INTRODUCTION

In a study aimed at generating baseline data about workers in the Philippine call center and business process outsourcing (BPO) industry, particularly, their employment terms and conditions and attitudes to trade unions as well as the context and possibilities of trade union organizing in that industry, Sale and Bool (2005) noted that labor standards on hours of work were generally being met. But night work during the prohibited interval for women employees, who constituted the majority in the survey, remained widespread. While the workers were young, night shifts adversely affected the health of a substantial number. 3 out of 4 workers in the sample encountered moderate to heavy work pressure, and 1 out of 2 was neither happy nor unhappy at the workplace. Majority of the respondents were in customer service. A big majority received ₱15,000 or less by way of average monthly take home pay. Majority had general knowledge about trade unions, despite their young age and notwithstanding that almost all were non-members. Nearly 2 out of 3 workers considered salary/wage negotiation as the most important role of trade unions. 51% were interested to join an affordable, principled and efficient workplace union. They concluded that it is possible to organize workplace trade unions in the call center and BPO industry. Organizing efforts should be industry-based rather than firm-based, due to the attrition rate and the prevalence of definite or fixed-period employment.

Later, Bool (2007) explored the potential of unionism in the country’s call centers by looking at employees’ predisposition to unionization taking into consideration their working conditions and socio-demographic factors. Employing probability proportional to size (PPS) sampling technique, the size of the sample was established using the Sloven formula at + 10% margin of error at 95% confidence interval or one hundred (100) respondents from randomly chosen Metro Manila call centers – Sykes Asia, Inc., Convergys Corporation and eTelecare International. Data were gathered through self-administration of survey questionnaire that captured respondents’ socio-demographic characteristics and conditions of employment. Data were analyzed using statistical tools on descriptive and causal (logistic regression) research. The study disclosed that the predisposition to join a union is a function of the following factors or independent variables: (1) average monthly income, (2) function or purpose of communication at work, (3) availability of company rules and regulations, (4) age, and (5) knowledge about trade union. Based on the study, call center employees are predisposed to join a
trade union if (1) they have lower monthly income, (2) the purpose of communication mechanisms at work is to merely inform, (3) availability of company rules and regulations is lesser, (4) they are younger, and (5) they have greater knowledge about trade union.

In another study commenced in 2008 and completed the year after, the authors took a closer look at the model for employee voluntary turnover developed by James March and Herbert Simon (1958) and cited by Kochan (1980). Based on the model, turnover is affected by two factors – ease of leaving and desirability of leaving a firm. Ease of leaving is primarily determined by alternative employment opportunities outside the firm. This means that the more attractive the labor market outside, the higher the probability of leaving. The desire to leave is a function of dissatisfaction at the current job, that is the higher the dissatisfaction level, the greater the probability of leaving. However, if there is opportunity to voice out employee dissatisfaction that would lead to changes in work conditions, employees might choose the “voice” rather than the “exit” option. Building on information generated from their previous studies and using data on turnover from call centers and others, the authors attempted to determine and explain the relationship between turnover and voice.

In this paper, the authors delve into turnover, voice, risks and collaboration in Philippine call centers, exploring their relationship, if any.

BACKGROUND

Collaboration traces its roots to two schools of thought – classic liberalism (market individualism involving exchange and preferences) and civic republicanism (community integration of shared preferences). The participants in collaboration are co-laboring with each other.

O’Flynn (2008) notes that distinctions were made by Himmelman “who made the case that collaboration was just one of four common strategies for working together, each representing a unique inter-organisational linkage, requiring different commitments of trust, time and turf. Each is more or less appropriate in different circumstances. In brief, the strategies are:

• Networking is an informal relationship in which information is exchanged for mutual benefit. This choice often reflects limited time, low levels of trust

---

1 In this section of the paper, the authors draw from the doctoral thesis/dissertation proposal of J.P. Sale tentatively titled “An analysis of Philippine labor disputes from the perspective of governance and decision theories: Shifting methods from command to collaboration?” scheduled for defense at the University of the Philippines National College of Public Administration and Governance in May 2010.
3 Id., at 3.
and a reluctance to share or concede turf. Himmelman uses the example of an early childhood centre and a public health department exchanging information about their approaches to supporting early childhood development. xx.

