990; for a review of the contradictions among Marxists in relation to the concept of productive labour see the literature presented in Milios and Economakis, 2011). As seen in the following analysis, the exploited labour under capitalism (i.e. the labour that produces surplus value) is not identical with the working class, although the exploitation is a precondition for the identification in the working class (for a detailed discussion of the issue see Economakis *et al.*, 2015).

Under conditions of total engagement or under conditions of non-total (partial) engagement of the real owner in the labour process, two distinct non-capitalist modes of production are formed. The first one (total engagement of the real owner in the labour process) is the SCMP and the second one (partial engagement of the real owner in the labour process) is the HMP (Economakis 2000, 2005).

Within the SCMP, only one social class is formed, the ‘traditional petty bourgeoisie’, which belongs to the fundamental social classes of the social formation. The simple commodity producer (self-employed) is the exclusive ‘carrier’ of the relations of production (real ownership and use relation). Apart from the owner of the production unit, the (non-salaried) contributing family workers belong to the traditional petty bourgeoisie, too. It must be noted that there is no exploitation relationship within the SCMP.

Within the HMP, two fundamental social classes are formed, which are both ‘carriers’ of production relations: the ‘middle bourgeoisie’ and the ‘spurious working class’. The middle bourgeoisie consists of the ‘small employers’ and contributing family workers. The middle bourgeoisie is the ‘carrier’ of the real ownership and of the partial use. The salaried class of HMP, which is only ‘carrier’ of the use relation (i.e. it is subjected to surplus-value extraction), is called spurious working class, in order to be distinguished from the working class which is exclusively formed within the CMP (see Economakis 2000, 2005).

4. The social classes within the state mechanism and the state capitalist enterprises

Within the state mechanism (general government), three non-fundamental social classes are formed, which cannot be defined according to the economic criterion, i.e. as the ‘carriers’ of production relations. These classes are: ‘the new petty bourgeoisie of the state mechanism’, the ‘upper state bureaucracy’ and the ‘lower ranking civil-servants’ (see Economakis *et al.* 2015). Within the general government, capitalist exploitation relations do not exist, i.e. production and extraction of surplus value.

‘[T]he new petty bourgeoisie [of the state mechanism]... comprises all those wage earners who staff the apparatuses of the capitalist state, hence exercise power in the name of the capitalist system in the process of its social reproduction’ (Milios and Economakis 2011: 231). It consists of civil servants that ensure ‘the cohesion of capitalist political power (state bureaucracy, the judicial apparatus, the military, etc.) and the systematization and dissemination of the ruling ideology, such as education’ (ibid. 232). These employees are salaried from the general government revenues (see Kappos 1987). The relationship of the new petty bourgeoisie of the state mechanism with the state is internal, as correspondingly internal is the relation between the new petty bourgeoisie of the CMP with the large capitalist enterprise (see Milios and Economakis 2011).

The lower hierarchical levels of civil servants (e.g. artisans, public service cleaners), who do not perform functions that ensure the consistency of state power or the systematization and dissemination of the dominant ideology, constitute the class of the lower ranking civil-servants.

The senior civil servants, the ‘heads’ of the state mechanism, exercise directly (i.e. non-delegated by others) authority for the reproduction of the capitalist system within the framework of the ‘relative autonomy’ of the state (Economakis *et al.* 2015; see also Poulantzas 1976: 183 ff.; Economakis and Bouras, 2007). We will call these ‘heads’ of the mechanism of the capitalist state upper state bureaucracy.

We consider the state capitalist enterprises (state-owned industries, public enterprises etc.) as a special form of the capitalist enterprise. Therefore, all our basic determinations on the CMP and therefore on the social classes that are formed within CMP, are applied in state capitalist enterprises. The most important difference of these enterprises, compared to the

private sector capitalist enterprises, is that the legal ownership belongs to the state, i.e. to the ‘collective capitalist’, and not to the individual capitalists (Economakis 2000; Carchedi 1977), and therefore the salaried classes are paid by ‘state capital’ (Kappos 1987). The social classes that are formed within the state capitalist enterprises are: the capitalist class which consists of the top managers, the new petty bourgeoisie of CMP and the working class (see Economakis 1999, 2000; Economakis *et al.* 2015).

