

# The SAGE Handbook of Industrial Relations

Edited by  
Paul Blyton  
Nicolas Bacon  
Jack Fiorito  
and Edmund Heery



The SAGE  
Handbook of

# Industrial Relations





The SAGE  
Handbook of  
**Industrial Relations**



Edited by  
Paul Blyton  
Nicolas Bacon  
Jack Fiorito  
and Edmund Heery



Los Angeles • London • New Delhi • Singapore

Introduction and Editorial Arrangement © Paul Blyton,  
Nicolas Bacon, Jack Fiorito and Edmund Heery 2008  
Chapters 1–34 © SAGE Publications Ltd 2008

First published 2008

Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, this publication may be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form, or by any means, only with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction, in accordance with the terms of licences issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside those terms should be sent to the publishers.

SAGE Publications Ltd  
1 Oliver's Yard  
55 City Road  
London EC1Y 1SP

SAGE Publications Inc.  
2455 Teller Road  
Thousand Oaks, California 91320

SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd  
B 1/I 1 Mohan Cooperative Industrial Area  
Mathura Road  
New Delhi 110 044

SAGE Publications Asia-Pacific Pte Ltd  
33 Pekin Street #02-01  
Far East Square  
Singapore 048763

**Library of Congress Control Number: 2007934979**

**British Library Cataloguing in Publication data**

A catalogue record for this book is available from  
the British Library

ISBN 978-1-4129-1154-2

Typeset by CEPHA Imaging Pvt. Ltd., Bangalore, India  
Printed in India at Replika Press Pvt. Ltd  
Printed on paper from sustainable resources

# Contents

List of Figures	viii
List of Tables	ix
Notes on Contributors	xi
Preface	xviii
1 Introduction: The Field of Industrial Relations <i>Edmund Heery, Nicolas Bacon, Paul Blyton and Jack Fiorito</i>	1
<b>PART ONE PERSPECTIVES AND APPROACHES</b>	<b>33</b>
2 The History of Industrial Relations as a Field of Study <i>Carola M. Frege</i>	35
3 Industrial Relations and the Social Sciences <i>Peter Ackers and Adrian Wilkinson</i>	53
4 System and Change in Industrial Relations Analysis <i>Edmund Heery</i>	69
5 Values, Ideologies, and Frames of Reference in Industrial Relations <i>John W. Budd and Devasheesh Bhave</i>	92
6 The Influence of Product Markets on Industrial Relations <i>William Brown</i>	113
7 Varieties of Capitalism and Industrial Relations <i>Kerstin Hamann and John Kelly</i>	129
8 New Forms of Work and the High Performance Paradigm <i>Stephen Procter</i>	149
9 Changing Traditions in Industrial Relations Research <i>George Strauss and Keith Whitfield</i>	170

<b>PART TWO</b>	<b>THE ACTORS IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS</b>	<b>187</b>
10	Trade Union Morphology <i>Jack Fiorito and Paul Jarley</i>	189
11	Trade Union Strategy <i>Peter Boxall</i>	209
12	Employer Organizations <i>Franz Traxler</i>	225
13	Management Strategy and Industrial Relations <i>Nicolas Bacon</i>	241
14	The State in Industrial Relations <i>Richard Hyman</i>	258
15	The Legal Framework of Employment Relations <i>Simon Deakin and Wanjiru Njoya</i>	284
16	The State as Employer <i>Marick F. Masters, Ray Gibney, Iryna Shevchuk, and Tom Zagenczyk</i>	305
17	International Actors and International Regulation <i>Rebecca Gumbrell-McCormick</i>	325
18	Works Councils <i>Jean Jenkins and Paul Blyton</i>	346
19	The Evolution of Stakeholder Regimes: Beyond Neo-Corporatism <i>Charles Heckscher</i>	358
<b>PART THREE</b>	<b>INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS PROCESSES</b>	<b>375</b>
20	Union Formation <i>John Godard</i>	377
21	The Changing Structure of Collective Bargaining <i>Robert J. Flanagan</i>	406
22	The High Performance Work Systems Literature in Industrial Relations <i>Ann C. Frost</i>	420
23	Employee Involvement and Direct Participation <i>Russell D. Lansbury and Nick Wailes</i>	434
24	Resolving Conflict <i>David Lewin</i>	447