- **Coordination** involves a more formal linkage in which information is exchanged and activities are altered in pursuit of mutual benefit and achievement of common purpose. Compared with networking, it involves more time and higher trust, but little or no access to one another’s turf. Himmelman suggests that when the two parties mentioned above then decide to alter their service schedules to provide combined support in a more user-friendly way, this constitutes coordination. xx.

- **Cooperation** involves an exchange of information, altering activities and resource sharing for mutual benefit in pursuit of a common purpose. Organisational commitments are higher, formal agreements can be used and this linkage requires higher levels of time and trust vis-à-vis networking and coordination. Each party will provide access to its turf. If the two parties Himmelman discusses now agree to share outreach services to increase the overall effectiveness of their support for early childhood development, this represents cooperation. xx.

- **Collaboration** is distinctive as it involves a willingness of the parties to enhance one another’s capacity—helping the other to ‘be the best they can be’ (Himmelman 2002:3)—for mutual benefit and common purpose. In collaboration, the parties share risks, responsibilities and rewards, they invest substantial time, have high levels of trust and share common turf. Where Himmelman’s two organisations now agree to provide skill-development training for the staff of the other organisation to enhance capacity and enable improved support for early childhood development, this reflects collaboration. xx.”

Himmelman (2002) argues that networking, coordinating, cooperating and collaborating are different forms of working together, but each may be regarded as a developmental stage in a relationship. As in a continuum, the more organizations engage in turf wars (taking greater risks in the process), the closer they are to networking and, beyond that, competing. The higher levels of time, trust and turf shared among organizations, the closer they get to collaboration (and lesser risks).

---

4 Id., at 185-186.
Trust is an indispensable building block for collaboration, as emphasized by Huxham and Vangen (2008) in the following trust-building loop. They argue that there can be two starting points: one based on reputation or past behavior or on more formal contracts and agreements, the other involves risk taking.\textsuperscript{6}

\textsuperscript{6} J. O’Flynn and J. Wanna, op. cit. supra, note 2, at 34-35.
This is similar to the A1 situation contemplated in the equation for the prisoners’ dilemma and is akin to March’s rule-based decision making. In explaining the prisoners’ dilemma, March (1994)\(^8\) uses the equation \(A_3 < A_1 < A_2 < A_4\), where:

- \(A =\) prison term of a certain length
- \(A_1 =\) if both cooperate and remain silent
- \(A_2 =\) if both do not cooperate and both confess
- \(A_3 =\) if one does not cooperate by confessing
- \(A_4 =\) if one cooperates and remains silent

If both prisoners decide to cooperate and remain silent, they will get a prison length \(A_1\), which is less than prison length \(A_2\) that would be the result should both decide not to cooperate and to confess instead. If one does not cooperate by confessing while the other cooperates and remains silent, the former would get the shortest prison term of length \(A_3\), while the latter would receive the longest at prison term \(A_4\). If these are the expectations, the parties are likely to opt for \(A_2\) if they decide on the basis of the logic of consequences and attempt to minimize the maximum losses ("minimax rule") as in game theory.

\(^7\) Ibid.
According to Peters (2001), citing Dror, such “minimax rule” has been applied in the study of policy making – labeled as “policy gambling” – based on the premise that much is unknown about the policy environment; thus policy makers actually “gamble” when they make policy and try to minimize maximum losses by making conservative policy choices to avoid huge losses (or externalities).9

However, the other alternative is for the parties to opt for A1 and decide on the basis of the logic of appropriateness, fulfilling identities by recognizing situations and complying with rules that match appropriate behavior to situations.10 Here, the parties act based on rules (e.g., as a friend, relative, or collaborator) instead of choices, as when one party acts in the same way as the other because of considerations of reputation, trust, retaliation, and learning (“tit-for-tat rule”).11

The resolution of the prisoners’ dilemma is based on trust, experience and making sense of the situation.12 Sense-making involves the social construction or shaping of preferences, identities and reality.13 Partnerships that endure introduce considerations of reputation, trust, retaliation, and learning into the rationality equation.14 Experience and trust are expressions of appropriate decision behavior rather than purely rational self-interested behavior.15

A2 situations reflect purely rational self-interested behavior or competition, while A1 situations indicate experience and trust the ultimate outcome of which could be collaboration. The dynamics of these decision situations are depicted in the next figure developed by Crow (2002).