5. The social classes of the social formation and the practical limits for the separation of modes of production

In accordance with the previous analysis, we summary the social classes of the social formation in the table below.

Table 1. Determination of the social classes within the capitalist system

Social Classes	Social division of labour	Real ownership on the means of production	Use of the means of production
Fundamental social classes			
Capitalist class and Top Managers of the private and state capitalist enterprises	CMP (private and state capitalist enterprises)	Yes	No
Middle bourgeoisie	HMP	Use	Partial use
Traditional petty bourgeoisie	SCMP	Yes	Yes
Working class	CMP (private and state capitalist enterprises)	No	Yes/exploitation relations
Spurious working class	HMP	No	Yes/exploitation relations
Non-fundamental or intermediate social classes			
Upper state bureaucracy	General government	No – direct (non-delegated by others) authority for the reproduction of the capitalist system	No
New petty bourgeoisie			
New petty bourgeoisie of the CMP	CMP (private and state capitalist enterprises)	No	No / exploitation relations – delegated power by the capitalist class
New petty bourgeoisie of the state mechanism	General government	No	No – delegated power by the state
Lower ranking civil-servants	General government	No	No

Source: Economakis *et al.* 2015: 55 (Table 8.1), see also Zisimopoulos and Economakis 2018: 45-46 (Table 1)

The separation of social classes at the level of production modes is the result of the separation-determination of the different modes of production (Economakis 2000). The determination of separation limits of the different modes of production, and consequently of the different social classes, depends on the ‘degree’ to which the ‘carriers’ of real ownership simultaneously constitute (or not) ‘carriers’ of the use relation. This ‘degree’ is directly linked to the number of salaried employees or to the non-existence of salaried employment. Thus, the criterion for the practical separation of the social classes (within the modes of production) is the number of salaried employees who are employed per production unit.

In accordance with the relative literature review (see Economakis *et al.* 2015: 57 ff) and given that in every production process where exploitation relations exist (production and

extraction of surplus value) there is at least one employer and one salaried employee, the numerical limits of the modes of production can be summarized in the following table.

Table 2. Modes of production: numerical limits

Mode of production	Employed/salaried employees
SCMP	1 employed / 0 salaried employees
HMP	2-5 employed / 1-4 salaried employees
'Grey area' between HMP and CMP (private capitalist enterprises)	6-9 employed / 5-8 salaried employees
CMP	$10 \leq$ employed / $9 \leq$ salaried employees

Source: Economakis *et al.* 2015: 63 (Table 9.1), see also Zisimopoulos and Economakis 2018: 46 (Table 2)

6. The social subject of trade union movement: the salaried social classes and the displayed as salaried social classes

In order to determine the class composition of the trade union movement, it is necessary to determine initially the social classes that are formed within the social subject of the trade union movement, i.e. within the wage labour.

According to the above analysis, this determination takes place within those modes of production in which wage employment exists, as well as within the state mechanism.

Both the top managers of the private and the state capitalist enterprises are displayed as salaried social classes in the bourgeois statistical taxonomies. However, salaried relation is a social relation, i.e. an expression of the exploiting production relations, and as such it concerns the exploited classes of the CMP (working class and new petty bourgeoisie) and not the 'carrier' of real ownership (capitalist class) (see Economakis 2018; Zisimopoulos 2018; Zisimopoulos and Economakis 2018).

More precisely, the wage labour exists within the CMP (private capitalist enterprises), the HMP and within the 'grey area' between HMP and CMP. Within CMP, the top managers are displayed as salaried social class, however their revenue derives mainly from profits (Economakis 1999, 2000, 2018). Both the working class and the new petty bourgeoisie are the hired classes of the CMP, and both are paid by variable capital (productive labour), that is, they are both exploited classes. Within the HMP, one salaried social class, the spurious working class, is exclusively formed, which is paid by variable capital (productive labour - exploited class). Within the 'grey area' between the CMP and the HMP, the working class or the spurious working class, and the new petty bourgeoisie are formed. Both are exploited classes paid by variable capital (productive labour) (Zisimopoulos 2018).

All the social classes which are formed within the state capitalist enterprises and the state mechanism are (or displayed as) salaried social classes. In the state capitalist enterprises (CMP of state capitalist enterprises) they are paid either by profits (the top managers) or they are exploited classes paid by variable capital, i.e. they exert productive labour (the working class and the new petty bourgeoisie). In the state mechanism all the salaried social classes are paid by the state revenue (*ibid.*).

