



Representativeness of the European social partner organisations: Civil aviation

Objectives of study

Economic background

National level of interest representation

European level of interest representation

Commentary

References

Annex: List of abbreviations

This report is available in electronic format only.

This study delineates the situation regarding social dialogue in the civil aviation industry. The study consists of three main parts: a summary of the sector's economic background; an analysis of the social partner organisations in all of the EU Member States, with special emphasis on their membership, their role in collective bargaining and public policy, and their national and European affiliations; and finally, an analysis of the relevant European organisations, in particular their membership composition and their capacity to negotiate. The aim of the EIRO representativeness studies is to identify the relevant national and supranational social partner organisations in the field of industrial relations in selected sectors. The impetus for these studies arises from the goal of the European Commission to recognise the representative social partner organisations to be consulted under the EC Treaty provisions. Hence, this study is designed to provide the basic information required to establish and evaluate sectoral social dialogue.

Objectives of study

The goal of this **representativeness** study is to identify the relevant national and supranational associational actors – that is, the trade unions and employer organisations – in the field of industrial relations in the civil aviation industry, and to show how these actors relate to the sector's European interest associations of labour and business. The impetus for this study and similar studies in other sectors arises from the aim of the **European Commission** to identify the representative social partner organisations to be consulted under the EC Treaty provisions. Hence, the studies seek to provide basic information needed to set up sectoral **social dialogue**. The effectiveness of the European social dialogue depends on whether its participants are sufficiently representative in terms of the sector's relevant national industrial relations actors across the EU Member States. Therefore, only European organisations that meet this precondition of representativeness will be admitted to the European social dialogue.

Against this background, the study will first identify the relevant national social partner organisations in the civil aviation industry, subsequently analysing the structure of the relevant European organisations, in particular their membership composition. This requires clarifying the unit of analysis at both the national and European level of interest representation. The study includes only organisations whose membership domain is 'sector-related' (see below). At both the national and European levels, a multiplicity of associations exists, which are not considered as social partner organisations as they do not essentially deal with industrial relations. This creates a need for clear-cut criteria that will enable analysis to distinguish the social partner organisations from other associations.

As regards the national-level organisations, classification as a relevant sector-related social partner organisation involves fulfilling one of two definitional criteria: the associations must be either a party to 'sector-related' **collective bargaining** or a member of a relevant 'sector-related' European association of business or labour. Basically, a European association is considered relevant to the sector if: it is on the Commission's list of European social partner organisations consulted under [Article 138 of the EC Treaty](#); and/or it participates in the sector-related European social dialogue; or it has requested to be included on the Commission's list to be consulted under Article 138. Taking affiliation to a European association as a sufficient criterion for regarding a national association as a relevant actor implies that such an organisation may not be involved in industrial relations in its own country. Hence, this selection criterion may look odd at first glance. However, if a national organisation is a member of a European association, it may become involved in industrial relations matters through its membership of this European organisation. Aside from this, it is important to know whether the national affiliates to the European associations are engaged in industrial relations in their respective country. Affiliation to a

This report is available in electronic format only.

European social partner organisation and/or involvement in national collective bargaining are of utmost importance to the European social dialogue, since these are the two constituent mechanisms that can systematically connect the national and European level. With regard to the selection criteria for the European organisations, any other sector-related European association that has sector-related national actors of relevance, as defined above, under its umbrella are considered; this is in addition to the European organisations in the above narrow sense. Thus, the aim of identifying the relevant sector-related national and European social partner organisations involves both a ‘top-down’ and ‘bottom-up’ approach.

Definitions

For the purpose of this study, the civil aviation industry is defined in terms of the Statistical Classification of Economic Activities in the European Community (*Nomenclature statistique des activités économiques dans la Communauté européenne*, [NACE](#)) (revision 1.1). This is to demarcate an ‘interest space’ that is common to all EU Member States, such that the cross-national comparability of the findings is assured. More specifically, the civil aviation industry is defined as embracing NACE 62.1 (scheduled air transport), NACE 62.2 (non-scheduled air transport) and NACE 63.23 (other supporting air transport activities such as airport infrastructure, air traffic control, baggage handling and technical maintenance).

The domains of the trade unions and employer organisations, and scope of the relevant [collective agreements](#), are not likely to be congruent with this NACE demarcation. This study therefore includes all trade unions, employer organisations and multi-employer collective agreements that are ‘sector-related’ in terms of the following four patterns relative to the above NACE demarcation:

- congruence – the domain of the organisation or scope of the collective agreement must be identical to the NACE demarcation, as specified above;
- sectionalism – the domain or scope only covers a certain part of the sector, as defined by the abovementioned NACE demarcation, while no group outside the sector is covered;
- overlap – the domain or scope covers the entire sector along with parts of one or more other sectors; however, it is important to note that the study does not include general associations that do not deal with sector-specific matters;
- sectional overlap – the domain or scope covers part of the sector as well as parts of one or more other sectors.

As regards the European level, the European Commission established a European Social Dialogue Committee for civil aviation in 2000. The social partners participating in social dialogue on behalf of the workers are the [European Transport Workers’ Federation \(ETF\)](#) and the [European Cockpit Association \(ECA\)](#). Their employer counterparts are [ACI Europe-Airports Council International \(ACI Europe\)](#), the [Association of European Airlines \(AEA\)](#), the [Civil Air Navigation Services Organisation \(CANSO\)](#), the [European Regions Airline Association \(ERA\)](#), the [International Association of Charter Airlines \(IACA\)](#), and the [International Handlers’ Association \(IAHA\)](#). In addition, this study covers two other European associations: the [Air Traffic Controllers European Unions Coordination \(ATCEUC\)](#) on the employee side, and the [European Low Fares Airline Association \(ELFAA\)](#) on the employers’ side.

The above European organisations are the reference associations when it comes to analysing the European level, and affiliation to one of these European organisations is one sufficient criterion for classifying a national association as a relevant actor. It should be noted, however, that the constituent definitional criterion is a sector-related membership domain. This is important in the

case of ETF due to its multi-sectoral domain. This study will include only those affiliates to ETF whose domain relates to civil aviation.

Collection of data

The collection of quantitative data, such as those on membership, is essential for investigating the representativeness of the social partner organisations. Unless cited otherwise, this study draws from the country studies provided by the [EIRO national centres](#). It is often difficult to find precise quantitative data. In such cases, rough estimates are given rather than leaving the question blank, given the practical and political relevance of this study. However, if there is any doubt over the reliability of an estimate, this will be noted.

In principle, quantitative data may stem from three sources:

- official statistics and representative survey studies;
- administrative data, such as data on membership figures provided by the respective organisations; these are then used for calculating the density rate on the basis of available statistical figures on the potential membership of the organisation;
- personal estimates made by representatives of the respective organisations.

While the data sources of the economic figures cited in the report are generally statistics, the figures on the organisations are usually either administrative data or estimates. Furthermore, it should be noted that some country studies also present data on trade unions and business associations that do not meet the above definition of a sector-related social partner organisation, in order to give a complete picture of the sector's associational 'landscape'. For the above substantive reasons, as well as for methodological reasons of cross-national comparability, such trade unions and business associations will not be considered in this report.

Structure of report

The report consists of three main parts, beginning with a brief summary of the civil aviation industry's economic background. The report then analyses the relevant national social partner organisations in all of the 27 EU Member States (EU27). The third part of the analysis considers the representative associations at European level. Each section will contain a brief introduction explaining the concept of representativeness in greater detail, followed by the study findings. As representativeness is a complex issue, it requires separate consideration of the national and European level for two reasons. Firstly, account has to be taken of how representativeness is captured by national regulations and practices. Secondly, the national and European organisations differ in their tasks and scope of activities. The concept of representativeness must therefore take account of this difference.

Finally, it is important to note the difference between the research and political aspects of this study. While providing data on the representativeness of the organisations under consideration, this study does not reach any definite conclusion on whether the representativeness of the European social partner organisations and their national affiliates under examination is sufficient for admission to the European social dialogue. The reason for this is that defining criteria for sufficient representativeness is a matter of political decision rather than an issue of research analysis.

Economic background

Tables 1 and 2 give an overview of the development of the civil aviation industry from the mid 1990s to the mid 2000s, presenting a few indicators that are important to industrial relations and social dialogue. For those countries recording related data, it emerges that the number of employers generally grew over the period covered. With the exception of Denmark, the same development can be seen in relation to employment in the sector. Male employment largely prevails in the sector. However, some noteworthy gender differences by occupation are also evident. For instance, the vast majority of pilots are male, whereas other occupations in the sector, such as flight attendants and ground staff ([TN0508101S](#)), are generally comprised of women. Table 2 also shows that the sector usually represents less than 1% of total employment in the national economies. Available data suggest that the sector's share of total employment remained rather stable over the period covered.

To understand the sector's system of interest representation in general and the system of industrial relations in particular, it is important to highlight four properties of the sector. Firstly, the sector shows a rather unique configuration of transnational and national orientation. On the one hand, air transport is highly internationalised, especially airline companies, which have employees working in sites across Europe. Air traffic control has also developed into a transnational activity – as demonstrated by the existence of the [Maastricht Upper Area Control Centre](#), which is run by the [European Organisation for the Safety of Air Navigation \(Eurocontrol\)](#). On the other hand, the sector is still anchored in the countries' national economies. Airports are commonly regarded as an important part of the national economies' infrastructure. For similar reasons, there is still noticeable concern about national flag carriers in the respective countries.

A second characteristic of the sector is that it is still highly regulated mainly for safety and security reasons, while it has undergone remarkable market deregulation and privatisation in connection with the creation of the single European market. Thirdly, deregulation has led to enhanced differentiation of product markets, resulting in the emergence of three distinct groups of airlines: that is, 'full-service' airlines, low-cost carriers and tour operators ([TN0508101S](#)). Fourthly, the sector's labour market is characterised by a high degree of segmentation in terms of employees' qualifications and occupations. This has given rise to profound differentiation by job profiles and related employee groups. For instance, clear-cut professional distinctions are visible between occupational groups such as air traffic controllers, pilots and ground staff. This strong segmentation of both product markets and labour markets is reflected in industrial relations, as will be shown in greater detail in this report.

Table 1: Total employment in civil aviation industry, 1995 and 2006

	Number of employers		Total employment		Male employment		Female employment	
	1995	2006	1995	2006	1995	2006	1995	2006
AT	n.a.	192 ^{a,b}	n.a.	14,480 ^b	n.a.	8,876 ^b	n.a.	5,604 ^b
BE	n.a.	275	n.a.	13,500	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
BG	n.a.	65	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
CY	3 ^a	23 ^{a,b}	1,972	2,496 ^b	1,047	1,219 ^b	925	1,207 ^b
CZ	132 ^a	137 ^{a,c}	10,400 ^c	10,300 ^c	6,300	6,200 ^c	400	390 ^c

	Number of employers		Total employment		Male employment		Female employment	
	1995	2006	1995	2006	1995	2006	1995	2006
DE	n.a.	1,170 ^b	n.a.	83,000 ^d	n.a.	52,000 ^d	n.a.	31,000 ^d
DK	n.a.	80 ^b	13,170	12,047	8,413	7,509	4,757	4,538
EE	n.a.	7 ^a	n.a.	728	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
EL	37	50 ^c	n.a.	6,180 ^c	n.a.	2,696 ^c	n.a.	3,484 ^c
ES	n.a.	4,764 ^{a,c,h}	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
FI	104 ^a	120 ^a	7,522	10,661	4,088	5,606	3,434	5,055
FR	n.a.	171 ^e	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
HU	n.a.	33	n.a.	5,597	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
IE	n.a.	6	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
IT	265 ^{a,f}	474 ^{a,g}	45,501 ^f	48,167 ^g	30,807 ^f	32,612 ^g	14,694 ^f	15,555 ^g
LT	n.a.	11	n.a.	1,689	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
LU	n.a.	17 ^c	n.a.	3,500 ^c	n.a.	2,300 ^c	n.a.	1,200 ^c
LV	26 ⁱ	28	1,451 ⁱ	2,324	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
MT	n.a.	27 ^{a,b}	n.a.	2,703 ^b	n.a.	2,091 ^b	n.a.	612 ^b
NL	175	250	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
PL	5	35	4,199	5,356	n.a.	2,930	n.a.	2,426
PT	n.a.	n.a.	11,832 ^f	12,290 ^g	8,454 ^f	8,221 ^g	3,378 ^f	4,069 ^g
RO	n.a.	54 ^d	n.a.	3,528 ^d	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
SE	45	68	14,960	15,542	8,652	8,992	6,308	6,550
SI	18	45	1,098	1,219	659	829	439	390
SK	4	3	356	807	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
UK	n.a.	377 ^e	n.a.	141,301 ^e	n.a.	84,389 ^e	n.a.	56,912 ^e