---

10 J.G. March, op. cit. supra, note 8, at 121-124.
11 Ibid.
13 Id, at 176-177.
14 Id, at 182.
15 Ibid.
Significantly, Wolff (2005) has devised a tool called the Continuum of Collaboration Worksheet that allows the assessment of efforts in making use of networking, coordination, cooperation and collaboration and determination of the frequency of actual and desired use of these processes, to wit –

The Continuum of Collaboration Worksheet

**Instructions:** Given the definitions of networking, coordinating, cooperating and collaborating, identify the following:

- With an “x” identify which functions are most frequently used in your collaborative efforts
- Discuss how you might like to change this “mix”
- With an “o” identify where you would like to be (which functions you would like to use more frequently, etc.)
- Discuss and note what your collaborative needs to do to make this happen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Use Frequently</th>
<th>Use Sometimes</th>
<th>Hardly Ever Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Exchanging information)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Exchange information Alter/harmonize activities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blake (2008), citing March and Shapiro, explains that decision makers in organizations tend to be risk-averse if organizational performance is just above target level, while they tend to be risk-takers if organizational performance is just below or well above target level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Level</th>
<th>Performance well above target (risk-taking behavior)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survival Level</td>
<td>Performance just above target (risk-aversion behavior)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinction Level</td>
<td>Performance just below target (risk-taking behavior)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival Level</td>
<td>Performance just above survival (risk-aversion behavior)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinction Level</td>
<td>Performance below survival</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The extent of risk-taking (or risk-aversion) could be examined via Himmelman’s matrix of strategies for working together.

When targets are being met (or not) are call centers and their employees risk-takers (or risk-averse)? Are voice regimes in call centers (if any) types of working together, i.e., networking, coordinating, cooperating or collaborating? What are the

---

factors contributing to their success or failure? Do they affect turnover? Do they make unions superfluous as there is none in the industry thus far? Are public policy reforms necessary? What techniques or approaches are proper for non-unionized workplaces? These are some issues that the present descriptive and correlational study hopes to address through an analysis of relevant provisions of the Labor Code of the Philippines (including the implementing rules) and call center data on income, turnover and voice mechanisms, among others.

METHODS

In this study, the correlation among turnover, voice, risks and collaboration in Philippine call centers, if any, is determined and explained by building on information generated from previous studies and using new data on income and turnover.

The extent of risk-taking or risk-aversion is determined through Himmelman’s matrix of strategies for working together (Figure 1) and an abridged version of Wolff’s The Continuum of Collaboration Worksheet (Appendix “A”).

A group discussion on administrative investigation and grievance handling and Himmelman’s matrix of strategies for working together was conducted on 12 December 2009 involving 12 graduate students in the University of the Philippines School of Labor and Industrial Relations as part of the core course Labor Standards, Justice and Equity handled by one of the authors. After the discussion, the students were asked to respond to the worksheet exercise and simulate grievance handling. The results of the worksheet exercise and other data are presented in the next section of the paper. For quantitative data, percentages, ratios and proportions were computed. Scatter plots were also derived.

Descriptive research is also used to ascertain and explain whether voice regimes in call centers are types of working together, the factors contributing to their success or failure, whether they make unions superfluous, the techniques or approaches proper for non-unionized workplaces, and the need, if any, for public policy reforms.