We summary the social classes within the wage labour in the table below.

Table 3. The salaried social classes and the displayed as salaried social classes according to the social division of labour

Social division of labour	Salaried social classes
Fundamental social classes	
CMP-private capitalist enterprises	Capitalist class: top managers (1)
	Working class (2)
HMP	Spurious working class (3)
‘Grey area’ between HMP and CMP (private capitalist enterprises)	Spurious working class or working class (4)
CMP-state capitalist enterprises	Capitalist class: top managers (5)
	Working class (6)
Non-fundamental or intermediate social classes	
CMP-private capitalist enterprises	New petty bourgeoisie of the CMP (7)
‘Grey area’ between HMP and CMP (private capitalist enterprises)	New petty bourgeoisie of the CMP (8)
General government	Upper state bureaucracy (9)
	New petty bourgeoisie of the state mechanism (10)
	Lower ranking civil-servants (11)
CMP-state capitalist enterprises	New petty bourgeoisie of the CMP (12)

Based on the above taxonomy of the salaried and the displayed as salaried social classes within the wage labour, the sub-categories of the salaried social classes as a percentage of the total wage labour are depicted in Table 4.

According to Table 4, the fundamental social classes represent approximately 65 per cent of the total wage labour and the non-fundamental represent 35 per cent of the total wage labour. The larger portions of the wage labour are the working class of the CMP of private capitalist enterprises (26.88 per cent in 2006, 28.26 per cent in 2014), the new petty bourgeoisie of the state mechanism (25.18 per cent in 2006, 27.44 per cent in 2014), the spurious working class that is formed within the HMP (21.01 per cent in 2006, 20.01 per cent in 2014) and the spurious working class or working class that is formed in the ‘grey area’ between HMP and CMP of private capitalist enterprises (12.38 per cent in 2006, 10.95 per cent in 2014). The rest portions of the social classes are all below 5 per cent of the total wage labour.

For the purpose of our analysis we unify the sub-categories of the salaried social classes in Table 5. According to Table 5, the larger portions of the wage labour are the working class (31.34 per cent in 2006, 31.30 per cent in 2014) and the new petty bourgeoisie (30.23 per cent in 2006, 33.46 per cent in 2014). It must be noted that the most populated social class in 2014 is the new petty bourgeoisie.

Following Poulantzas (1976: 314-315), we consider that the working class, the spurious working class and the lower ranking civil-servants form an ensemble of potential class alliance (the ‘working-popular classes’) since they display ‘an objective proletarian polarization’ (for a detailed argumentation on this issue see Economakis *et al.* 2015: 35, 56, 183, 2016a: 120, 2016b: 105). This ensemble of class alliance, although exhibits a reduction between 2006 and 2014 (from 68.96 per cent to 65.68 per cent of wage labour), is the vast majority of wage labour in Greece.

Table 4. The salaried social classes and the displayed as salaried social classes according to the social division of labour as % of wage employment 2006-2014 (second quarter)

Social division of labour	Salaried social classes	2006	2008	2010	2012	2014
Fundamental social classes						
CMP-Private capitalist enterprises	Capitalist class: top managers of the private capitalist enterprises (1)	0.18	0.28	0.25	0.40	0.36
	Working class (2)	26.88	27.20	25.50	26.19	28.26
HMP	Spurious working class (3)	21.01	21.38	22.74	20.27	20.01
“Grey area” between HMP and CMP (private capitalist enterprises)	Spurious working class or Working class (grey area) (4)	12.38	12.52	12.17	11.24	10.95
CMP-State capitalist enterprises	Capitalist class: top managers of the state capitalist enterprises (5)	0.18	0.24	0.21	0.18	0.07
	Working class (6)	4.46	4.16	3.47	3.17	3.04
	Total salaried fundamental social classes	65.09	65.77	64.34	61.45	62.70
Non-fundamental or intermediate social classes						
CMP-Private capitalist enterprises	New petty bourgeoisie of the CMP (7)	3.84	3.92	4.17	5.39	4.88
‘Grey area’ between HMP and CMP (private capitalist enterprises)	New petty bourgeoisie of the CMP (private capitalist enterprises) (grey area) (8)	0.61	0.74	0.87	1.04	0.68
General government	Upper state bureaucracy (9)	0.44	0.42	0.37	0.33	0.42
	New petty bourgeoisie of the state mechanism (10)	25.18	24.87	25.96	27.65	27.44
	Lower ranking civil-servants (11)	4.23	3.62	3.82	3.67	3.42
CMP-State capitalist enterprises	New petty bourgeoisie of the CMP (12)	0.60	0.66	0.47	0.47	0.46
	Total salaried non-fundamental social classes	34.91	34.23	35.66	38.55	37.30
	Total salaried social classes	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Source: Zisimopoulos 2018: 176, see also Zisimopoulos and Economakis 2018: 51