Notes: ^a companies; ^b 2005; ^c 2007; ^d NACE 63.23 excluded; ^e 2008, only air carriers; ^f 1991; ^g 2001; ^h NACE 62.1, 62.2 and 63.2; ⁱ 1997

n.a. = not available

Source: EIRO national centres, 2008

Table 2: Total employees in civil aviation industry, 1995 and 2006

	Total employees		Male employees		Female employees		Total sectoral employment as % of total employment in economy		Total sectoral employees as % of total employees in economy	
	1995	2006	1995	2006	1995	2006	1995	2006	1995	2006
AT	n.a.	14,393 ^a	n.a.	8,795 ^a	n.a.	5,598 ^a	n.a.	0.38 ^b	n.a.	0.43 ^a
BE	n.a.	13,400	n.a.	5,586	n.a.	2,593	n.a.	0.30	n.a.	0.40
BG	n.a.	6,762	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.30
CY	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.68	0.70 ^a	n.a.	n.a.
CZ	7,000	6,700 ^b	5,400	4,600 ^b	1,500	2,100 ^b	0.21	0.21 ^b	0.17	0.16 ^b
DE	n.a.	31,676 ^c	n.a.	15,166 ^c	n.a.	16,510 ^c	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
DK	13,136	12,038	8,382	7,502	4,754	4,536	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.5
EE	n.a.	728	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.20	n.a.	0.20
EL	n.a.	6,180 ^b	n.a.	2,696 ^b	n.a.	3,484 ^b	n.a.	0.16	n.a.	0.21 ^b
ES	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
FI	7,514	10,640	4,081	5,586	3,433	5,054	0.40	0.50	0.50	0.50
FR	73,544	90,425	n.a.	54,728	n.a.	35,697	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.39
HU	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.14	n.a.	n.a.
IE	n.a.	11,800	n.a.	3,800	n.a.	8,000	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.50
IT	45,033 ^e	47,613 ^f	30,409 ^e	32,151 ^f	14,624 ^e	15,462 ^f	0.20 ^e	0.21 ^f	0.27 ^e	0.27 ^f
LT	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.11	n.a.	n.a.
LU	n.a.	3,200 ^b	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	1.04 ^b	n.a.	0.95 ^b
LV	1,449 ^g	2,324	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.19 ^g	0.24	0.19 ^g	0.24
MT	n.a.	2,696 ^a	n.a.	2,085 ^a	n.a.	611 ^a	n.a.	2.14 ^a	n.a.	2.70 ^a
NL	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
PL	4,199	4,952	n.a.	2,692	n.a.	2,260	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03
PT	11,507 ^e	11,956 ^f	8,215 ^e	8,018 ^f	3,292 ^e	3,938 ^f	0.29 ^e	0.26 ^f	0.36 ^e	0.32 ^f
RO	n.a.	3,520 ^c	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.04 ^c	n.a.	0.08 ^c
SE	14,915	15,474	8,618	8,932	6,297	6,542	0.39	0.36	0.42	0.40
SI	1,098	1,207	659	819	439	388	0.15	0.16	0.15	0.16
SK	352	807	256	469	96	338	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.04
UK	n.a.	138,863 ^d	n.a.	82,386 ^d	n.a.	56,477 ^d	n.a.	0.4	n.a.	0.4

Notes: ^a 2005; ^b 2007; ^c NACE 63.23 excluded; ^d 2008, only air carriers; ^e 1991; ^f 2001; ^g 1997

n.a. = not available

Source: EIRO national centres, 2008

National level of interest representation

In many of the Member States, statutory regulations explicitly refer to the concept of representativeness, when allocating certain rights of interest representation and public governance to trade unions and/or employer organisations. The most important rights addressed by such regulations include: formal recognition as a party to collective bargaining; the extension of the scope of a multi-employer collective agreement to employers not affiliated to the signatory employer organisation; and participation in public policy and tripartite bodies of social dialogue. Under these circumstances, representativeness is normally captured as the membership strength of the organisations. For instance, statutory extension provisions usually allow for extending a collective agreement to unaffiliated employers only when the signatory trade union and employer organisation organise 50% or more of the employees within the agreement's domain (see Institut des Sciences du Travail (IST), 2001).

As outlined earlier, the representativeness of the national social partner organisations is of interest here in connection with the capacity of their European umbrella organisations for participation in the European social dialogue. Hence, the role of the national actors in collective bargaining and public policymaking constitutes another important component of representativeness. The effectiveness of the European social dialogue tends to increase with the growing ability of the national affiliates of the European associations to regulate the employment terms and to influence national public policies that affect the sector. As cross-national comparative analysis shows (see Traxler, 2004), a generally positive correlation emerges between the bargaining role of the social partners and their involvement in public policy. Social partner organisations that are engaged in multi-employer bargaining are incorporated in state policies to a significantly greater extent than their counterparts in countries where multi-employer bargaining is lacking. The explanation for this finding is that only multi-employer agreements matter in macroeconomic terms, such that they set an incentive for the governments to persistently seek the cooperation of the social partner organisations. If single-employer bargaining prevails in a country, none of the collective agreements will have a noticeable effect on the economy due to their limited scope. As a consequence, the basis for generalised tripartite policy concertation will be absent.

The result of these considerations is that representativeness is a multi-dimensional concept that embraces three basic elements:

- the membership domain and the membership strength of the social partner organisations;
- their role in collective bargaining;
- their role in public policymaking.

Membership domain and membership strength

The membership domain of an organisation, as formally established by its constitution, demarcates its potential members from other groups which the association does not claim to organise and represent. As pointed out previously, this report only considers the organisations whose domain relates to the civil aviation industry. For reasons of space, it is impossible to delineate the domain demarcations of all the organisations in detail. Instead, the report notes how

they relate to the sector by classifying them according to the four patterns of ‘sector relatedness’, as specified by the conceptual remarks earlier.

As regards membership strength, there is differentiation between strength in terms of the absolute number of members and strength in relative terms. The literature usually refers to relative membership strength as density – that is, the ratio of actual to potential members. A difference also exists between trade unions and employer organisations when measuring membership strength. Trade union membership simply means the number of unionised persons. Aside from taking the total membership of a trade union as an indicator of its strength, it is also reasonable to give a breakdown of this figure according to gender. Measuring the membership strength of employer organisations is more complex, however, since they organise collective entities, in other words companies, that employ employees. In this case, there are two possible measures of membership strength – one referring to the companies themselves, and the other to the employees working in the member companies of an employer organisation.

For a sectoral study such as this, measures of membership strength of both the trade unions and employer organisations also have to consider how the membership domains relate to the sector. If a domain is not congruent with the sector demarcation, the organisation’s total density (the density referring to its overall domain) may differ from its sector-specific density (the density referring to the sector). As a result, three measures of density should be distinguished as follows:

- domain density – this refers to the ratio of the total membership to potential membership, as demarcated by the membership domain;
- sectoral density – this measures sectoral membership relative to the total number of employees or companies in the sector;
- sectoral domain density – this captures sectoral membership in relation to potential membership within the sector, as demarcated by the domain.

The second measure of density differs from the third one if the domain of an organisation includes only a certain part of the sector of focus. The report will first present the data on the domains and membership strength of the trade unions and then shift to the employer organisations.

Trade unions

Table 3 presents the data on the trade unions’ domains and membership strength. The table lists all of the trade unions meeting the two definitional criteria for classification of a sector-related social partner organisation, as defined earlier. The domain of more than 100 trade unions – in other words, the majority of the unions – is sectionalist. Closer consideration shows that there are two profiles of sectionalism that originate either from company trade unions and or occupational trade unions. Within this sectionalist group, the occupational trade unions clearly outnumber the company unions. Almost half of the total number of the sector-related trade unions have demarcated their domain by occupation. With the exception of Ireland, Latvia and Slovakia, occupational trade unions are established in all EU Member States. In several countries, namely France, Hungary and Slovenia, as many as 10 trade unions of this type exist. In this case, a generally fragmented national trade union system increases the relevance of occupational organisations in that each trade union confederation tends to gather occupational unions. Pilots, flight attendants, cabin crew in general, air traffic controllers and specialists in maintenance are the professions most frequently organised in occupational trade union organisations.

A minor but notable number of overlapping and sectionally overlapping trade unions is also evident. Overlaps usually ensue from trade unions whose domain embraces the entire transport

sector. Sectionalist overlaps emanate from specialisation in certain employee groups of cross-sectoral nature, which are then also organised by the respective trade unions across sectors. Typical examples of sectionalist overlaps are trade unions representing either white-collar employees, blue-collar employees or public-sector employees. Trade unions whose domain largely coincides with the sector are rare. This underlines the fact that statistical definitions of business activities differ somewhat from the lines along which employees identify common interests and group together in trade unions.

Overall, pronounced pluralism characterises the trade union system. A multi-union situation is given in all countries, with the exception of Slovakia. In principle, the co-existence of pronounced occupational trade unionism alongside more comprehensive trade union organisations fuels inter-union competition. Against this background, rivalries and competition over rights of collective bargaining and participation in public policy are reported for a relatively small number of countries – namely, Austria, Bulgaria, Latvia, Luxembourg, Portugal, Sweden and the United Kingdom (UK).

Turning to the membership data of the trade unions, considerable differences emerge regarding the membership of men and women. The share of female members as a proportion of the total membership ranges from 1% to 80% or over. Given the large number of occupational trade unions, these differences mainly reflect the gender-specific differences between the distinct professions. For instance, the pilots' associations register extremely low female membership levels. This contrasts with the trade unions representing cabin crew which often register high proportions of female members.

The absolute number of trade union members differs markedly, ranging from several hundred thousand members to less than one hundred members. This considerable variation reflects differences in the size of the economy and the comprehensiveness of the membership domain, rather than the ability to attract members. In almost all trade unions with overlapping or sectionally overlapping domains, total membership is clearly higher than membership within the sector.

Since density corrects for differences in country size, it is a more appropriate measure of membership strength for a comparative analysis. As already outlined, the domain of the vast majority of trade unions is sectionalist. In this case, domain density is identical with sectoral domain density. Sectionalist unions are generally characterised by contrasting figures on sectoral density and sectoral domain density. Sectoral density is rather low and often remains below 10%. Sectoral domain density is usually high, with a proportion of often more than 70%. This follows from the narrow domain of sectionalist trade unions, which usually embrace only a small group within the total number of employees working in civil aviation. Since sectionalist trade unions tend to specialise in recruiting highly qualified staff, they achieve high levels of unionisation within their domain.

There are far less data on the sectoral membership strength of overlapping and sectionally overlapping trade unions. Available data indicate strong differences in density within this group, ranging from sectoral domain density of 80% or more to less than 20%. Nevertheless, the broader domain of these trade unions usually results in a higher sectoral density, compared with the sectionalist unions. Notwithstanding country-specific differences in detail, it is possible to differentiate between two basic profiles of unionisation which are closely associated with the comprehensiveness of membership domain. On the one hand, overlapping and sectionally overlapping trade unions are characterised by a large absolute number of members in the sector, high sectoral density and low sectoral domain density. On the other hand, the sectionalist trade unions show the opposite properties, that is, a smaller absolute number of members, low sectoral density and high sectoral domain density. Given these contrasting unionisation profiles, it is hard

to infer from Table 3 an estimate of total trade union density in the sector. However, the large number of trade unions in combination with the high densities in many cases suggests that overall trade union density is quite high in the civil aviation industry.

Table 3: Interest representation of trade unions in civil aviation, 2006–2008

Country	Type of membership ^a	Domain coverage	Membership			Density (%)		Collective bargaining	Consultation	National and European affiliations ^c
			Members	Members in sector	Female membership (% of total membership) ^b	Domain	Sector (sectoral domain) ^d			
AT										
Vida	Vol.	O	154,436	5,000	30%	n.a.	35% (80%)	Yes	Yes	ÖGB, ETF, EFFAT, UNI-Europa
GPA-DJP	Vol.	SO	249,500	2,600	43.2%	20%	18% (25%)	Yes	Yes	ÖGB, UNI-Europa, EFFAT, EMCEF, EPSU
GPF	Vol.	SO	59,618	n.a.	24.3%	80%	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	ÖGB, UNI-Europa, ETF
ACA	Vol.	S (OC)	600	600	1%	55%	4% (55%)	No	Yes	ECA
BE										
ACV-Public Services (CCSP-CCOD)	Vol.	SO	148,908	1,407	46%	n.a.	15% (30%)	Yes	Yes	ACV-CSC, FIOST, EPSU, ETF
ACV-Transcom	Vol.	SO	82,000	1,300	15%	n.a.	10%–15% (33%)	Yes	Yes	ACV-CSC, ETF
BBTK-SETCa	Vol.	SO	360,000	7,200	n.a.	n.a.	<10% (15%–20%)	No	Yes	ABVV-FGTB, ETF
BTB	Vol.	SO	38,130	n.a.	18%	65%	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	ABVV-FGTB, ETF
ACOD/CGSP (CGSP Telecom/CA)	Vol.	SO	284,576	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	ABVV-FGTB, EPSU, PSI, ETF

Country	Type of membership ^a	Domain coverage	Membership			Density (%)		Collective bargaining	Consultation	National and European affiliations ^c
			Members	Members in sector	Female membership (% of total membership) ^b	Domain	Sector (sectoral domain) ^d			
VSOA-LRB/SLFP-ALR	Vol.	SO	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	ACLVB/CGSLB, EPSU
BeCA	Vol.	S (OC)	800	800	n.a.	n.a.	5% (n.a.)	No	Yes	ECA
ACLVB-CGSLB	Vol.	SO	220,000	n.a.	38.7%	n.a.	15% (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	ACLVB/CGSLB, ETF
LBC-NVK	Vol.	SO	297,449	500	59%	n.a.	3%–4% (30%)	Yes	Yes	ACV-CSC, ETF
BG										
FTTUB	Vol.	O	13,240	1,993	35%	n.a.	29.5% (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	CITUB, ETF
FTW	Vol.	O	7,000	1,442	21%	n.a.	21.3% (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	CL Podkrepa, ETF
FreeAviation Trade Union	Vol.	n.a.	n.a.	100	n.a.	n.a.	0.1% (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
AirTraffic Controllers Union	Vol.	S (OC)	450	450	n.a.	n.a.	6.7% (n.a.)	Yes	No	Promiana, ATCEUC
BUL-ALPA	Vol.	S (OC)	100	100	0%	n.a.	2.2% (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	ECA
CY										
ASISEKA	Vol.	S	149	149	13.4%	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
PALPU	Vol.	S (OC)	119	119	5%	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	ECA
SIDIKEK	Vol.	SO	3,500	220	28.6%	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	PEO
SIPKKA	Vol.	S (OC)	170	170	50%	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
SYNYKA	Vol.	S	n.a.	900	40%	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	OHO-SEK, ETF
CZ										
Transport Workers ⁷	Vol.	O	15,000	n.a.	18%	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	ČMKOS, ETF