---

19 A correlational relationship means that two things or variables perform in a synchronized manner. For example, when inflation is high, unemployment also tends to be high and when inflation is low, unemployment also tends to be low. The two variables are correlated; but that does not mean that one causes the other. In a positive relationship, high values on one variable are associated with high values on the other and low values on one are associated with low values on the other. A negative or inverse relationship implies that high values on one variable are associated with low values on the other. (Trochim, William. The Research Methods Knowledge Base 2e. http://www.atomicpublishing.com.) See also Sale, Jonathan P. (2008). Labor Market Institutions and Political Development in the Philippines: Trends, Patterns and Directions. TUCP Profesorial Chair Lecture. July 2008. UP SOLAIR Auditorium.

20 Sale, J.P. teaches Labor Standards, Justice and Equity at the University of the Philippines School of Labor and Industrial Relations.


22 Descriptive studies are designed to describe what is going on or what exists. (Ibid.)
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondents’ Profile

67% of the respondents work in the call center and BPO industry, e.g., IBM Business Services, Inc., Sky Arrow Tech., Inc., Telus International Philippines, Emerson Electric Asia, Emerson Network Power, Teledvelopment Services, and Hewlett-Packard Philippines Corporation.

Collaboration, Risks and Voice

The following table shows the distribution of responses to the Continuum of Collaboration Worksheet –

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Use Frequently</th>
<th>Use Sometimes</th>
<th>Hardly Ever Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking (Exchanging information)</td>
<td>7 = O 6 = X</td>
<td>3 = O 5 = X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination (Exchange information Alter/harmonize activities)</td>
<td>9 = O 5 = X</td>
<td>1 = O 6 = X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation (Exchange information Alter/harmonize activities Share resources)</td>
<td>7 = O 5 = X</td>
<td>3 = O 5 = X 1 = X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration (Exchange information Alter/harmonize activities Share resources Enhance capacity)</td>
<td>10 = O 1 = X</td>
<td>7 = X</td>
<td>1 = O 3 = X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table –

- collaboration was hardly ever used in the workplace for 25%
- cooperation was hardly ever used in the workplace for 8%
- no one said networking or coordination was hardly ever used in the workplace
- 8% would like to hardly ever use collaboration in the workplace
- 58% use collaboration sometimes in the workplace
- 50% use coordination sometimes in the workplace
- 42% use cooperation sometimes in the workplace
- 42% use networking sometimes in the workplace
- 25% would like to sometimes use cooperation in the workplace
• 25% would like to sometimes use networking in the workplace
• 8% would like to sometimes use coordination in the workplace
• 50% use networking frequently in the workplace
• 42% use coordination frequently in the workplace
• 42% use cooperation frequently in the workplace
• collaboration is used frequently in the workplace for 8%
• 83% would like to use more frequently collaboration in the workplace
• 75% would like to use more frequently coordination in the workplace
• 58% would like to use more frequently cooperation in the workplace
• 58% would like to use more frequently networking in the workplace

Thus, a big majority actually use collaboration, while \( \frac{1}{2} \) actually use coordination, sometimes in the workplace. A larger proportion said they would like to use more frequently in the workplace collaboration and coordination.

Moreover, the desire to use networking, coordination, cooperation, and collaboration more frequently in the workplace is greater than the desire to use them sometimes or hardly ever, as indicated by the wide disparity or difference between those who would like to use them more frequently and those who would like to use them sometimes or hardly ever.

Figure 5 - Where respondents would like to be

The disparity or difference is narrow between those who frequently use and those who sometimes (occasionally) use networking, coordination and cooperation, signifying commonality in actual usage. The disparity or difference is wide between frequent use of collaboration and occasional use of collaboration, the latter being higher. Collaboration is hardly ever used in more workplaces (compared to frequent use of collaboration). Among the forms of working together, networking is highest in
terms of frequent use. Collaboration is highest in terms of occasional use and scant use, and lowest in terms of frequent use.