Table 5. The salaried social classes and the displayed as salaried social classes (unified sub-categories) as % of wage employment 2006-2014 (second quarter)

Social class	2006	2008	2010	2012	2014
Upper state bureaucracy (9)	0.44	0.42	0.37	0.33	0.42
Capitalist class (1+5)	0.36	0.52	0.46	0.58	0.43
New petty bourgeoisie (7+8+10+12)	30.23	30.19	31.47	34.55	33.46
Working class (2+6)	31.34	31.36	28.97	29.36	31.3
Spurious working class (3)	21.01	21.38	22.74	20.27	20.01
Spurious working class or Working class (grey area) (4)	12.38	12.52	12.17	11.24	10.95
Lower ranking civil-servants (11)	4.23	3.62	3.82	3.67	3.42
Total	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00

7. Methodology

The analysis of the class composition of the Greek trade union movement is based on primary data that were collected in the second quarter of 2018 by the method of semi-structured interview. The population of our survey was the wage and salary earners, who were 2.570.179 in the second quarter of 2018 (ELSTAT). Our sample consisted of 651 persons from the general population –422 wage and salary earners– and has been weighted according to sectors of production, gender, region and salaried social classes. The weighting according to social classes has been done on the base of Table 4, i.e. for the class composition of wage labour in 2014. For

the data analysis has been used the statistical package SPSS. The confidence level for this research is 95 per cent.

The union density estimated by using the Narrow Density Rate, according to which the member is defined as ‘[...] the person who self-defines that he or she belongs to a labor union, employee or staff organization’ (Visser 2006: 40), and the unemployed persons, the retirees or others groups that are out of labour force, are excluded (Chang and Sorrentino 1991: 47).

The narrow density rate is a quotient which has as numerator the union members in paid employment (excluding the unemployed, self-employed and retirees) and as denominator the total number of employees.

$$\text{Narrow Density Rate} = \frac{\text{union members in paid employment}}{\text{total number of employees}} \%$$

As the factor ‘social class’ is a qualitative-categorical nominal variable, we investigate its statistical significance by using the non-parametrical hypothesis test chi-square.

In the sample, the social classes are determined from the combination of six specific questions that contained into the questionnaire. The combination of these six questions can define the ‘carriers’ and the ‘non-carriers’ of production relations, i.e. fundamental and non-fundamental social classes within the modes of production, as well as the non-fundamental classes within the state mechanism. More precisely, these questions concern: a) the employment status, b) the ownership status of the enterprise/organization (private or public sector), c) the one-digit groups of individual occupations, d) the occupational status, e) the managerial status (i.e. the supervision-coordination or the non-supervision-coordination of other employees) and f) the number of employees at workplace.

8. Results

The results from data analysis show that the union density rate is 27.10 per cent. The confidence interval for a significance level of 95 per cent is [24.94 per cent, 29.26 per cent].

From Table 6 is resulted that social class as independent variable affects statistical significantly the union density rate.

Table 6. Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1079,345 ^a	6	,000
Likelihood Ratio	1061,571	6	,000
Linear-by-Linear Association	533,057	1	,000
N of Valid Cases	33782		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 37,95.

Table 7 shows the union density for every social class (per cent within the social class) and the portion of non-members and members as a percentage of the non-members and members (per cent within union membership).