Country	Type of membership ^a	Domain coverage	Membership			Density (%)		Collective bargaining	Consultation	National and European affiliations ^c
			Members	Members in sector	Female membership (% of total membership) ^b	Domain	Sector (sectoral domain) ^d			
Union (OSD)										
CZALPA	Vol.	S (OC)	499	499	1.8%	n.a.	7.4% (n.a.)	Yes	No	ECA, SPA
Aviation Trade Union	Vol.	C	864	864	n.a.	n.a.	12.9% (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
CZATCA	Vol.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	ASO ČR
CZALDA	Vol.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
OOPL	Vol.	S	800	800	n.a.	n.a.	11.9% (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
OOML	Vol.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
CZLCA	Vol.	n.a.	n.a.	800	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
DE										
ver.di	Vol.	O	2,205,145	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	DGB, ETF
VC	Vol.	S (OC)	8,200	8,200	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	ECA
GdF	Vol.	S (OC)	3,000	3,000	19.1%	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	ATCEUC
dbbtarif-union	Vol.	SO	360,000	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	DBB, EULOS
UFO	Vol.	S (OC)	8,739	8,739	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	n.a.	–
DK										
DALPA/DPF	Vol.	S (OC)	600	600	2.5%	100%	5% (100%)	Yes	No	ECA
LH	Vol.	SO	76,260	1,200	22%	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
3F	Vol.	SO	341,672	5,000	33.2%	75%	41.5% (95%)	Yes	No	LO, ETF, EFFAT, EPSU, UNI-Europa, EFBWW

Country	Type of membership ^a	Domain coverage	Membership			Density (%)		Collective bargaining	Consultation	National and European affiliations ^c
			Members	Members in sector	Female membership (% of total membership) ^b	Domain	Sector (sectoral domain) ^d			
CUD	Vol.	S (OC)	1,637	1,550	71.5%	95%	13.6% (95%)	Yes	No	<i>FTF, ETF</i>
DFE-S	Vol.	SO	18,777	1,500	24.3%	70%	12.5% (85%)	Yes	No	<i>LO, ETF</i>
DMF	Vol.	SO	132,113	1,000	4.7%	80%	8.3% (90%)	Yes	No	<i>LO, ETF, EMF, EPSU</i>
HK Privat	Vol.	SO	329,679	950	74.2%	45.5%	6.3% (n.a.)	Yes	No	<i>LO, ETF, UNI-Europa</i>
DEF	Vol.	SO	29,769	76	1%	80%	0.6% (100%)	Yes	–	<i>LO, EMCEF, EMF, UNI-Europa, EFBWW</i>
DATCA	Vol.	S (OC)	300	300	30%	100%	2.5% (100%)	Yes	–	<i>FTF</i>
LLF	Vol.	S	1,300	1,300	67%	90%	10% (90%)	Yes		<i>FTF</i>
EE										
ETTA	Vol.	SO	4,630	296	20%	13%	22% (50%)	Yes	No	<i>EAKL, ETF</i>
ALPA	Vol.	S (OC)	52	52	n.a.	80%	4% (80%)	Yes	Yes	<i>EAKL, ECA</i>
ESSTU	Vol.	S (OC)	96	96	80%	48%	7.2% (48%)	Yes	No	<i>EAKL</i>
EL										
OSPA	Vol.	S	5,457	5,457	n.a.	0.7%	n.a. (0.7%)	Yes	Yes	<i>GSEE, ETF</i>
OPAM	Vol.	S	645	645	n.a.	60%	n.a. (60%)	Yes	Yes	<i>GSEE</i>
OSYPA	Vol.	S	2,970	2,970	n.a.	99%	n.a. (99%)	No	Yes	<i>ATCEUC^f, ECA^f</i>
FAU	Vol.	S (OC)	700	700	57%	87.5%	n.a. (87.5%)	Yes	No	<i>GSEE, ETF</i>
ES										

Country	Type of membership ^a	Domain coverage	Membership			Density (%)		Collective bargaining	Consultation	National and European affiliations ^c
			Members	Members in sector	Female membership (% of total membership) ^b	Domain	Sector (sectoral domain) ^d			
USCA	Vol.	S (OC)	2,219	2,219	30%	94%	4.7% (94%)	Yes	No	ATCEUC
FCT-CC.OO	Vol.	O	250,000	8,140	n.a.	17%	17% (17%)	Yes	No	CC.OO, ETF
FETCM-UGT	Vol.	SO	71,400	8,200	17%	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	UGT, ETF
SITCPLA	Vol.	S (OC)	2,500	2,500	65%	25%	5.3% (25%)	Yes	No	ETF
SEPLA	Vol.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	ECA
FSP-UGT	Vol.	SO	200,000	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	UGT
USO-STA	Vol.	O	n.a.	4,500	40%	9.5%	9.5% (n.a.)	Yes	No	USO
FI										
IAU	Vol.	C	3,800	3,800	25%	85%	35% (85%)	Yes	Yes	SAK, ETF
SLSY	Vol.	S (OC)	2,200	2,200	89%	93%	21% (94%)	Yes	Yes	SAK, ETF
FPA	Vol.	S (OC)	1,000	1,000	3%	78%	9% (96%)	(Yes) ^d	Yes	ECA
TU	Vol.	SO	125,000	1,600	49%	79%	15% (85%)	Yes	No	STTK, UNI-Europa, EMF, EMCEF, ETUF-TCL, EFFAT, ETF, EFBWW
SLJY	Vol.	S (OC)	260	260	15%	90%	2% (90%)	Yes	Yes	–
Pardia	Vol.	SO	68,000	600	53%	60%	6% (80%)	Yes	No	STTK, EPSU
JHL	Vol.	SO	230,000	460	71%	30%–40%	4% (92%)	Yes	No	SAK, EPSU
AKT	Vol.	O	51,000	45	12%	80%	0.4% (100%)	Yes	No	SAK
YTN	Vol.	SO	125,000	530	25%	67%	5% (85%)	(Yes) ^d	No	–

Country	Type of membership ^a	Domain coverage	Membership			Density (%)		Collective bargaining	Consultation	National and European affiliations ^c
			Members	Members in sector	Female membership (% of total membership) ^b	Domain	Sector (sectoral domain) ^d			
Akava Erityisalat	Vol.	SO	22,000	200	81%	60%	2% (85%)	Yes	No	<i>Akava</i>
FR										
FGTE-CFDT	Vol.	O	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>CFDT, ETF</i>
CFE-CGC	Vol.	O	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>ETF^e</i>
FGT-CFTC	Vol.	O	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>CFTC, ETF</i>
FNST-CGT	Vol.	O	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>CGT, ETF</i>
FO-FETS-CGT-FO	Vol.	O	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>CGT-FO, ETF</i>
National Union of Civil Aviation Technical Ground	Vol.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
SNMSAC	Vol.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	7%	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	<i>UNSA, ETF^e</i>
UNAC	Vol.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	<i>CFE-CGC, ETF</i>
SNPL	Vol.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	<i>ECA</i>
SPAC	Vol.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
SNOMAC	Vol.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
SNPNC	Vol.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	<i>ETF</i>
SPAF	Vol.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
SNPNAC	Vol.	S (OC)	1,600	1,600	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	<i>UNSA, ETF^e</i>
SNAC-CFTC	Vol.	C	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>CFTC, ETF</i>

Country	Type of membership ^a	Domain coverage	Membership			Density (%)		Collective bargaining	Consultation	National and European affiliations ^c
			Members	Members in sector	Female membership (% of total membership) ^b	Domain	Sector (sectoral domain) ^d			
SNCTA	Vol.	S (OC)	n.a.	1,213	30%	30%	n.a. (30%)	No	Yes	ATCEUC
HU	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
LESZ	Vol.	C	1,200	1,200	n.a.	21.4%	21.4% (21.4%)	Yes	No	LIGA, ETF
HUNACCA	Vol.	S (OC)	350	350	n.a.	60%–70%	6.3% (60%–70%)	Yes	No	–
GSZSZ	Vol.	SO	80	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	1.4% (n.a.)	Yes	No	LIGA
RMFSZ	Vol.	S (OC)	600	600	n.a.	80%–85%	10.7% (n.a.)	Yes	No	LIGA, ETF
HUNALPA	Vol.	S (OC)	330	330	n.a.	90%–95%	5.9% (90%–95%)	Yes	No	ECA
MALÉV SS	Vol.	S	225	225	n.a.	n.a.	4% (n.a.)	Yes	No	LIGA
RDSZSZ	Vol.	S	80	80	n.a.	n.a.	1.4% (n.a.)	Yes	No	MOSZ
MDM	Vol.	S (OC)	150	150	n.a.	n.a.	2.7% (n.a.)	Yes	No	MOSZ
LIFSZ	Vol.	S (OC)	185	185	n.a.	n.a.	3.3% (n.a.)	Yes	No	LIGA, ETF, ATCEUC
FORTISZ	Vol.	S (OC)	50	50	n.a.	n.a.	0.8% (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
JÉSZ	Vol.	S (OC)	50	50	n.a.	n.a.	0.8% (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
Control	Vol.	S (OC)	160	160	n.a.	86	2.9% (86%)	Yes	No	–
IDFSZ	Vol.	S (OC)	8	8	n.a.	n.a.	2.9% (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
MLSZSZ	Vol.	S	15	15	n.a.	n.a.	0.2% (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
LIGOSZ	Vol.	SO	100	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	1.8% (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
RTFSZ	Vol.	S (OC)	29	29	n.a.	n.a.	0.5% (n.a.)	Yes	No	LIGA
IE										
SIPTU	Vol.	O	225,000	4,500	45%	n.a.	38% (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	ICTU, ETF,

Country	Type of membership ^a	Domain coverage	Membership			Density (%)		Collective bargaining	Consultation	National and European affiliations ^c
			Members	Members in sector	Female membership (% of total membership) ^b	Domain	Sector (sectoral domain) ^d			
										CES
IMPACT	Vol.	O	~60,000	2,950	65%	n.a.	25% (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>ICTU</i> , <i>ECA</i> ^e , <i>ETF</i> , <i>CES</i> , <i>ATCEUC</i>
Mandate	Vol.	SO	n.a.	n.a.	90%	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>ICTU</i> , <i>CES</i>
Unite	Vol.	O	n.a.	n.a.	10%	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>ICTU</i>
TEEU	Vol.	SO	n.a.	n.a.	5%	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>ICTU</i>
IT										
FILT	Vol.	O	147,279	11,623	12%–13%	13.6%	24.1% (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>CGIL</i> , <i>ETF</i>
FIT	Vol.	O	112,500	8,000	15%	10.4%	16.6% (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>CISL</i> , <i>ETF</i>
Ultrasporti	Vol.	O	103,312	n.a.	20%	8.6%	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>UIL</i> , <i>ETF</i>
UGL Trasporti	Vol.	O	80,676	8,000	45%	8.2%	16.6% (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>UGL</i>
UP	Vol.	S (OC)	1,400	1,400	5%	23.3%	2.9% (23.3%)	Yes	No	–
AVIA	Vol.	S (OC)	1,500	1,500	65%	23%	3.1% (23%)	Yes	No	–
SDL	Vol.	O	7,500	4,200	30%	0.63%	8.7% (n.a.)	Yes	No	
ANPAV	Vol.	S (OC)	1,000	1,000	50%	12.5%	2.1% (12.5%)	Yes	Yes	<i>Or.SA</i>
ANPAC	Vol.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	<i>ECA</i>
ATM-PP	Vol.	S (OC)	1,000	1,000	n.a.	n.a.	2.1% (n.a.)	Yes	No	<i>ATCEUC</i>
LT										
TVOUDPS	Vol.	S	48	48	50%	6%	2.8% (6%)	Yes	No	<i>LPSK</i>
LRSVA	Vol.	S (OC)	80	80	12%	90%	4.7% (90%)	Yes	No	<i>LPSK</i>

Country	Type of membership ^a	Domain coverage	Membership			Density (%)		Collective bargaining	Consultation	National and European affiliations ^c
			Members	Members in sector	Female membership (% of total membership) ^b	Domain	Sector (sectoral domain) ^d			
ONDPS	Vol.	S	189	189	60%	71%	11.2% (71%)	Yes	No	<i>LPSK, IFATCA</i>
FLDPS	Vol.	S (OC)	70	70	83%	50%	4% (50%)	No	No	<i>LPS</i>
LU										
OGB-L	Vol.	O	61,000	1,000	33%	n.a.	28.6% (28.6%)	Yes	No	<i>CGT-L, ETF, EPSU, ATCEUC</i>
ALPL	Vol.	S (OC)	452	452	5%	28.6%	n.a. (28.6%)	No	Yes	<i>LCGB, ECA</i>
GLCCA	n.a.	S (OC)	25	25	n.a.	62.5%	n.a. (62.5%)	No	Yes	<i>ATCEUC</i>
LCGB	n.a.	O	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	n.a.	<i>ETF</i>
NGL-SNEP	n.a.	O	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	No	n.a.	–
LV										
LAAF	Vol.	C	460	460	24%	27%	n.a. (n.a.)	(Yes) ^d	Yes	<i>LBAS</i>
MT										
GWU	Vol.	O	45,993	1,110	17.5%	30%	41% (41%)	Yes	No	<i>ETF, EPSU, EFFAT, EMF, EMCEF, FERPA, EUROWEA, SCECBU</i>
UHM	Vol.	O	26,231	400	31%	17%	15% (15%)	Yes	No	<i>CMTU, Eurofedop, FERPA</i>
MATCA	Vol.	S (OC)	75	75	5%	100%	2.8% (100%)	Yes	No	<i>ATCEUC</i>
AAE	Vol.	S (OC)	78	78	0%	100%	2.9% (100%)	Yes	No	–
UCC	Vol.	S (OC)	214	214	49%	98%	7.9% (98%)	Yes	No	<i>GWU, ETF^e</i>