<b>PART FOUR</b>	<b>INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS OUTCOMES</b>	<b>469</b>
25	Contingent Work Arrangements <i>Daniel G. Gallagher</i>	471
26	The Theory and Practice of Pay Setting <i>Alex Bryson and John Forth</i>	491
27	Working Time and Work-Life Balance <i>Paul Blyton</i>	513
28	Worker Well-Being <i>David Guest</i>	529
29	Industrial Relations Climate <i>Ali Dastmalchian</i>	548
30	Equality at Work <i>Barbara Pocock</i>	572
31	Conflict at Work <i>Gregor Gall and Robert Hebdon</i>	588
32	Skill Formation <i>Irena Grugulis</i>	606
33	Industrial Relations and Business Performance <i>John T. Delaney</i>	623
34	Labor Market Institutions Around the World <i>Richard B. Freeman</i>	640
	Index	659

# List of Figures

5.1	Defining ideology and frame of reference	93
11.1	The context of trade union strategy	211
11.2	Phases of industry evolution	213
11.3	Four patterns of trade union strategic choice in neo-liberal environments	216
11.4	Willman's 'Union Portfolio'	217
16.1	IR systems framework of the state as employer	306
29.1	The industrial relations climate model and summary of relevant factors	554
29.2	Simplified model of organizational performance	561
31.1	US – strike days per 1,000 workers, 1948–2006	599
31.2	Canada – strike incidence and duration, 1946–2005	599

# List of Tables

1.1	Levels of industrial relations analysis	7
4.1	Models of change underpinning theories of union revitalization	79
5.1	Four theories of the employment relationship	102
7.1	Union density (%) and density change in 20 OECD countries 1980–2000	138
7.2	Bargaining coordination index and rankings in 15 OECD countries 1973–77 and 1993–97	138
7.3	Collective bargaining coverage (%) in 20 OECD countries 1980–2000	139
7.4	Employment protection legislation in 19 OECD countries, late 1980s–2003	140
7.5	Gross earnings inequality (90:10 ratios) for full time employees in 19 OECD countries 1980–1984 to 1995–1999	140
7.6	Industrial conflict in selected OECD countries 1985–2003 (days lost per 1000 workers)	141
7.7	Standardized unemployment rates (%) in selected OECD countries 1985–2003	142
8.1	Classification device for studies linking HR practice and organizational performance	154
9.1	Nature of papers published in main IR journals	180
9.2	Type of data and methods of analysis used	181
9.3	Industrial relations research methods	182
12.1	The largest employer peak organization: Basic data (1994–96)	228
12.2	The system of employer organization (1991–98)	234
13.1	Management style industrial relations typologies	244
13.2	Employment relations choices	246
16.1	Dimensions of governance	308
16.2	General government final consumption expenditure (percent of GDP)	311
16.3	Core government functions of selected OECD member countries	312
16.4	Public employment	313
16.5	Country breakdown of amounts raised by privatization (Billions of \$US)	314
16.6	Privatization initiatives in selected countries	315
16.7	Union density, private and public sector (percent of unionized workers)	317
16.8	Characteristics of career-based, department-based, and position-based civil systems	318
20.1	Major studies and data sets employed in voting propensity analyses	378
21.1	Bargaining structures in OECD countries, 1970–2000	414
21.2	Bargaining coordination in OECD countries, 1970–2000	414
26.1	Gross hourly earnings in the UK, Autumn 2005	493
28.1	Perspectives on the outcomes of contemporary employment relations	532
29.1	A summary of the six longitudinal case studies	559
33.1	Summary of meta-analyses of union effects	627