Table 7. Social class * union membership Cross tabulation

			union_membership	
			Non-member	Member
Social_class	Upper state bureaucracy	% within social_class	63,6%	36,4%
		% within union_membership	0,4%	0,6%
		% of Total	0,3%	0,2%
	Capitalist class	% within social_class	82,8%	17,2%
		% within union_membership	0,9%	0,5%
		% of Total	0,7%	0,1%
	New petty bourgeoisie	% within social_class	62,1%	37,9%
		% within union_membership	28,4%	46,6%
		% of Total	20,7%	12,6%
	Working class	% within social_class	77,0%	23,0%
		% within union_membership	33,0%	26,4%
		% of Total	24,0%	7,2%
	Spurious working class	% within social_class	81,5%	18,5%
		% within union_membership	22,3%	13,6%
		% of Total	16,2%	3,7%
	Spurious working class or Working class (grey area)	% within social_class	78,0%	22,0%
		% within union_membership	11,7%	8,8%
		% of Total	8,5%	2,4%
Lower ranking civil-servants	% within social_class	73,1%	26,9%	
	% within union_membership	3,4%	3,4%	
	% of Total	2,5%	0,9%	
Total	% within social_class	72,9%	27,1%	
	% within union_membership	100,0%	100,0%	
	% of Total	72,9%	27,1%	

On the basis of Table 7 we extract the Tables 8 and 9. Table 8 depicts the union density by social class. From this table we can conclude that the highest level of union density corresponds to the ‘new petty bourgeoisie’ (37.9 per cent), the union density of ‘Upper state bureaucracy’ is 36.4 per cent and of the ‘lower ranking civil-servants’ is 26.9 per cent. The lower level of union density rate corresponds to the displayed as salaried social class ‘capitalist class-managers’. It must be noted that the social classes that are in core of exploitation show lower level of union density rate compared to the union density of total wage employment. More precisely, union density rate of ‘working class’ is 23.0 per cent, of ‘spurious working class or working class’ is 22 per cent and of ‘spurious working class’ is 18.5 per cent.

Table 8. Union density of the salaried social classes and of the displayed as salaried social classes

Social class	Union density by social class
Upper state bureaucracy	36,4%
Capitalist class	17,2%
New petty bourgeoisie	37,9%
Working class	23,0%
Spurious working class	18,5%
Spurious working class or Working class (grey area)	22,0%
Lower ranking civil-servants	26,9%
Total	27,1%

Table 9 shows that the largest portion of the labor movement consists of the ‘new petty bourgeoisie’ (46.6 per cent of union membership). The next largest part of the trade union movement consists of the ‘working class’ (26.4 per cent of union membership). The lowest parts of trade union movement correspond to ‘upper state bureaucracy’ (0.6 per cent of union membership) and to the displayed as salaried social class ‘capitalist class’ (0.5 per cent). The percentages of ‘spurious working class’ and of ‘spurious working class or working’ of the grey area, are notably lower despite the fact that wage and salary earners who belong to these social classes represent over than 30 per cent of total wage employment (see Table 4.). Nevertheless, the social classes that in core of the exploitation (i.e. the ‘the working class’, the ‘spurious working class’ and the ‘spurious working class or working class’ of the grey area) represent 48.8 per cent of the total union membership.

Table 9. The class composition of trade union movement

Social class	% of total membership
Upper state bureaucracy	0,60%
Capitalist class	0,50%
New petty bourgeoisie	46,60%
Working class	26,40%
Spurious working class	13,60%
Spurious working class or Working class (grey area)	8,80%
Lower ranking civil-servants	3,40%
Total	100%

Following the results of Table 7 we construct two indexes. We name the first index ‘Rallying of Class Index’ (RCI). This index depicts the degree of rallying of each social class within the trade union movement. In other words, it shows how compact a social class is within the trade union movement in order to defend its interests. The RCI resulted as a fraction by the comparison of (each) social class’ union density rate (numerator) compared to the total union density of the wage employment (denominator). The higher the value of the RCI, the higher the degree of rallying of the social class within the trade union movement is.

$$RCI = \frac{\text{union members of social class as \% within social class}}{\text{union density rate}}$$

We name the second index ‘Hegemony of the Class Index’ (HCI). This index depicts the degree of participation of each social class within the trade union movement. In other words, it shows the position of a social class in the correlation of power compared to the other social classes within the trade union movement in order to defend its interests. The HCI resulted as a fraction by the comparison of (each) social class’ share in the total union density of the wage employment (numerator) compared to the total union density of the wage employment (denominator). The higher the value of the HCI, the higher the degree of participation of the social class within the trade union movement is.