Country	Type of membership ^a	Domain coverage	Membership			Density (%)		Collective bargaining	Consultation	National and European affiliations ^c
			Members	Members in sector	Female membership (% of total membership) ^b	Domain	Sector (sectoral domain) ^d			
ALPA	Vol.	S (OC)	130	130	5%	65%	4.8% (65%)	Yes	No	ECA
NL										
FNV-Bondgenoten	Vol.	O	470,000	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>FNV</i> , ETF
CNV-Bedrijvenbond	Vol.	O	90,000	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>CNV</i> , ETF
De Unie	Vol.	O	85,000	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>MHP</i>
OVN	Vol.	S (OC)	20	20	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	–
VNV	Vol.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	ECA
VNC	Vol.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	ETF
VHKP	Vol.	S	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>CMHF</i>
TUEM	Vol.	S (OC)	460	460	n.a.	71%	n.a. (71%)	(Yes) ^f	Yes	ATCEUC
EPSU Eurocontrol	Vol.	S (OC)	500	500	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	(Yes) ^f	Yes	EPSU
ATC LVNL (NL Guild)	Vol.	S (OC)	410	410	25%	90%	n.a. (90%)	Yes	No	<i>MHP</i> , ATCEUC
PL										
NSZZ S PLL LOT	Vol.	S	950	950	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>NSZZ Solidarność</i>
ZZKRL	Vol.	S (OC)	400	400	n.a.	98%	n.a. (98%)	Yes	Yes	ATCEUC
POLALPA	Vol.	S (OC)	350	350	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	No	Yes	ECA
ZZPLP	Vol.	S (OC)	575	575	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	No	Yes	<i>OPZZ</i> , ETF
PT										
SITEMA	Vol.	S (OC)	1,471	1,471	5%	70%	12.3% (70%)	Yes	No	<i>UGT</i> , ETF

Country	Type of membership ^a	Domain coverage	Membership			Density (%)		Collective bargaining	Consultation	National and European affiliations ^c
			Members	Members in sector	Female membership (% of total membership) ^b	Domain	Sector (sectoral domain) ^d			
SITAVA	Vol.	C	4,700	4,700	n.a.	n.a.	39.3% (39.3%)	Yes	No	<i>CGTP-IN</i> , ETF
SNPVAC	Vol.	S (OC)	2,491	2,234	65%	90%	15.1% (81.2%)	Yes	No	<i>UGT</i> , ETF
SPAC	Vol.	S (OC)	800	800	n.a.	90.2%	6.7% (90.2%)	Yes	No	–
SINTAC	Vol.	S	400	400	n.a.	n.a.	3.3% (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
STHA	Vol.	S (OC)	1,100	1,100	n.a.	n.a.	9.2% (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
SQAC	Vol.	S	350	350	n.a.	n.a.	2.9% (n.a.)	Yes	No	<i>UGT</i> , ETF
SIMA	Vol.	O	n.a.	350	n.a.	n.a.	2.9% (n.a.)	Yes	No	EMF
SITECSA	n.a.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
SITNA	n.a.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	–
SINCTA	n.a.	S (OC)	650	650	n.a.	100%	n.a. (100%)	Yes	No	ATCEUC
APPLA	n.a.	S (OC)	–	–	–	–	–	No	No	ECA
RO										
FSAR	Vol.	S	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>BNS</i>
CSNTR	n.a.	O	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>BNS</i>
ASTR	n.a.	O	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	ETF
SPNT	n.a.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	ETF
ATCOR	n.a.	S (OC)	695	695	n.a.	100%	n.a. (100%)	No	Yes	ATCEUC
SLIPEF	n.a.	S	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	
ETOS	n.a.	S	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.) (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	–

Country	Type of membership ^a	Domain coverage	Membership			Density (%)		Collective bargaining	Consultation	National and European affiliations ^c
			Members	Members in sector	Female membership (% of total membership) ^b	Domain	Sector (sectoral domain) ^d			
SSZT	n.a.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	
SITT	n.a.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	
SETA	n.a.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	
SPLR	n.a.	S (OC)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	
SIOT	n.a.	S	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	
SE										
Civilekonomerna	Vol.	SO	33,000	100	52%	50%	0.6% (n.a.)	Yes	Yes	<i>SACO</i>
Jusek	Vol.	SO	76,757	n.a.	50%	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	<i>SACO</i>
Ledarna	Vol.	SO	71,000	342	20%	15%	2.2% (n.a.)	Yes	No	CEC
Pilotförbundet	Vol.	S (OC)	100	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	
SEKO	Vol.	SO	140,000	1,000	30%	80%	6.5% (50%)	Yes	No	<i>LO, ETF, EPSU</i>
ST	Vol.	SO	90,000	1,500	65%	25%–30%	9.6% (30%)	Yes	No	<i>TCO, ETF, EPSU, UNI-Europa</i>
SFF	Vol.	S (OC)	783	700	1.2%	75%	4.5% (75%)	Yes	No	
SI	Vol.	SO	115,500	n.a.	25%	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	Yes	No	<i>SACO</i>
Swealpa	Vol.	S (OC)	1,225	1,225	5%	80%	8% (80%)	Yes	No	ECA
Transport	Vol.	O	64,536	2,177	16%	85%	14% (n.a.)	Yes	No	<i>LO, ETF</i>
Unionen	Vol.	SO	483,526	4,826	44%	80%–85%	42% (n.a.)	Yes	No	<i>TCO, ETF, UNI-Europa</i>

Country	Type of membership ^a	Domain coverage	Membership			Density (%)		Collective bargaining	Consultation	National and European affiliations ^c
			Members	Members in sector	Female membership (% of total membership) ^b	Domain	Sector (sectoral domain) ^d			
SI										
SPP	Vol.	S (OC)	100	100	n.a.	70%	7.8% (70%)	Yes	No	<i>Pergam, ECA</i>
ZKOPLS	Vol.	S (OC)	80	80	n.a.	90%	6.3% (90%)	Yes	No	<i>KNSS</i>
SLTO	Vol.	S (OC)	80	80	n.a.	n.a.	6.3% (n.a.)	Yes	No	<i>ZSSS</i>
SLTOM	Vol.	S (OC)	50	50	n.a.	50%	3.9% (50%)	Yes	No	
SLMS	Vol.	S (OC)	30	30	n.a.	n.a.	2.4% (n.a.)	Yes	No	<i>CTU-90</i>
SAITS	Vol.	S (OC)	40	40	n.a.	n.a.	31% (n.a.)	Yes	No	<i>CTU-90</i>
SDLTP	Vol.	S (OC)	40	40	n.a.	n.a.	31% (n.a.)	Yes	No	<i>KNSS</i>
SDKLRS-95	Vol.	S (OC)	95	95	n.a.	n.a.	7.5% (n.a.)	Yes	No	<i>CTU-90, ATCEUC</i>
Sindikat Adria	Vol.	S	100	100	n.a.	n.a.	6.3% (n.a.)	Yes	No	<i>KNSS</i>
SZPS	Vol.	C	400	400	n.a.	n.a.	31.4% (n.a.)	Yes	No	<i>CTU-90</i>
SSKL	Vol.	S (OC)	95	95	8%	95.5%	7.5% (95.5%)	Yes	No	<i>CTU-90, ATCEUC</i>
UCC-SLO	Vol.	S (OC)	80	80	93%	90%	3% (90%)	Yes	No	<i>KNSS, ETF</i>
SK										
OZ Doprava	Vol.	O	6,975	463	17%	50%	25% (25%)	Yes	Yes	<i>KOZ SR</i>
UK										
Unite	Vol.	O	1,940,000	50,000	22%	6%	36% (36%)	Yes	Yes	<i>TUC, ETF</i>
GMB	Vol.	O	605,000	8,500	43%	2%	6% (6%)	Yes	Yes	<i>TUC, ETF</i>
PCS	Vol.	O	310,000	2,000	60%	16%	1% (1%)	Yes	Yes	<i>TUC, ETF</i>
Prospect	Vol.	SO	102,000	3,500	22%	8%	3% (3%)	Yes	Yes	<i>TUC, ETF</i>

Country	Type of membership ^a	Domain coverage	Membership			Density (%)		Collective bargaining	Consultation	National and European affiliations ^c
			Members	Members in sector	Female membership (% of total membership) ^b	Domain	Sector (sectoral domain) ^d			
Unison	Vol.	O	1,350,000	400	70%	17%	0.2% (0.2%)	Yes	Yes	<i>TUC, ETF</i>
BALPA	Vol.	S (OC)	10,000	10,000	6%	85%	6.5% (85%)	Yes	Yes	<i>TUC, ECA</i>

Notes: See Annex for list of abbreviations and full names of organisations.

^a Vol. = voluntary

^b = as a percentage of total trade union membership

^c = national affiliations appear in italics; for the national level, only cross-sectoral (i.e. peak-level) associations are listed; for the European level, only sector-related associations are listed

^d = indirect involvement via lower-level affiliates

^e = indirect affiliation via higher-level or lower-level organisations

^f = consultation

O = Overlap, SO = Sectional overlap, S = Sectionalism, C = Congruence,

OC = Occupational union

n.a. = not available

Membership data are partly from the European organisations.

Source: EIRO national centres, 2008

Employer organisations

Tables 4 and 5 present the membership data on the employer organisations. Altogether, some 14 of the 27 Member States register employer organisations. Of these, seven countries have more than one employer organisation in the sector. In the other countries, no organisation meets the definition of a sector-related social partner organisation, as defined earlier. This does not mean that business has remained unorganised. Generally, business interest organisations may also deal with interests other than those related to industrial relations. Organisations specialised in matters other than industrial relations are commonly designated as ‘trade associations’ (see [TN0311101S](#)). Sector-level trade associations usually outnumber sector-level employer organisations (see Traxler, 1993).

As regards domain demarcation, there are relatively few cases of overlaps, sectionalist overlaps and congruence. Half of the employer organisations listed in Table 4 have demarcated their domain in a way that sectionally relates to the sector. Sectionalist demarcations are usually based on differentiation by business activity, such as airports and airlines. Moreover, distinct associations may exist for domestic and foreign airlines, as is the case in Greece and Italy. Sectionalist overlaps result almost exclusively from specialisation in state-owned businesses across sectors. As a result of the predominance of sectionalist domain demarcation, certain parts of the sector remain outside the remit of any existing employer organisation. This situation applies particularly to countries where only one employer organisation is established in the sector,

such as Germany and Romania. The employer organisations have usually managed to arrive at complementary domain demarcations. In countries where more than one employer organisation operates, the associational domains are usually complementary either by formal demarcation or by practice. Inter-associational competition for membership is thus absent in such countries, with the exception of Finland. Moreover, competition over bargaining rights does not exist.

As the figures on density show (Table 4), most of the organisations for which data are available have more than 70% of the companies as members within their domain. The number of organisations that reach such levels of domain density in terms of employees is even larger. In contrast, relatively low densities are recorded for the Slovenian organisations, along with one Finnish association and the majority of the Italian organisations. Generally, density relates to the sector in a similar way as it does for the trade unions. Sectoral domain density tends to be far higher than sectoral density. This is mainly because the domain of most of the employer organisations is sectionalist, as is the case for their trade union counterparts.

Table 4: Domain coverage, membership and density of employer organisations in civil aviation, 2005–2006

Country	Domain coverage	Membership					Density (%)			
		Type ^a	Comp-anies	Comp-anies in sector	Employ-ees	Employ-ees in sector	Companies		Employees	
							Domain	Sector (sectoral domain density)	Domain	Sector (sectoral domain density)
AT										
FL	S	oblig.	124	124	14,581	14,581	100%	65% (100%)	100%	~100% (100%)
BE										
BATA	S	vol.	8	8	6,000	6,000	95%	4% (95%)	99%	45% (99%)
BAR	S	vol.	56	56	8,000	8,000	95%	55% (95%)	99%	55% (99%)
EFITTRA	O	vol.	515	n.a.	24,000	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)
BG										
BAA	S	vol.	17	17	1,500	1,500	85%	26.2% (85%)	n.a.	22.2% (n.a.)
CY	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
CZ	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
DE										
VKA	SO	vol.	n.a.	n.a.	2,000,000	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)
DK										
DI	O	vol.	11,000	20	~500,000	3,500	n.a.	95% (95%)	n.a.	95% (95%)

Country	Domain coverage	Membership					Density (%)			
		Type ^a	Comp-anies	Comp-anies in sector	Employ-ees	Employ-ees in sector	Companies		Employees	
							Domain	Sector (sectoral domain density)	Domain	Sector (sectoral domain density)
EE	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
EL										
UFAC	S	vol.	23	23	650	650	70%	n.a. (70%)	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)
ES										
ASEATA	S	vol.	10	10	18,932	18,932	100%	0.2% (100%)	100%	40% (100%)
AECA	S	vol.	>20	>20	6,000	6,000	n.a.	12% (n.a.)	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)
FI										
ASSI	SO	vol.	200	20	35,000	7,500	25%	17% (n.a.)	80%	70% (n.a.)
LTY	SO	vol.	21	2	18,600	2,400	90%	2% (n.a.)	95%	23% (n.a.)
ET	SO	vol.	1,300	2	42,000	230	75%	2% (n.a.)	80%	2% (n.a.)
FR										
FNAM	C	vol.	159	159	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)
SCARA	S	vol.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)
HU	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
IE										
IBEC	O	vol.	n.a.	4	n.a.	7,500	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	n.a.	63% (n.a.)
IT										
Assaeroporti	S	vol.	39	39	15,000	15,000	16.7%	8.2% (16.7%)	65.4%	31.1% (65.4%)
Assohandlers	S	vol.	12	12	7,000	7,000	5.1%	2.5% (5.1%)	30.5%	14.5% (30.5%)
Assocatering	SO	vol.	6	6	2,500	2,500	2.6%	1.3% (2.6%)	10.9%	5.2% (10.9%)
Assaereo	S	vol.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)	n.a.	n.a. (n.a.)
FAIRO	S	vol.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Country	Domain coverage	Membership					Density (%)			
		Type ^a	Companies	Companies in sector	Employees	Employees in sector	Companies		Employees	
							Domain	Sector (sectoral domain density)	Domain	Sector (sectoral domain density)
								(n.a.)		(n.a.)
LT	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
LU	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
LV	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
MT	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
NL	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
PL	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
PT	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
RO										
AAR	S	vol.	17	17	2,018	2,018	100%	n.a. (100%)	100%	n.a. (100%)
SE										
Arbetsgivarverket	SO	vol.	280	1	250,000	3,500	100%	n.a. (100%)	100%	20% (100%)
Flygarbetsgivarna	SO	vol.	98	93	12,800	12,400	95%	n.a. (95%)	n.a.	80% (n.a.)
SI										
GZS	O	vol.	17,750	34–37	n.a.	650	16%	75% (n.a.)	n.a.	50% (n.a.)
ZDS	O	vol.	1,410	1	3,000	450	2.9%	2.2% (n.a.)	0.4%	35% (n.a.)
SK	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
UK	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Notes: See Annex for list of abbreviations and full names of organisations.