Figure 6 – Where respondents are

With respect to voice regimes extant in Philippine call centers and BPO firms, the following were established by Bool (2007) –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer’s Communication Mechanism with Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin board, internal paper mail, email, intranet, team meetings (5)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin board, email, intranet, team meetings (3)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin board, email, team meetings (3)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email, team meetings (2)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin board, team meetings (2)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, Sale and Bool (2005) came out with the following findings in their earlier study –
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer’s Communication Mechanism with Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team meetings (1)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email, team meetings (2)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin board, team meetings (2)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email, intranet, team meetings (3)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin board, internal paper mail, email, intranet, team meetings (5)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intranet (1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2007 data suggest that the variety of employer’s communication mechanisms with staff increased or widened. The top response in 2007 reflects five (5) different mechanisms (bulletin board, internal paper mail, email, intranet, team meetings), while the top response in 2005 reflects only one (1) mechanism (team meetings). Also, the top response in 2007 shows a combination of electronic and non-electronic forms of communication, while that in 2005 indicates only a non-electronic form of communication.

In terms of availability of work rules, purpose of communication mechanisms at work and interest to join a union, Bool (2007) noted that –

- company work rules were available for 86% of her respondents
- changes in company work rules were available for 77%
- the purpose of communication mechanisms at work is to inform (not consult) for 58%
- 62% would be interested to join an affordable, principled and efficient union

In contrast, Sale and Bool (2005) reported in their earlier study that –

- company work rules were available for 83%
- changes in company work rules were available for 72%
- the purpose of communication mechanisms at work is to inform (not consult) for 54%
- 51% would be interested to join an affordable, principled and efficient union.

Comparing the data in the two studies done in two different time periods, it will be noted that the 2007 data increased from the 2005 data by –

1. 3% for availability of company work rules
2. 5% for availability of changes in company work rules
3. 4% as to mere information being the purpose of communication mechanisms at work
4. 11% as to those interested to join affordable, principled and efficient union

Turnover and Income

The Business Processing Association Philippines (BPA/P) estimated the revenues of call centers at US$24 million in 2000, US$56 million in 2001, US$120 million in 2002, US$320 million in 2003, US$800 million in 2004, and US$1.7 billion in 2005. According to the Congressional Planning and Budget Department, House of Representatives, in 2006 the industry earned approximately US$2.7 billion in total revenues and employed nearly 160,000 agents. BPA/P estimates call center revenues at US$5.29 billion in 2010. It was also reported that the Philippine attrition rate is relatively manageable at 60% as compared to 102% in India (computed as the number of employees who left the company divided by the number of those who joined the company in a particular period), albeit, according to an economist the attrition rate is less than 50% in the Philippines compared to more than 100% in India. It was also noted that a contact center agent stays with the employer for an average of two (2) years in the Philippines compared to six (6) months in the USA. The high attrition rate is partly due to the non-regular nature of agents’ employment.

Public Policy

Through the exercise of the rights to self-organization and collective bargaining, terms and conditions of employment may be negotiated, fixed, arranged or modified over and above minimum standards. Under the Philippine Labor Code, they are companion rights since a union is organized in whole or in part for the purpose of collective bargaining and of dealing with the employer about terms and conditions of employment.

The first step involves the labor organization’s formation, registration and acquisition of majority status. Rank and file employees may form a labor organization.

---

29 LABOR CODE, art. 212.
So may supervisory employees, but not managerial employees. After its formation, the labor organization becomes a legitimate labor organization (LLO) upon registration with the Department of Labor and Employment (DoLE). That the membership of the labor organization must comprise at least 20% of employees in the bargaining unit is required for independent registration. However, charter registration by a national union or labor federation is an alternative. An LLO has certain rights arising from law like the right to become the exclusive bargaining representative (EBR) of employees in the bargaining unit. EBR or majority status is obtained through ways authorized by law, sometimes referred to as representation disputes.