34.1	Measures of the variation of labor institutions across advanced countries	642
34.2	Mean values of ranks of Anglo-American and other advanced economies labor institutions (low value=market oriented) and <i>t</i> -tests of their statistical significance	644
34.3	90/10 Wage differentials and Gini coefficients for advanced countries, circa 2000	651

# Notes on Contributors

**Peter Ackers** is Professor of Industrial Relations and Labour History at Loughborough University Business School. During 2005–06 he was Leverhulme Visiting Fellow at the Indian Institute of Management, Calcutta. His current research is on British Industrial Relations History, including a biographical study of Professor Hugh Clegg, and Indian Industrial Relations. He has edited *Understanding Work and Employment: Industrial Relations in Transition* (Oxford University Press 2003) with Adrian Wilkinson and *The New Workplace and Trade Unionism* (Routledge 1996) with Chris Smith and Paul Smith.

**Nicolas Bacon** is Professor of Human Resource Management at Nottingham University Business School, UK. His current research on trade unions includes partnership agreements, negotiations to change working practices and union learning representatives; the employment effects of buyouts and shareholder value management; and employment practices in small and medium-sized enterprises. He is currently editor of the *Industrial Relations Journal*.

**Devasheesh Bhawe** is a PhD candidate in the Human Resources and Industrial Relations department at the Carlson School of Management, University of Minnesota. His research interests include the areas of electronic performance monitoring, relational demography, and employment relationships.

**Paul Blyton** is Professor of Industrial Relations and Industrial Sociology at Cardiff University, UK. His research interests include employees' experience of work restructuring, working time developments, and work-life balance concerns. His recent publications include *The Realities of Work* with Mike Noon (Palgrave Macmillan) and *Key Concepts in Work* with Jean Jenkins (Sage).

**Peter Boxall** is Professor of Human Resource Management at the University of Auckland. His research is concerned with both management and employee strategies in contemporary workplaces and their respective outcomes. He is co-editor (with John Purcell and Patrick Wright) of the Oxford University Press *Handbook of Human Resource Management* and co-editor (with Richard Freeman and Peter Haynes) of *What Workers Say: Employee Voice in the Anglo-American Workplace* (Cornell University Press).

**William Brown** is Professor of Industrial Relations in the Economics Faculty at Cambridge University and Master of Darwin College. He was previously Director of the Industrial Relations Research Unit at Warwick University. An active arbitrator, he was a member of the council of the UK's Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS), and was a founder member of the Low Pay Commission which established, and maintains, the UK national minimum wage.

His research interests include collective bargaining, pay systems, trade unions, and the effects of legal intervention in the labor market.

**Alex Bryson** is a Research Director at the Policy Studies Institute. He has been at the institute since 1991, during which time his research has focused on the evaluation of welfare-to-work programs and industrial relations. Recently he has been applying techniques common in the evaluation literature to problems in industrial relations. He is an editor of the *British Journal of Industrial Relations* and the Manpower Research Fellow at the Centre for Economic Performance.

**John W. Budd** is a Professor in the Industrial Relations Center at the University of Minnesota's Carlson School of Management. He is the author of *Employment with a Human Face: Balancing Efficiency, Equity, and Voice* (Cornell University Press), *Labor Relations: Striking a Balance* (McGraw-Hill/Irwin), and a co-editor of *The Ethics of Human Resources and Industrial Relations* (Labor and Employment Relations Association). His current research interests include industrial relations theory, employment-related public policies, and conceptualizations of work.

**Ali Dastmalchian** is Professor of Organizational Analysis and Dean, Faculty of Business, University of Victoria, Canada. His recent research interests include organizational change, organizational design in health care, and healthy organizations. His recent publications include *Work-Life Integration* with Paul Blyton, Ken Reed, and Betsy Blunsdon (Palgrave Macmillan). His work has appeared in journals such as the *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* and *Human Relations*.