^a vol. = voluntary membership; oblig. = obligatory membership

O = Overlap, SO = Sectional overlap, S = Sectionalism, C = Congruence

n.a. = not available

Source: EIRO national centres, 2008

Table 5: Collective bargaining, consultation and national/European affiliations of employer organisations in civil aviation, 2005–2006

Country	Collective bargaining	Consultation	National and European affiliations ^a
AT			
FL	yes	yes	<i>WKÖ</i>
BE			
BATA	yes	yes	<i>FEB-VBO</i>
BAR	yes	yes	BAR
EFITTRA	yes	yes	<i>FEB-VBO</i>
BG			
BAA	yes	yes	<i>UPEB</i>
CY	–	–	–
CZ	–	–	–
DE			
VKA	yes	yes	CEEP
DK			
DI	yes	no	<i>DA</i>
EE	–	–	–
EL			
UFAC	yes	yes	–
ES			
ASEATA	yes	no	<i>CEOE</i>
AECA	yes	no	<i>CEOE</i>
FI			
ASSI	yes	yes	<i>EK</i>
LTY	yes	no	<i>EK, CEEP^b</i>
ET	yes	no	<i>EK</i>
FR			
FNAM	yes	n.a.	–
SCARA	yes	n.a.	–
HU	–	–	–

Country	Collective bargaining	Consultation	National and European affiliations^a
IE			
IBEC	yes	yes	–
IT			
Assaeroporti	yes	yes	<i>Confindustria</i>
Assohandlers	yes	yes	–
Assocatering	yes	yes	<i>Confcommercio, HOTREC, HORECA</i>
Assaereo	yes	yes	<i>Confindustria</i>
FAIRO	yes	yes	–
LT	–	–	–
LU	–	–	–
LV	–	–	–
MT	–	–	–
NL	–	–	–
PL	–	–	–
PT	–	–	–
RO			
AAR	yes	yes	–
SE			
Arbetsgivarverket	yes	yes	–
Flygarbetsgivarna	yes	no	<i>SN</i>
SI			
GZS	yes	yes	EICTA
ZDS	yes	yes	–
SK	–	–	–
UK	–	–	–

Notes: See Annex for list of abbreviations and full names of organisations.

^a = national affiliations appear in italics; only affiliations to sectoral European associations are listed

^b = indirect affiliation via higher-level or lower-level organisations

Source: EIRO national centres, 2008

Collective bargaining and its actors

Table 6 gives an overview of the system of sector-related collective bargaining in the EU27. The standard measure of the importance of collective bargaining as a means of employment regulation is collective bargaining coverage – that is, the total number of employees covered by collective bargaining as a proportion of the total number of employees within a certain segment of the economy (see Traxler, Blaschke and Kittel, 2001). Accordingly, the sector's rate of collective bargaining coverage is defined as the ratio of the number of employees covered by any kind of collective agreement to the total number of employees in the sector.

To delineate the bargaining system, two further indicators are used. The first indicator refers to the relevance of multi-employer bargaining, compared with single-employer bargaining. Multi-employer bargaining is defined as being conducted by an employer organisation on behalf of the employer side. In the case of single-employer bargaining, it is the company or its divisions that are party to the agreement. This includes instances where two or more companies jointly negotiate an agreement. The relative importance of multi-employer bargaining – measured as a percentage of the total number of employees covered by a collective agreement – thus indicates the impact of the employer organisations on the overall collective bargaining process.

The second indicator considers whether statutory extension schemes are applied to the sector. For reasons of brevity, this analysis is confined to extension schemes that seek to extend the scope of a collective agreement to employers not affiliated to the signatory employer organisation; extension regulations targeting the employees are not significant to this analysis for two reasons. Firstly, extending a collective agreement to the employees who are not unionised in the company covered by the collective agreement is a standard of the [International Labour Organization \(ILO\)](#), aside from any national legislation. Secondly, employers have good reason to extend a collective agreement concluded by them, even when they are not formally obliged to do so. Otherwise, they would set an incentive for their workforce to unionise.

Compared with employee-related extension procedures, schemes that target the employers are far more significant to the strength of collective bargaining in general and to multi-employer bargaining in particular. This is because employers are capable of refraining from joining an employer organisation and from entering single-employer bargaining in the context of a purely voluntaristic system. Therefore, employer-related extension practices increase the coverage of multi-employer bargaining. Moreover, when it is pervasive, an extension agreement may encourage more employers to join the controlling employer organisation, since membership enables them to participate in the bargaining process and to benefit from the organisation's related services in a situation where the respective collective agreement will bind them in any case (see Traxler, Blaschke and Kittel, 2001).

It should be noted that the category of extension practices also covers functional equivalents to these practices. There are two kinds of such equivalents. The first type is obligatory membership, which is legally established in public-law interest associations such as the Federal Association of Aviation Companies ([Fachverband der Luftfahrtunternehmen, FL](#)) in Austria. The other functional equivalent to statutory extension schemes can be found in Italy. Under the country's constitution, minimum conditions of employment must apply to all employees. The labour court

rulings relate this principle to the multi-employer agreements, in the sense that they are seen as being generally binding (see IST, 2001).

Table 6: System of sectoral collective bargaining in civil aviation, 2005–2006

Country	Collective bargaining coverage (CBC)	Proportion of multi-employer bargaining (MEB) as % of total CBC	Extension practices ^a
AT	90%	35%	(Limited/exceptional)
BE	100%	100% ^b	Pervasive
BG	100%	100% ^b	Pervasive
CY	~100%	0%	No practice
CZ	99%	0%	No practice
DE	n.a.	n.a.	No practice
DK	95%	99%	No practice
EE	33%	0%	No practice
EL	~100%	n.a.	Pervasive
ES	n.a.	n.a.	Limited/exceptional
FI	100%	MEB prevailing	Pervasive
FR	100%	MEB prevailing	Pervasive
HU	59%	0%	No practice
IE	60%	n.a.	No practice
IT	>90%	n.a.	n.a.
LT	69%	0%	No practice
LU	95%	0%	No practice
LV	~48%	0%	No practice
MT	~95%	0%	No practice
NL	>95%	0%	No practice
PL	80%	0%	No practice
PT	100%	0%	No practice
RO	100%	100%	Pervasive
SE	100%	70%	(Limited/exceptional)
SI	100%	100% ^b	Pervasive
SK	~50%	0%	No practice

Country	Collective bargaining coverage (CBC)	Proportion of multi-employer bargaining (MEB) as % of total CBC	Extension practices ^a
UK	~75%	0%	No practice

Notes: Collective bargaining coverage = employees covered as a percentage of the total number of employees in the sector

MEB = multi-employer bargaining relative to single-employer bargaining

^a *Extension practices include functional equivalents to extension provisions, i.e. obligatory membership and labour court rulings; cases of functional equivalents appear in parentheses.*

^b *= supplementary single-employer bargaining*

n.a. = not available

Source: EIRO national centres, 2008

Collective bargaining coverage

On the whole, collective bargaining coverage in the civil aviation industry is generally high, with 18 of the 26 countries for which data are available registering a very high coverage rate of 80% or more. In the remaining countries, 50% or more of the employees are covered, with the exception of Estonia and Latvia, which record a coverage level of 33% and 48%, respectively. In both of these countries, only single-employer bargaining exists. Depending on national circumstances, several factors, sometimes interacting with each other, account for the generally high coverage rates. The highest rate of collective bargaining coverage, at 100%, can be found in countries where multi-employer bargaining coincides with pervasive extension practices. While coverage in countries with prevalent multi-employer bargaining is generally very high, there is much more variance across countries operating under single-employer bargaining. In such circumstances, coverage ranges from 33% in Estonia to almost 100% in Cyprus. Total coverage in single-employer bargaining systems is usually contingent on trade union density, which interacts with the economic concentration of a sector. Unionisation generally increases with company size (see Visser, 1991). The relatively high economic concentration of the civil aviation industry in terms of employment is thus conducive to both unionisation and favourable collective bargaining coverage, and explains why coverage is also high in most cases of predominantly single-employer bargaining.

With the exception of Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy and Spain, at least a rough estimate can be made with regard to the relative importance of multi-employer bargaining. Multi-employer bargaining prevails in eight countries, while 14 countries are characterised by the predominance of single-employer bargaining. It should be noted that the distinction between multi-employer and single-employer bargaining does not fully describe the complexity of the bargaining systems. In some countries – for example, Belgium, Bulgaria and Slovenia – a multi-level bargaining system exists, which combines multi-employer bargaining with single-employer settlements. In these cases, the single-employer settlements contain more favourable employment terms than the multi-employer agreements. It is also important to note that the scope of multi-employer agreements varies considerably. In some countries, the sector is covered by a central agreement (for example Bulgaria and Slovenia) or by a multi-industry agreement that embraces the entire transport sector (Romania). In many other countries, the scope of the multi-employer agreements is limited to certain parts of the sector. In these cases, their scope is usually demarcated by business activities, in line with the (sectionalist) domain of most employer organisations.

Finally, the high economic concentration of the sector combined with the importance of single-employer bargaining, even within multi-employer bargaining systems, directs special attention to employers' attitudes towards collective bargaining. While a detailed survey of the bargaining climate is beyond the scope of this study, an important question relates to whether there are companies which refuse to recognise trade unions and to enter collective bargaining. Such cases are reported for Austria, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands and the UK. In terms of business activities, these cases involve airline companies only, usually those belonging to the group of low-cost carriers. Of these, the low-cost airline [Ryanair](#) in Ireland has reportedly pursued a non-union policy the most consistently (see also [TN0508101S](#))

Participation in public policymaking

Interest associations may take part in public policy in two basic ways: firstly, they may be consulted by the authorities on matters affecting their members; alternatively, they may be represented on 'corporatist', that is tripartite, committees and boards of policy concertation. This study considers only cases of consultation and corporatist participation that explicitly relate to sector-specific matters. Consultation processes are not necessarily institutionalised and, therefore, the organisations consulted by the authorities may vary according to the issues to be addressed and over time, depending on changes in government. Moreover, the authorities may initiate a consultation process on an ad hoc basis rather than regularly. Given this variability, Tables 3–5 list only those sector-related trade unions and employer organisations that are usually consulted. Depending on country-specific regulations and practices, the sector-related organisations may directly or indirectly participate in public policy. Indirect participation takes place through their affiliation to a peak-level organisation that obtains participatory rights.

The trade unions are usually consulted in two thirds of the 27 Member States. In most of the countries where such consultation practices occur, this process involves not all but only some of the existing trade unions. The situation of pronounced multi-unionism, as it is characteristic of most countries, probably fosters selective consultation processes. In addition, formal criteria of representativeness also perform a selective function. Spain provides a particular example in this instance. Since rights of consultation are formally tied to criteria of representativeness, only the most representative trade union organisations are admitted to the consultation process in this country.

The situation is less differentiated on the employer side due to the far smaller number of organisations. The employer organisations, where existing, are consulted by the authorities in almost all countries. If two or more employer organisations are established, all of them are usually consulted. Furthermore, if employer organisations exist, then their opportunity to participate in consultation processes does not differ from that of the trade unions. Generally, each of the two sides of industry is either consulted or not consulted. As already noted, employer organisations in the sense of the aforementioned definition of a social partner organisation are not established in all of the 27 Member States. This does not mean that employers are excluded from consultation procedures in these countries. Under these circumstances, trade associations are likely to be consulted. In addition to these associations of business, large employers themselves may directly be involved in consultation procedures, particularly when policymaking follows the pattern of a 'company state' rather than that of an 'associative state' (see Grant, 1993).

Tripartite participation

Turning from consultation to tripartite participation, it emerges that sector-specific tripartite bodies are only established in a minority of countries – namely, Austria, Bulgaria, Finland, France, Portugal, Slovakia and the UK (Table 7). The legal basis of these tripartite bodies is either a statute or an agreement between the parties involved. Their scope of activities ranges from specific tasks to any matter that affects the sector.