$$HCI = \frac{\text{union members of social class as \% of wage employment}}{\text{union density rate}}$$

Table 10. Indexes RCI and HCI

Social Class	Rallying of the Class Index (RCI)	Hegemony of the Class Index (HCI)
Upper state bureaucracy	<i>1.343</i>	0.010
Capitalist class	0.635	0.004
New petty bourgeoisie	<i>1.399</i>	<i>0.465</i>
Working class	0.849	<i>0.266</i>
Spurious working class	0.683	0.137
Spurious working class or Working class (grey area)	0.812	0.089
Lower ranking civil-servants	0.993	0.033

According to Table 10 the most compact social class within the trade union movement is the ‘new petty bourgeoisie’ (RCI=1.399). The next more compact social class is the ‘upper state bureaucracy’ (RCI=1.343). The rest of the social classes are less compact. As regards the position of social classes in the correlation of power within the trade union movement, the ‘new petty bourgeoisie’ shows the best position in the correlation of power (HCI=0.465) and the ‘working class’ follows (HCI=0.266).

9. Concluding remarks

From the above analysis is concluded that the ‘social class’ is a factor that determine the union density. More precisely, wage and salary earners who belong to the ‘new petty bourgeoisie’ tend to be more unionized compared to the employees who belong to the other social classes.

As regards the second research question of this paper, the above analysis shows that the larger part of the Greek trade union movement consists of wage and salary earners who belong to the ‘new petty bourgeoisie’. The ‘new petty bourgeoisie’ is also the more compact social class within the trade union movement and has the better position in the correlation of power within it.

References

- Arleen, H (1995), 'Impact of Part-Time Employment on Union Density', *Journal of Labor Research*, vol. 16 no. 4.
- Bean, R and Holden, K. (1992), 'Cross-national differences in trade union membership in OECD countries', *Industrial Relations Journal*, vol. 23 no.1.
- Carchedi, G. (1977), *On the economic identification of social classes*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Chacko, T. and Greer, C. (1982), 'Perceptions of Union Power, Service, and Confidence in Labor Leaders: A Study of Member and Nonmember Differentials', *Journal of Labor Research*, vol. 3.
- Chang, C. and Sorrentino, C. (1991), 'Union Membership Statistics in 12 Countries', *Monthly Labor Review*, vol. 114.
- Ebbinghaus, B. and Visser, J. (1999), 'When Institutions Matter: Union Growth and Decline in Western Europe, 1950-1995', *European Sociological Review*, vol. 15 no. 2.
- 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*, vol. 17 no. 2.
- Economakis, G. (1999), 'Καπιταλιστικός Τρόπος Παραγωγής και Μάνατζερς [Capitalist Mode of Production and Managers]', *Utopia*, vol. 37 [in Greek].
- Economakis, G. (2000), *Ιστορικοί Τρόποι Παραγωγής, Καπιταλιστικό Σύστημα και Γεωργία [Historical Modes of Production, Capitalist System and Agriculture]*, Athens: Ellinika Grammata [in Greek].
- Economakis, G. (2005), 'Definition of the capitalist mode of production: a re-examination (with application to non-capitalist modes of production)', *History of Economics Review*, vol. 42.
- Economakis, G. (2018), 'Ο καπιταλιστής ως εργαζόμενος επιχειρηματίας στον 3^ο τόμο του Κεφαλαίου [The capitalist as a worker-entrepreneur in the 3rd volume of Capital]'. *Theseis*, vol. 144 [in Greek].
- Economakis, G. Frunzaru, V & Zisimopoulos, I. (2016), 'The economic crisis and industrial relations: Greece and Romania in comparison', *East - West: journal of economics and business*, vol. 19 no 1.
- Economakis, G., & Bouras, F. (2007), 'Ο κοινωνικοοικονομικός και πολιτικός ρόλος των μικροϊδιοκτητών αγροτών στη Γαλλία των μέσων του 19ου αιώνα: Σημείωμα πάνω στη μαρξική ανάλυση και πλευρές της θεωρητικής της αξιοποίησης από τον Νίκο Πουλαντζά [The socioeconomic and political role of the small farmers in France in the middle of the 19th Century: A note on the Marxist analysis and aspects of its theoretical use by Nicos Poulantzas]', *Theseis*, vol. 99 [in Greek].
- Economakis, G., Zisimopoulos, I., Katsoridas, D., Kollias, G., & Kritikidis, G. (2016a), 'Κοινωνικές τάξεις: Θεωρία και εμπειρική διερεύνηση στην Ελληνική κοινωνία – Μέρος πρώτο: Θεωρητικό πλαίσιο [Social Classes: Theoretical and empirical investigation in Greek Society – Part I: Theoretical context]', *Theseis*, vol. 135 [in Greek].
- Economakis, G., Zisimopoulos, I., Katsoridas, D., Kollias, G., & Kritikidis, G. (2016b), 'Κοινωνικές τάξεις: Θεωρία και εμπειρική διερεύνηση στην Ελληνική κοινωνία – Μέρος δεύτερο: Εμπειρική διερεύνηση [Social Classes: Theoretical and empirical investigation in Greek Society – Part II: Empirical investigation]', *Theseis*, vol. 136 [in Greek].
- Economakis, G., Zisimopoulos, J., Katsoridas, J., Kollias, G., & Kritikidis, G. (2015), *Η ταξική διάρθρωση και η θέση της εργατικής τάξης στην ελληνική κοινωνία [The Class Structure*

