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**Introduction**

Little is known about this important collective industrial relations actor (OECD, 2017)

The common assumption is that the current direction of economic change is detrimental to employers’ associations (Traxler, 2004)

Italian employers' associations are traditionally strongly fragmented and this tendency has been accentuated in recent years (Bellardi, 2013)

Scholars have questioned the possible repercussions on collective agreements and on the structure of collective bargaining as a whole.

To shed light on this topic we utilised RIL, a survey conducted by INAPP, in its fourth edition, 2015.
**Employers’ Association fragmentation**

Progressive and important decrease in membership rates and density

*Share of firms with an association membership and share of employees in firms with an association membership, Years 2005 and 2015 (%)*

Source: Authors’ calculations based on data from INAPP-RIL
Employers’ Association Membership  Clear weight of the classical “determinants” within the Italian IR system on membership rates and density

Membership rate of firms with at least one employee per specific characteristics, 2015 (%)

Membership rate of employees in firms with at least one employee, members of an employers’ association per specific characteristics, 2015 (%)

Source: Authors’ calculations based on data from INAPP-RIL
**Multi-employer CB** Increase of firms applying a CCNL... but outside of an employers’ organisation

Composition of firms with at least one employee, members of an employers’ association and applying a CCNL, Years 2005 and 2015 (%)

- **2005**
  - No answer: 18.8%
  - No membership and no application; No answer and no application: 7.7%
  - Application and no membership: 56.8%
  - Membership and application: 7.4%

- **2015**
  - No answer: 40.9%
  - No membership and no application; No answer and no application: 14.5%
  - Application and no membership: 44.7%
  - Membership and application: 9.3%

Source: Authors’ calculations based on data from INAPP-RIL
**CCNL and Membership**  CCNL coverage maintained owing to the increase in the share of employees in firms that do not join an Employers’ Association

*Composition of employees in firms with at least one employee, members of an employers’ association and applying a CCNL, for Years: 2005 and 2015 (%)*

- **2005**
  - No answer: 4.2%
  - No membership and no application; No answer and no application: 3.0%
  - Application and no membership: 10.2%
  - Membership and application: 71.9%

- **2015**
  - No answer: 6.9%
  - No membership and no application; No answer and no application: 26.4%
  - Application and no membership: 66.7%

- **decrease by about 5pp in the share of employees in firms that join an Employers’ Association**
- **about 16pp increase in the share of employees in firms that do not join an Employers’ Association**

Source: Authors’ calculations based on data from INAPP-RIL
Company level CB: trends  Decrease in the share of firms stating to apply a company level agreement as well as in employees’ coverage

Incidence per firms’ size, Years 2005 and 2015 (%)

Incidence of employees in firms with at least one employee per firms’ size, Years 2005 and 2015 (%)

Source: Authors’ calculations based on data from INAPP-RIL
Conclusion

Stagnation in membership rates and density

1) Multi-employer bargaining has not been affected

• However over time, the number of free-rider employers has increased

• This context could favour the phenomena of ‘Law shopping’

2) Firm-level bargaining is at a standstill

• The coverage, already limited, has further decreased and remains a prerogative of large firms

• SMEs prefer multi-employer bargaining (especially if “pirate”)