Some business associations which are represented on the boards are not listed in Tables 4–5, since they do not meet the criteria of a social partner organisation, as established in this comparative study. In the case of Portugal, it is the cross-sectoral peak employer organisation that is represented.

Table 7: Tripartite sector-specific boards of public policy in civil aviation, 2005–2006

Country	Name of body and scope of activity	Origin	Participants	
			Trade unions	Business associations
AT	Civil Aviation Advisory Board: all matters affecting the sector	Statutory	vida	FL
BG	Council for Social Partnership for Air Transport – all sector-related matters	Statutory	FTTUB, FTW	BAA
FI	Council for Safety at Work	Administrative	IAU, TU	ASSI
FR	Conseil Supérieur de l'Aviation Marchande	Statutory	CFDT, CFE-CGC, CFTC, CGT, CGT-FO	n.a.
PT	Evaluation Council for Certification of Aircraft Maintenance Technicians	Statutory	SITAVA, SITEMA	CIP
SK	Consultative Body for Civil Aviation: sector-related legislation	Administrative	OZ Doprava and local airport trade unions	ÚDPT SR and six airports
UK	Transec: security at airports	Administrative	Unite, Prospect, GMB, BALPA	BATA

Notes: See Annex for list of abbreviations and full names of organisations.

n.a. = not available

Source: EIRO national centres, 2008

European level of interest representation

At European level, eligibility for consultation and participation in the social dialogue is linked to three criteria, as defined by the European Commission see [Commission Decision \(34Kb PDF\)](#) of 20 May 1998). Accordingly, a social partner organisation must meet the following criteria:

- be cross-industry or relate to specific sectors or categories, and be organised at European level;
- consist of organisations that are themselves an integral and recognised part of Member States' social partner structures and that have the capacity to negotiate agreements, as well as being representative of all Member States, as far as possible;
- have adequate structures to ensure effective participation in the consultation process.

As regards social dialogue, the constituent property of these structures is the ability of an organisation to negotiate on behalf of its members and to conclude binding agreements. Accordingly, this section on the European associations of the civil aviation industry will analyse these organisations' membership domain, the composition of their membership and their ability to negotiate.

Membership domain

As will be outlined in greater detail below, the membership domain of three European associations on the employee side, and seven associations on the employer side, is sector-related in the way that is delineated above. On the employee side, these associations are ETF, ECA and ATCEUC. Sector-related business interests, on the other hand, are organised by ACI Europe, AEA, CANSO, ERA, IACA, IAHA and ELFAA.

The following analysis will concentrate on these organisations, while providing supplementary information on other European associations that are organisationally linked to the sector's national industrial relations actors through these actors' affiliation to these other European associations.

As far as the membership domain of the employee representatives is concerned, the domain of ETF overlaps in relation to the civil aviation industry, while the domains of ECA and ATCEUC are sectionalist. In the case of both ECA and ATCEUC, this sectionalism is based on specialisation by occupation. The membership domains of all European business associations, meanwhile, are sectionalist. This sectionalist domain demarcation of business interests mainly originates in specialisation in distinct business activities. In addition, the associations of the airlines are differentiated by markets.

Membership composition

Although the countries covered by the associations extend beyond the EU Member States to include other countries, this report will only consider the EU Member States. Furthermore, the report will only examine ETF affiliates that have members in the civil aviation industry, as demarcated earlier.

Following these specifications, Table 8 lists the members of the European organisations representing employees. Accordingly, ETF covers most of the 27 EU Member States, with the exception of Latvia, Lithuania and Slovakia. ECA records affiliates in 21 EU Member States, with Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Romania, Slovakia and Spain not being covered. ATCEUC has members in 15 EU Member States, with no affiliations being recorded in Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Sweden and the UK. When reviewing the overall territorial coverage of the three European labour representatives, it emerges that there are three countries where none of the organisations registers an affiliation – namely, Latvia, Lithuania and Slovakia.

Table 8: Members of European trade union organisations, 2008

Country	ETF ^a	ECA	ATCEUC
AT	GPF, Vida	ACA*	–
BE	ACOD/CGSP, ACV-Transcom, ACLVB-CGSLB, BBTK-SETCa*, BTB, ACV-Public Services, LBC-NVK	BeCA*	–
BG	FTTUB, FTW	BUL-ALPA	Air Traffic Controllers' Union
CY	SYNYKA	PALPU	–
CZ	Transport Workers' Union	CZALPA	–
DE	Ver.di	VC	GdF
DK	3F, CUD, DFF-S/DFS, DMF, HK Privat	DALPA/DPF	–
EE	ETTA	ALPA	–
EL	OSPA, FAU	HALPA (OSYPA)	Air Traffic Controllers' Associations (OSYPA)**
ES	FCT-CC.OO, FETCM-UGT	–	USCA
FI	SLSY, IAU, TU	FPA**	–
FR	FGTE-CFDT, FO-FETS, UNSA (SNMSAC, SNPAC), SNPNC, FGT-CFTC, FNST-CGT, SNAC-CFTC, UNAC-AFA Council (CFE-CGC)	SNPL	SNCTA*
HU	LESZ, RMFSZ	HUNALPA	LIFSZ
IE	IMPACT, SIPTU	IALPA (IMPACT)	IMPACT

Country	ETF ^a	ECA	ATCEUC
IT	FILT, FIT, Ultrasporti	ANPAC	ATM-PP
LT	–	–	–
LU	OGB-L, LCGB	ALPL*	GLCCA*
LV	–	–	–
MT	GWU	–	MATCA
NL	FNV-Bondgenoten, CNV-Bedrijvenbond, VNC	VNV	ATC LVNL (NL Guild), TUEM ^b
PL	ZZPLP*	POLALPA*	ZZKRL
PT	SITAVA, SITEMA, SNPVAC, SQAC	APPLA*	SINCTA
RO	SPNT, ATU Romania (SPLR)	–	ATCOR*
SE	SEKO, ST, Unionen, Transport	Swealpa	–
SI	UCC SLO	SPP	SSKL
SK	–	–	–
UK	UNITE, GMB, PCS, PROSPECT, UNISON	BALPA	–
Participant in social dialogue	Yes	Yes	No
Negotiating mandate⁺	Yes	No evidence	Yes

Notes: See Annex for list of abbreviations and full names of organisations.

Membership list is confined to the sector-related associations of the countries under consideration.

^a *Members in the civil aviation section, 2008*

^b *Listed as a member for Eurocontrol*

^{*} *Not involved in collective bargaining*

^{**} *Indirectly involved in collective bargaining via higher-level or lower-level affiliations*

⁺ *As formalised in the associational constitution.*

Associations that appear in parentheses are sector-related trade unions listed in Table 3 which are indirectly affiliated via national higher-order associations or lower-level affiliates.

Source: EIRO national centres, 2008

In relation to the sector-related European business associations, it is a common property of the membership structure that only businesses – in contrast to business interest associations – are eligible for full or regular membership. Table 9 presents some basic data about the membership composition of these organisations. Of the associations organising airlines, AEA covers 21 of the

27 EU Member States, while ERA, IACA and ELFAA cover 19, 13 and 10 countries, respectively. It is worth noting that none of these four airline representatives has a national affiliate in Estonia, although airline companies do exist in this country. The territorial remit of ACI-Europe is all-encompassing insofar as it has members in all of the 27 EU Member States. For its part, CANSO has 24 countries under its umbrella. IAHA, on the other hand, only covers nine countries.

Table 9: Members of European business interest organisations, 2008

	ACI-Europe	AEA	CANSO	ELFAA	ERA	IACA	IAHA
AT	6	1	1	–	3	1**	–
BE	7	1	1	–	–	1	1
BG	4*	–	1*	–	–	1	–
CY	2	1	–	–	–	1	2
CZ	3	1*	1	–	–	–	–
DE	23*	1*	1	–	7*	5	–
DK	2	–	1	1	2	1	–
EE	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
EL	2	1*	1	–	2	–	1
ES	2*	2*	1	1	2	5	2
FI	1	1	–	–	2	1	–
FR	45	1	1	–	2	1	1
HU	1*	1*	1	1	–	–	–
IE	3	1*	1	1**	2**	–	–
IT	16	2	1	1	2*	2	1
LT	5	–	1	–	1	–	–
LU	1	2*	–	–	1*	–	–
LV	2	–	1	–	1	–	–
MT	1*	1	1*	–	–	–	1
NL	6	1*	1	1	2*	3	–
PL	5	1*	1	–	2*	–	–
PT	2	1*	1*	–	2	–	–
RO	16	1	1	–	1	–	–
SE	2	1*	1	1	5	2	3
SI	1*	1*	1*	–	1*	–	–

	ACI-Europe	AEA	CANSO	ELFAA	ERA	IACA	IAHA
SK	1*	–	1	1	–	–	–
SK	1*	–	1	1	–	–	–
UK	21*	3*	2*	3**	3	4	4
Participant in European social dialogue	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes***
Negotiating mandate ⁺	No	No	Yes ^c	No	Yes ^a	No	Yes ^b

Notes: Membership list is confined to the countries under consideration; number of members by country is listed; regular/full members are shown only (i.e. companies/businesses in all cases).

** Member(s) from the respective country is (are) party to one or more sector-related collective agreements of major importance.*

*** Member(s) from the respective country refuse(s) to recognise trade unions and to enter collective bargaining.*

**** Since 2008*

^a Unless issue is voluntarily referred to the general assembly of members.

^b Subject to case-by-case assessment.

^c On behalf of members which joined the corresponding partnership structure.

⁺ As formalised in the associational constitution.

Source: EIRO national centres, 2008

Involvement in collective bargaining and membership strength

In addition to the territorial remit of the European associations, the weight of their affiliates in the national industrial relations systems is another criterion for evaluating their membership structure. In this respect, the key criterion is involvement of the national affiliates in collective bargaining. Aside from this, there is a question specific to each organised labour and business association. In the case of the labour representatives, the domain overlap of ETF with the two other associations raises the question of the relative strength of their affiliates in terms of the number of employees covered. As regards the European business associations, the fact that they organise only businesses raises the question of how relevant their members are in collective bargaining matters. This question is of special importance in countries where the existing employer organisations are all outside the membership domain of the European associations.

Table 8 also summarises the bargaining role of the affiliates of the European labour organisations (those marked with an asterisk do not participate in collective bargaining). Almost all member trade unions of ETF conduct collective bargaining. This means that its affiliates have a bargaining role in all of the countries covered by ETF, with the exception of Poland and one of the trade union organisations in Belgium. Of the 21 ECA members, 16 are directly or indirectly engaged in collective bargaining. This same is true for 12 of the 15 ATCEUC members. As far as available data on membership of the national trade unions provide sufficient information on their relative

strength (Table 3), it can be concluded that ETF tends to organise the largest national trade unions of the sector in the EU Member States. Poland and Slovenia are the two exceptions in this respect, aside from the three countries where no trade union is affiliated to ETF. On the whole, ETF represents the majority of the sector's unionised employees across Europe. Due to their occupational specialisation, the affiliates of ECA (covering pilots) and ATCEUC (covering air traffic controllers) are comparatively small. As a rule, one single trade union exists for each of these two occupations in each country that is covered by ECA and ATCEUC. In Portugal and Sweden, pilots have a special representative trade union in addition to the ECA-affiliated union. In the case of Portugal, close links exist between these two organisations. Due to the overlapping domain of ETF, pilots as well as air traffic controllers are also under the umbrella of this federation. In Ireland, one national trade union holds dual membership in sector-related European associations – that is, the [IMPACT](#) trade union, which is a member of ETF and also affiliated to ECA through its branch the [Irish Airline Pilots' Association \(IALPA\)](#).

Table 9 specifies whether the members of the European business associations are a signatory party to a collective agreement of major importance to the national bargaining systems. As the cross-national comparison shows, multi-employer bargaining of employer organisations and single-employer bargaining are not mutually exclusive. In countries where only single-employer bargaining exists, the members of the European associations do not necessarily figure prominently in the national bargaining process. Conversely, in many countries where multi-employer bargaining is established, companies that are affiliated to one of the European associations negotiate over major collective agreements. There are two possible reasons for this: firstly, there may be a multi-level bargaining system; secondly, multi-employer and single-employer bargaining may cover distinct areas of the sector.

Comparing the European business associations, in nine countries under the umbrella of ACI-Europe, one or more of its members are party to a collective agreement of major importance. The corresponding figures for AEA, CANSO and ERA are 13, five and six members, respectively. None of the members of ELFAA, IACA and IAHA is a major bargaining party. For an evaluation of how the European business associations relate to bargaining, it is also important to examine whether members avoid trade union recognition as a partner in collective bargaining (see also Table 9). This situation applies to two ELFAA members from Ireland and the UK, to two ERA members again from Ireland, and to one IACA member from Austria. Hence, the total bargaining record of the national affiliates of ELFAA and IACA is negative – that is, they have no cases of major bargaining parties under their umbrella, but instead record cases of trade union avoidance.

Capacity to negotiate

The third criterion of representativeness at the European level is the capacity of an organisation to negotiate on behalf of its own members. In this context, reference is made to whether this capacity is formally endorsed in the organisations' constitution. Tables 8 and 9 present the information on this issue for the trade unions and business associations respectively. Of the European labour representatives, ETF has obtained a general negotiating mandate (Table 8). Similarly, ATCEUC is entitled to negotiate on behalf of its members. The constitution of ECA does not contain a provision that deals with the right to negotiate.