Before the second step commences, certain “jurisdictional preconditions” must exist. The LLO must not only possess EBR status, it must give proof of such status and send a valid demand to bargain to the employer. Once these preconditions are met, the second step is set in motion and the parties negotiate on proposals and counter-proposals as part of their duty to bargain collectively. This is signified by the reply of the employer to the demand to bargain of the EBR. The duty to bargain collectively means the duty to meet and convene promptly, expeditiously and in good faith for the purpose of negotiating an agreement on wages, hours of work and all other terms and conditions of employment, including proposals for adjusting grievances or questions arising under the agreement. A majority of the employees in the bargaining unit must then ratify the CBA, after which the same shall be registered with the DoLE. A deadlock in bargaining is a valid ground for a notice of strike or lockout. So is unfair labor practice. The duty to bargain collectively when the preconditions are met applies to single-enterprise bargaining. It does not apply to the new concept of multi-employer bargaining under the amendatory Implementing Rules, which is purely voluntary. In multi-employer bargaining, the CBA covers two or more certified or recognized bargaining units in two or more enterprises.

The third step involves the administration or implementation of the CBA, during which grievance handling and voluntary arbitration are crucial.

In 2007, a new law on labor relations came into effect in the Philippines – Republic Act 9481 – to strengthen the right to self-organization. Among the major features of the law are the relaxation of requirements on charter registration of union

30 LABOR CODE, art. 234.
33 Kiok Loy v. NLRC, G.R. No. 54334, January 22, 1986; LABOR CODE, art. 250.
34 LABOR CODE, art. 252.
locals or chapters, the eligibility of the unions of rank and file and supervisors in an establishment to join the same national union or federation, the removal of certain grounds for cancellation of union registration, and the applicability of the “employer bystander rule” during representation disputes. Under said rule, the employer is regarded as a bystander because the employer shall not be considered a party to the representation dispute. These are significant changes designed to make it easier for workers to organize and bargain collectively. But the DoLE has yet to issue the necessary rules and regulations to implement the provisions of this relatively new law. Up to now no union has been organized and, consequently, there is no CBA in the Philippine call center and BPO industry.

CONCLUSIONS

In Philippine call centers, the tendency for risk aversion is reflected in data showing that 58% actually use collaboration, while another 50% actually use coordination, sometimes in the workplace. This is evident as well from data indicating that a larger proportion would like to use collaboration and coordination more frequently in the workplace.

Voice regimes extant in call centers – bulletin board, internal paper mail, email, intranet, and team meetings – are, at least, forms of networking (exchange of information). At most, they could partake of the nature of coordination (exchange of information and harmonization of activities). This is buttressed by data showing that networking is highest in terms of frequent use, followed by coordination. This is also supported by data exhibiting high and still increasing demand for voice through unions, which could pave the way for cooperation and collaboration via CBAs.

The success (in terms of persistence) of existing voice regimes may be attributable to the variety of employer communication mechanisms with staff which has increased or widened over time. A combination of electronic and non-electronic forms of communication is now available. However, their persistence also contributes to the rising demand for more meaningful voice regimes, i.e., those in the nature of cooperation and collaboration. In that sense, unions are not rendered superfluous.

But public policy reforms making it easier to organize non-regular employees and form industry unions are necessary in light of high turnover rate. Moreover, the 20% requirement for independent registration must be relaxed, if not eliminated, given employment size in the industry. Unions should start organizing non-regular employees and focusing on recruitment. And the DoLE must immediately issue the implementing rules and regulations of Republic Act 9481.

There appears to be a positive correlation among turnover, demand for voice, risk aversion (as indicated, for instance, by the greater desire to use networking, coordination, cooperation, and collaboration more frequently in the workplace), and income or revenues.
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**APPENDIX “A”**

**WORKSHEET**

*Instructions*: Given the definitions of networking, coordinating, cooperating and collaborating, identify the following:

- With an “x” identify which functions are most frequently used in your workplace
- With an “o” identify where you would like to be (which functions you would like to use more frequently in the workplace, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Use Frequently</th>
<th>Use Sometimes</th>
<th>Hardly Ever Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking (Exchanging information)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination (Exchange information Alter/harmonize activities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation (Exchange information Alter/harmonize activities Share resources)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration (Exchange information Alter/harmonize activities Share resources Enhance capacity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---