- of Greek Society and the Position of the Working Class], Athens: INE-GSEE [in Greek].
 Online Available HTTP: <https://www.inegsee.gr/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/MELETH-41.pdf> (accessed 25 May 2019).
- ELSTAT (Hellenic Statistical Authority), Labour Force Survey 2nd Quarter 2018, Online Available HTTP: <http://www.statistics.gr/en/home/>.
- Freeman, R. and Medoff, J. (1984), *What do unions do?*, New York: Basic Books.
- Friedman, B., Abraham, S. and Thomas, R. (2006), 'Factors Related to Employee's Desire to Join and Leave Unions'. *Industrial Relations*, vol. 45 no. 1.
- Kappos, K. (1987), *Κοινωνικοπολιτικά Ζητήματα του Εργατικού Κινήματος* [Sociopolitical Issues of the Labour Movement], Athens: Sygchroni Epoxi Publications [in Greek].
- Marx, K. (1969), *Theories of Surplus-Value*, Part I, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Marx, K. (1981), *Grundrisse*, London: New Left Review.
- Marx, K. (1990), *Capital*. Vol. 1, London: Penguin Classics.
- Meng, R. (1990), 'The relationship between unions and job satisfaction', *Applied Economics*, vol. 22.
- Milios, J., & Economakis, G. (2011), 'The Middle Classes, Class Places, and Class Positions: A Critical Approach to Nicos Poulantzas's Theory', *Rethinking Marxism*, vol. 23 no. 2.
- Poulantzas, N. (1976), *Classes in contemporary capitalism*, London: NLB.
- Schnabel, C. and Wagner, J. (2007), 'Union density and determinants of union membership in 18 EU countries: evidence from micro data, 2002/03', *Industrial Relations Journal*, vol. 38 no. 1.
- Van den Berg, A., & Groot, W. (1992), 'Union membership in the Netherlands: A cross-sectional analysis', *Empirical Economics*, vol. 17.
- Van den Berg, A., & Groot, W. (1994), 'Why union density has declined', *European Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 10.
- Visser, J. (2006), 'Union Membership Statistics in 24 Countries', *Monthly Labor Review*, vol. 129 no.1.
- Zisimopoulos, I., & Economakis, G. (2018), 'The Class Configuration of Wage Labour in Greece: Changes During the Recent Economic Crisis', in Papatheodorou, C., Çevik, S., Paitaridis, D., & Yılmaz, G. (eds) *Political Economy of Labour, Income Distribution & Exclusion*, London: IJOPEC Publications.
- Zisimopoulos, I. (2018), *Ταξική σύνθεση των συνδικάτων και προσδιοριστικοί παράγοντες της συνδικαλιστικής πυκνότητας* [The class composition of trade unions and the factors that determine union density in Greece], (Doctoral dissertation), University of Patras, Dept. of Business Administration [in Greek], Online Available HTTP: <http://hdl.handle.net/10442/hedi/43332> (accessed 25 May 2019).