In the case of the business associations, the constitution of ERA and IAHA provides for a conditional mandate (Table 9). ERA is generally vested with a mandate, unless an issue is voluntarily referred to the general assembly. Under the constitution of IAHA Europe, the association aims to foster dialogue with social partners such as the sectoral European social dialogue. Hence, IAHA can be equipped with a mandate on a case-by-case basis. For the purpose of negotiations, CANSO created a special structure that is tailored to the European social dialogue – namely, the CANSO Social Dialogue Partnership (CSDP), which is a subunit within CANSO

Europe. CSDP delegates are mandated and it is important to note that membership of CSDP is voluntary, such that a member can opt out of the dialogue process. AEA, ELFAA and ACI Europe lack a formal mandate. As an AEA representative outlined in response to the survey for this report: ‘AEA’s member airlines consider employer–employee relations as the prerogative of the members themselves. AEA does not have a mandate to enter into negotiations on detailed topics and issues with regard to employer–employees relations’. Similarly, the constitution of ELFAA underlines the autonomy of its members: ‘where no common position has been agreed, there is nothing to stop an airline from expressing their own view on any issue.’ With regard to IACA, the association’s constitution was not accessible for this study.

Overall, there is no evidence of a formal mandate in the case of ECA, ACI-Europe, AEA, ELFAA and IACA. This finding is somewhat surprising with regard to the associations that participate in the European social dialogue – that is, ECA, ACI-Europe, AEA and IACA – particularly since the dialogue resulted in a European agreement in 2000. A possible explanation for this is that these associations are equipped with a mandate on an ad hoc basis, depending on circumstances. In any case, the constitutional differences in providing a negotiating mandate do not mirror the (non)participation patterns in the sectoral European social dialogue: while some participating associations lack a formalised mandate, such a mandate is granted to some of the non-participating associations, such as ATCEUC. For its part, IAHA joined the sectoral social dialogue committee as a full member in 2008.

As proof of the weight of the sector-related European associations considered above, it is also worth identifying other European associations that may be important representatives of the sector. This can be done by reviewing the membership of the national associations in sector-specific European associations.

For the trade unions, these affiliations are listed in Table 3. As a consequence of the multiplicity of trade unions listed, there are also numerous affiliations to European organisations other than ETF, ECA and ATCEUC. For brevity, only those European organisations that cover at least three countries are mentioned here, namely:

- the [European Federation of Public Service Unions \(EPSU\)](#), which covers 13 trade unions in eight countries;
- [UNI-Europa](#), with eight affiliations in four countries;
- the [European Federation of Food, Agriculture and Tourism Trade Unions \(EFFAT\)](#), with five members in four countries;
- the [European Metalworkers’ Federation \(EMF\)](#), with five members in four countries;
- the [European Mine, Chemical and Energy Workers’ Federation \(EMCEF\)](#), with four affiliations in four countries.

The presence of EPSU is attributed to the fact that parts of the civil aviation industry were or are still owned by the state. Moreover, due to its cross-sectoral domain, UNI-Europa also relates to civil aviation. The relationship of the remaining European associations to the sector is less evident. In principle, this relationship depends on how the national trade unions demarcate their domain. In many cases, the affiliations to European associations other than ETF, ECA and ATCEUC result from overlapping and rather broadly defined membership domains of the national trade unions which largely involve member groups outside of civil aviation. Even though the list of affiliations in Table 3 may be incomplete, this review confirms that the sector-related national trade unions are most frequently affiliated to ETF, ECA and ATCEUC.

An similar review of the memberships of the national employer organisations can be derived from Table 5. Most of the organisations do not show any membership of a European business interest

association. There is only one European association that has three members from three countries – namely, the [European Centre of Enterprises with Public Participation and of Enterprises of General Economic Interest \(CEEP\)](#). As with EPSU on the side of labour, this reflects the presence of public ownership in the sector. However, in terms of both the number of affiliations as well as territorial coverage, CEEP remains far behind the seven sector-related European business associations listed in Table 9.

Commentary

Compared with other sectors, the representational system of the civil aviation industry has several characteristics. One characteristic of the sector is its comparatively high degree of unionisation at national level. In comparison with many other service sectors, trade union density is usually high. The same holds true for employer density, where employer organisations exist, although this applies to only a minority of the 27 EU Member States. In the majority of countries, the large businesses in the sector act as trade union counterparts in industrial relations.

The high levels of density are backed by the sectionalist profile of many trade unions and employer organisations. This creates a ‘small size effect’, which helps overcome free-riding tendencies (see Olson, 1965). In addition, the fact that rather large businesses characterise major parts of the sector helps foster greater unionisation. The high levels of density are reflected in the high collective bargaining coverage. A comparison with recent figures on cross-sectoral collective bargaining coverage in 25 EU Member States (the EU25, prior to the accession of Bulgaria and Romania) indicates that bargaining coverage in civil aviation is higher than the country average in 16 of the 19 countries for which comparable data are available, whereas sectoral coverage is lower than the country average only in Austria (see Marginson and Traxler, 2005). In two countries, the sector’s coverage is equal to overall coverage. The main reasons for the comparatively high levels of coverage in civil aviation are the high levels of trade union density, as well as employer density in cases where employer associations are established. The relatively high economic concentration of the sector is conducive to single-employer bargaining in areas where employer organisations are absent.

Another property of the sector is that its associational system is highly heterogeneous and differentiated on both sides of industry. On the employee side, this heterogeneity is manifested in the large number of trade unions, which reflects the strong labour market segmentation in terms of qualifications and professions. Public ownership or its associational legacies in cases where privatisation has taken place meanwhile adds to this heterogeneity. This situation has given rise to two basic types of sector-related trade unions: overlapping or sectionalistically overlapping trade unions, which account for the major proportion of unionised employees in the sector; and occupational trade unions, which usually record a smaller share in sector unionisation but which register high levels of density within their narrow, occupational domain.

On the employer side, heterogeneity is not expressed in a large number of employer organisations. On the contrary, the number of employer organisations is small because the large companies in the sector are often the principal industrial relations actors rather than employer organisations. Nevertheless, the degree of associational heterogeneity is also remarkable on the employer side, as employer organisations, if existing, are usually based on a sectionalist or sectionalistically overlapping domain. The type of economic activities is the most important criterion for such domain demarcations. This means that the sector is also highly segmented in terms of business activities. Of the 11 national employer organisations with a sectionalist domain, seven are specialised in airlines. Two special associations also exist for airports and handlers.

On both sides of industry, this high degree of organisational heterogeneity at national level is reflected at the European level. Not only can a relatively large number of sector-related European

associations be found for business as well as labour, but also a notable number among these have demarcated their domain in a sectionalist way. The noteworthy exception to this rule is ETF and its overlapping domain. In January 2009, ETF, EPSU and [Union Syndicale Federal \(USF\)](#) – which is the umbrella of staff trade unions active within EU institutions, and which is an affiliate of EPSU – concluded an agreement to recognize ETF as the main organisation representing the interests of air traffic management members of EPSU and USF in civil aviation social dialogue. Compared with the trade unions as well as the national level of business association, the European-level associational system of business is even more differentiated. On the one hand, there is a special association for civil air navigation services that has no associational counterparts at national level. On the other hand, the representational system of airlines is far more differentiated according to subgroups at European level. In addition, a qualitative difference is evident in this respect. If special associations for subgroups of airlines exist at national level, then the organisational divide is always between domestic and foreign carriers. In contrast to this, the associational differentiation at European level follows the segmentation of sales markets. Finally, no organisational link exists between the national and European level of business interest associations, since all European associations have only companies as full or regular members.

References

- Grant, W., *Business and politics in Britain*, London, Macmillan, 1993.
- Institut des Sciences du Travail (IST), *Collective agreement extension mechanisms in EU member countries*, Catholic University of Louvain, Typescript, 2001.
- Marginson, P. and Traxler, F., ‘After enlargement: Preconditions and prospects for bargaining coordination’, *Transfer*, Vol. 11, No. 3, 2005.
- Olson, M., *The logic of collective action*, Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Traxler, F., ‘Business associations and labour unions in comparison’, *British Journal of Sociology*, No. 44, 1993.
- Traxler, F., ‘The metamorphoses of corporatism’, *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 43, No. 4, 2004.
- Traxler, F., Blaschke, S. and Kittel, B., *National labour relations in internationalised markets*, Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Visser, J. ‘Trends in trade union membership’, *OECD Employment Outlook*, 1991.

Annex: List of abbreviations

Country	Abbreviation	Full name of organisation
Austria (AT)	ACA	Austrian Cockpit Association
	FL	Federal Association of Aviation Companies
	GPA-DJP	Union of Salaried Employees, Graphical Workers and Journalists
	GPF	Union of Post and Telecommunications Employees
	ÖGB	Austrian Trade Union Federation
	Vida	Vida Trade Union
	WKÖ	Austrian Federal Economic Chamber
Belgium (BE)	ABVV/FGTB	Belgian General Confederation of Labour
	ACLVB/CGSLB	Federation of Liberal Trade Unions of Belgium
	ACV/CSC	Confederation of Christian Trade Unions
	ACV/CSC-Public Services	Confederation of Christian Trade Unions – Public Services
	ACV/CSC-Transcom	Confederation of Christian Trade Unions – Transport and Communications
	BAR	Board of Airline Representatives in Belgium
	BATA	Belgian Air Transport Association
	BBTK/SETCa	Belgian Union of White-collar, Technical and Executive Employees
	BeCA	Belgian Airline Pilot Association
	BTB	Belgian Transport Workers' Federation
	EFITTRA	Employers' Federation for International Trade, Transport and Related Activities
	FEB/VBO	Belgian Federation of Employers
	LBC/NVK	Federation of White-collar Workers and Managers
	VSOA-LRB/SLFP-ALR	Free Trade Union of the Public Service
	Bulgaria (BG)	BAA
BUL-ALPA		Bulgarian Airline Pilots' Association
CITUB		Confederation of Independent Trade Unions in Bulgaria
CL Podkrepa		Confederation of Labour 'Podkrepa'
Free Aviation TU		Free Aviation Trade Union Organisation

Country	Abbreviation	Full name of organisation
	FTTUB	Federation of Transport Trade Unions in Bulgaria
	FTW	Federation of Transport Workers
	Promiana	Trade Union of Air Traffic Controllers of the 'Promiana' Trade Union
	UPEB	Union of Private Entrepreneurs in Bulgaria 'Vuzrazhdane'
Cyprus (CY)	ASISEKA	Independent Trade Union of Cyprus Airways Employees
	OHO-SEK	Cyprus Workers' Confederation
	PALPU	Pancyprian Airline Pilots' Union
	PEO	Pancyprian Federation of Labour
	SIDIKEK	Local Authority Workers' and Employees' Trade Union
	SIPKKA	Cyprus Airways' Cabin Crew Union
	SYNYKA	Cyprus Airways Employees' Trade Union
Czech Republic (CZ)	ASO ČR	Association of Autonomous Trade Unions
	ČMKOS	Czech-Moravian Confederation of Trade Unions
	CZALDA	Czech Association of Air Traffic Controllers
	CZALPA	Czech Airline Pilots' Association ČSA
	CZATCA	Czech Air Traffic Controllers' Association
	CZLCA	Czech Load Controllers' Association
	OOML	Airline Mechanics' Union
	OOPL	Air Crew Trade Union Organisation
	OSD	Transport Workers' Union
Denmark (DK)	3F	United Federation of Danish Workers
	CUD	Cabin Union Denmark
	DA	Confederation of Danish Employers
	DALPA/DPF	Danish Airline Pilots' Association
	DATCA	Danish Air Traffic Controllers' Association
	DEF	Danish Union of Electricians
	DFF-S	Federation of Salaried Employees
	DI	Confederation of Danish Industries
	DMF	Danish Metalworkers' Union

Country	Abbreviation	Full name of organisation
	FTF	Confederation of Salaried Employees and Civil Servants
	HK Privat	Union of Commercial and Clerical Employees in Denmark/Private
	LH	Danish Association of Managers and Executives
	LLF	Federation of Salaried Employees in Air Transport
	LO	Danish Confederation of Trade Unions
Estonia (EE)	ALPA	Estonian Airline Pilots' Association
	EAKL	Confederation of Estonian Trade Unions
	ESSTU	Estonian Stewardesses' and Stewards' Trade Union
	ETTA	Estonian Transport and Road Workers' Trade Union
Finland (FI)	Akava	Confederation of Unions for Academic Professionals
	Akava Erityisalat	Akava Special Branches
	AKT	Transport Workers' Union
	ASSI	Association of Support Service Industries (affiliated to EK)
	EK	Confederation of Finnish Industries
	ET	Employers' Association of the Special Branches
	FPA	Finnish Pilots' Association
	IAU	Finnish Aviation Union
	JHL	Trade Union for the Public and Welfare Sectors
	LTY	Employers' Association for Transport and Special Services
	Pardia	Federation of Salaried Employees Pardia
	SAK	Central Organisation of Finnish Trade Unions
	SLJY	Finnish Air Traffic Controllers' Association
	SLSY	Cabin Crew Union
	STTK	Finnish Confederation of Salaried Employees
	TU	Union of Salaried Employees
	YTN	Federation of Professional and Managerial Staff
France (FR)	CFDT	French Democratic Confederation of Labour
	CFE-CGC	French Confederation of Professional and Managerial Staff – General Confederation of Professional and Managerial Staff
	CFTC	French Christian Workers' Confederation

Country	Abbreviation	Full name of organisation
	CGT	General Confederation of Labour
	CGT-FO	General Confederation of Labour – <i>Force Ouvrière</i>
	FGT-CFTC	General Federation of Transport – French Christian Workers' Confederation
	FGTE-CFDT	General Federation of Transport and Infrastructure – French Democratic Confederation of Labour
	FNAM	National Commercial Aviation Federation
	FNST-CGT	National Federation of Transport Unions – General Confederation of Labour
	FO-FETS-CGT-FO	Federation of Infrastructure, Transport and Services – General Confederation of Labour – <i>Force Ouvrière</i>
	SCARA	Union of Independent Airlines
	SNAC-CFTC	National Union of Civil Aviation – French Christian Workers' Confederation
	SNCTA	National Union of Air Traffic Controllers
	SNMSAC	National Union of Civil Aviation Technical Ground Staff
	SNOMAC	National Union of Civil Aviation Cabin Engineering Officers
	SNPL	National Pilots' Union
	SNPNAC	National Union of Civil Aeronautics Cabin Crew
	SNPNC	National Union of Commercial Cabin Crew
	SPAC	Civil Aviation Pilots' Union
	SPAF	Air France Pilots' Union
	UNAC	Union of Civil Aviation Cabin Crew
	UNSA	National Federation of Independent Unions
Germany (DE)	dbbtarifunion	Bargaining Cartel of the German Civil Service Association
	DGB	Confederation of German Trade Unions
	GdF	Gewerkschaft der Flugsicherung (Air navigation services' union)
	VC	Cockpit Association
	ver.di	United Services Union
	VKA	Confederation of Municipal Employers' Associations
Greece (EL)	FAU	Flight Attendants' Union

Country	Abbreviation	Full name of organisation
	GSEE	General Confederation of Labour of Greece
	HALPA	Hellenic Airline Pilots' Association
	OPAM	Air Transport Staff Federation
	OSPA	Civil Aviation Associations' Federation
	OSYPA	Federation of Civil Aviation Agency Associations
	UFAC	Union of Foreign Air Companies
Hungary (HU)	Control	Hungarian Air Traffic Controllers' Trade Union
	FORTISZ	Trade Union of Traffic and Ramp Officers
	GSZSZ	Trade Union of Economic Professionals
	HUNACCA	Hungarian Cabin Crew Association
	HUNALPA	Hungarian Airline Pilots' Association
	IDFSZ	Independent Trade Union of Workers in Air Traffic Control Technology
	JÉSZ	Workers' Union of Flight Service Provision
	LESZ	United Civil Aviation Trade Union
	LIFSZ	Air Traffic Controllers' Independent Trade Union
	LIGA	Democratic League of Independent Trade Unions
	LIGOSZ	Trade Union of Administration, Economic and Education Workers
	MALÉV SS	Trade Union of MALÉV
	MDM	Airport Minibus Drivers' Trade Union
	MLSZSZ	Trade Union of Hungarian Air Traffic Services
	MOSZ	Engine Drivers' Trade Union
	RDSZSZ	Trade Union of Airport Workers and Service Providers
	RMFSZ	Aircraft Technicians' Independent Trade Union
	RTFSZ	Independent Trade Union of Flight Information Specialists
Ireland (IE)	IBEC	Irish Business and Employers' Confederation
	ICTU	Irish Congress of Trade Unions
	IMPACT	Irish Municipal Public and Civil Trade Union
	Mandate	Union of Retail, Bar and Administrative Workers in Ireland
	SIPTU	Services, Industrial, Professional and Technical Union

Country	Abbreviation	Full name of organisation
	TEEU	Technical, Engineering and Electrical Union
	Unite	Unite the Union
Italy (IT)	ANPAC	National Association of Civil Aviation Pilots
	ANPAV	National Association of Flight Assistants
	Assaeroporti	Italian Association of Airport Management
	Assaereo	National Association of Vectors and Operators in Air Transport
	Assocatering	National Association of Catering Operators
	Assohandlers	Assohandlers' Association
	ATM-PP	Air Traffic Management Professional Project
	AVIA	Italian Associated Hostesses and Stewarts
	Confcommercio	General Confederation of Trade, Tourism, Services and SMEs
	CGIL	General Confederation of Italian Workers
	Confindustria	Confederation of Italian Industry
	CISL	Italian Confederation of Workers' Trade Unions
	FAIRO	Association of Foreign Airline Companies
	FILT	Italian Transport Workers' Federation
	FIT	Italian Transport Federation
	Or.SA	Autonomous Trade Union and Base Organisation
	SDL	Workers' Trade Union
	UGL	General Workers' Union
	UGL Trasporti	General Workers' Union – Transport
	UIL	Union of Italian Workers
	Uiltrasporti	Italian Union of Transport Workers
	UP	Union of Pilots
Latvia (LV)	LAAF	Latvian Federation of Civil Aviation Trade Unions
	LBAS	Free Trade Union Confederation of Latvia
Lithuania (LT)	FLDPS	Trade Union of 'Fly Lithuanian Airlines (LAL)' Workers
	LPS	Lithuania Trade Union 'Solidarity'
	LPSK	Lithuanian Trade Union Confederation
	LRSVA	Association of Air Traffic Controllers of the Republic of

Country	Abbreviation	Full name of organisation
		Lithuania
	ONDPS	Trade Union of Air Navigation Workers
	TVOUDPS	Vilnius Airport Trade Union
Luxembourg (LU)	ALPL	Luxembourg Pilots' Association
	GLCCA	Luxembourg Air Traffic Control
	LCGB	Luxembourg Christian Trade Union Confederation
	NGL-SNEP	National Union of Private Sector White-Collar Employees
	OGB-L	Independent Trade Union Confederation of Luxembourg
Malta (MT)	AAE	Malta Association of Airline Engineers
	CMTU	Confederation of Malta Trade Unions
	MATCA	Malta Air Traffic Controllers' Association
	UCC	Union of Cabin Crew
	UHM	Union of United Workers
Netherlands (NL)	ATC LVNL	Air Traffic Controllers – Air Traffic Control the Netherlands
	CNV	Christian Trade Union Federation
	CNV Bedrijvenbond	Industry, Food and Transport Workers' Union
	De Unie	Union of Intermediate and Higher Personnel
	FNV	Dutch Trade Union Federation
	FNV Bondgenoten	Federation of Dutch Trade Unions Allied Unions
	MHP	Federation of Managerial and Professional Staff Unions
	NL Guild	Netherlands Guild of Air Traffic Controllers
	OVN	Dutch Independent Pilots' Association
	TUEM	Trade Union Eurocontrol Maastricht
	VHKP	Association for Higher KLM Personnel
	VNC	Association of Dutch Cabin Personnel
	VNV	Association of Dutch Pilots
Poland (PL)	NSZZ S PLL LOT	Independent and Self-Governing Trade Union Solidarity of Polish Airline Employees LOT SA
	NSZZ Solidarność	Independent and Self-Governing Trade Union 'Solidarity'
	OPZZ	All-Poland Alliance of Trade Unions

Country	Abbreviation	Full name of organisation
	POLALPA	Polish Airline Pilots' Association
	ZZKRL	Trade Union of Air Traffic Controllers
	ZZPLP	Trade Union of Cockpit and Cabin Crew of PLL LOT
Portugal (PT)	APPLA	Association of Portuguese Airline Pilots
	CGTP-IN	General Confederation of Portuguese Workers
	CIP	Confederation of Portuguese Industry
	SIMA	Union of Metal Industries and Correlative Industries and Services
	SINCTA	Union of Air Traffic Controllers
	SINTAC	National Union of Civil Aviation Workers
	SITAVA	Union of Aviation and Airport Workers
	SITECSA	Union of Aerial Security Technicians
	SITEMA	Union of Aircraft Maintenance Technicians
	SITNA	Union of Air Travel Technicians
	SNPVAC	National Union of Civil Aviation Cabin Crew Staff
	SPAC	Union of Civil Aviation Pilots
	SQAC	Union of Qualified Ground Personnel in Commercial Aviation
	STHA	Union of Airport Handling Technicians
	UGT	General Workers' Confederation
Romania (RO)	AAR	Airports' Association of Romania
	ASTR	Trade Unions Alliance of Transport Workers from Romania
	ATCOR	Air Traffic Controllers' Trade Union
	BNS	National Trade Union Bloc
	CSNTR	Romanian Transport Workers' Trade Union Convention
	ETOS	Tarom ETOS Trade Union
	FSAR	Airport Workers' Trade Union Federation of Romania
	SETA	Airships Technical Exploitation Trade Union
	SIOT	Tarom Operational Independent Trade Union
	SITT	Tarom Technical Independent Trade Union
	SLIPEF	Free Independent Armada Exploitation Workers' Trade Union

Country	Abbreviation	Full name of organisation
	SPLR	Line Pilots' Trade Union of Romania
	SPNT	Tarom Aerial Navigators' Trade Union
	SSZT	Tarom Flight Safety Trade Union
Slovakia (SK)	KOZ SR	Central Confederation of Trade Unions
	OZ Doprava	Trade Union Association of Transport, Road Economy and Car-repair Industry
	ÚDPT SR	Union of Transport, Post and Telecommunications
Slovenia (SI)	CTU-90	Confederation of Trade Union 90
	GZS	Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Slovenia
	KNSS	Independent Confederation of New Trade Unions of Slovenia
	Pergam	Confederation of Trade Unions of Slovenia Pergam
	SAITS	Trade Union of Aeronautical Informatics and Technical Services
	SDKLRS-95	Trade Union of Air Traffic Controllers – 95
	SDLTP	Trade Union of Flying Technical Support
	Sindikát Adria	Trade Union Adria
	SLMS	Trade Union of Air Meteorologists
	SLTO	Trade Union of Avian Technical Operatives
	SLTOM	Trade Union of Flying Technical Staff Mechanics
	SPP	Trade Union of Traffic Pilots
	SSKL	Air Traffic Controllers' Trade Union
	SZPS	Trade Union of Air Transport Employers of Slovenia
	UCC-SLO	Slovenian Union of Cabin Crew
	ZDS	Association of Employers of Slovenia
	ZKOPLS	Trade Union of Cabin Crew of Slovenian Aircraft
	ZSSS	Confederation of Free Trade Unions of Slovenia
Spain (ES)	AECA	Spanish Association of Air Companies
	ASEATA	Association of Airport Handling Companies
	CC.OO	Trade Union Confederation of Workers' Commissions
	CEOE	Spanish Federation of Employer Organisations
	FGT-CC.OO	Communication and Transport Workers' Federation – Trade Union Confederation of Workers' Commissions

Country	Abbreviation	Full name of organisation
	FETCM-UGT	Aviation Sector of the National Federation of Transport, Communications and the Sea – General Workers' Confederation
	FSP-UGT	National Federation of Public Services – General Workers' Confederation
	SELPA	Spanish Trade Union of Airline Pilots
	SITCPLA	Independent Trade Union of Airline Passenger Cabin Crew
	UGT	General Workers' Confederation
	USCA	Trade Union of Air Controllers
	USO	Workers' Trade Union Confederation
	USO-STA	Workers' Trade Union Confederation – Aviation Sector
Sweden (SE)	Arbetsgivarverket	Swedish Agency for Government Employers
	Civilekonomerna	Swedish Association of Economics or Business School Graduates
	Flygarbetsgivarna	Swedish Air Transport Industry Employers' Association
	Jusek	Swedish Association of Graduates in Law, Business Administration and Economics, Computer and Systems Science, Personnel Management and Social Science
	Ledarna	Swedish Organisation for Managers
	SMA	Steel and Metal Employers' Association
	LO	Swedish Trade Union Confederation
	Pilotförbundet	United Pilots of Scandinavia
	SACO	Swedish Confederation of Professional Associations
	SEKO	Swedish Association for Service and Communication
	SFF	Swedish Flight Technicians' Association
	Sveriges Ingenjörer (SI)	Swedish Association of Graduate Engineers
	Svenskt Näringsliv (SN)	Confederation of Swedish Enterprise
	Statstjänstemannaförbundet (ST)	Union of Civil Servants
	Swealpa	Swedish Airline Pilots' Association
	TCO	Swedish Confederation of Professional Employees
	Transport	Swedish Transport Workers' Union

Country	Abbreviation	Full name of organisation
	Unionen	Union of White-collar Workers
United Kingdom (UK)	BALPA	British Airline Pilots' Association
	BATA	British Air Transport Association
	PCS	Public and Commercial Services Union
	Prospect	Trade Union 'Prospect'
	TUC	Trades Union Congress
	Unison	Trade Union Unison
	Unite	Unite the Union
Europe	ATCEUC	Air Traffic Controllers' European Union Coordination
	BAR Europe	Board of Airline Representatives in Europe
	CEC	European Confederation of Executives and Managerial Staff
	CEEP	European Centre of Enterprises with Public Participation and of Enterprises of General Economic Interest
	CES	Economic and Social Council
	ECA	European Cockpit Association
	EFBWW	European Federation of Building and Woodworkers
	EFFAT	European Federation of Food, Agriculture and Tourism Trade Unions
	EICTA	European Information, Communications and Consumer Electronics Industry Technology Association
	EMCEF	European Mine, Chemical and Energy Workers' Federation
	EMF	European Metalworkers' Federation
	EPSU	European Federation of Public Service Unions
	ETF	European Transport Workers' Federation
	ETUF:TCL	European Trade Union Federation: Textiles, Clothing and Leather
	EULOS	European Network of Independent Unions of Local Authority Staff
	Eurocontrol	European Organisation for the Safety of Air Navigation
	Eurofedop	European Organisation of Public Service Employees

Country	Abbreviation	Full name of organisation
	EURO-WEA	European Workers' Educational Association
	FERPA	European Federation of Retired and Older Persons
	FIOST	International Trade Union Federation of Transport Workers
	HORECA	International Federation of Hotels, Restaurants and Cafés
	HOTREC	Hotels, Restaurants and Cafés in Europe
	IFATCA	International Federation of Air Traffic Controllers' Associations
	PSI	Public Services International
	SCECBU	Standing Committee of European Central Bank Unions
	SPA	SkyTeam Pilots' Association
	UNI-Europa	Union Network International – Europe

Franz Traxler, Department of Industrial Sociology, University of Vienna
EF/09/105/EN