**Simon Deakin** is Professor of Law at the University of Cambridge. He specializes in the economics and sociology of law, focusing on labor, company and private law. His books include *The Law of the Labour Market* (2005, with Frank Wilkinson). He is a member of the editorial boards of the *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, the *Industrial Law Journal*, and the *Cambridge Journal of Economics*.

**John T. Delaney** is Professor of Management and Dean of the Joseph M. Katz Graduate School of Business and College of Business Administration at the University of Pittsburgh. His research focuses on dispute resolution, high performance work practices, and labor relations. His recent publications include *Organized Labor's Political Scorecard* (with Marick Masters), *Ethical Challenges in Labor Relations*, and *Change to Win: Can Structural Change Revitalize the American Labor Movement* (with Jack Fiorito and Paul Jarley).

**Jack Fiorito** is J. Frank Dame Professor of Management at Florida State University and Principal Research Fellow at the University of Hertfordshire. His research interests include worker attitudes toward unions and employers, and how unions function as organizations. His recent publications include 'The State of the Unions in the United States', *Journal of Labor Research* (2007), and 'Change to Win: Can Structural Reform Revitalize the American Labor Movement?' *Advances in Industrial and Labor Relations* (2007).

**Robert J. Flanagan** is the Konosuke Matsushita Professor of International Labor Economics and Policy Analysis at the Graduate School of Business, Stanford University. His current research interests include the relationship between globalization, working conditions, and labor rights around the world and the economics of symphony orchestras. His most recent book is *Globalization and Labor Conditions* (Oxford University Press, 2006).

**John Forth** is a Research Fellow at the National Institute of Economic and Social Research. He works on a range of labor market issues including employment relations, equality, and skills. He is co-author of *Inside the Workplace* and *All Change at Work?*, both arising from his involvement in the Workplace Employment Relations Survey series. Other recent publications have focused on topics such as pay determination, 'high involvement management', and productivity, with a particular emphasis on the role of trade unions.

**Richard B. Freeman** is Professor of Economics at Harvard University, Labor Studies Program Director at NBER, and Professorial Research Fellow at the Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics. His research interests include the growth and decline of unions; self-organizing non-unions in the labor market; restructuring European welfare states; international labor standards; Chinese labor markets; crime; employee involvement programs; globalization; income distribution and equity in the marketplace; immigration and trade; and the job market for scientists and engineers. His recent publications include *What Workers Want* (Cornell 2nd edition), *Can Labor Standards Improve Under Globalization?* (IIE), and *America Works: The Exceptional Labor Market* (Sage).

**Carola M. Frege** is a Reader in Employment Relations at the London School of Economics and Political Science. She is the author of *Employment Research and State Traditions* (Oxford University Press 2007) and co-editor of *Varieties of Unionism* (OUP, 2004). She has published widely in academic journals and edited collections on comparative employment relations and is the editor of the *British Journal of Industrial Relations*.

**Ann C. Frost** is Associate Professor at the Richard Ivey School of Business, University of Western Ontario. Her main research focus has been in the area of workplace restructuring and high performance forms of work organization. Articles from this research have appeared in *Advances in Industrial and Labor Relations*, the *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, and the *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*. Her current research interests include models of labor-management co-operation, restructuring in the health care sector, the impact of recent changes in work organization on the careers of low wage workers, and employment practices in Canadian call centers.

**Gregor Gall** is Professor of Industrial Relations and Director of the Centre for Research in Employment Studies at the University of Hertfordshire, UK. His research interests revolve around trade unionism and worker mobilization. His recent books include *Sex Worker Union Organizing: An International Study* (Palgrave Macmillan) and *The Political Economy of Scotland: Red Scotland? Radical Scotland?* (University of Wales Press). Also, he is the editor of two volumes on union recognition (with Routledge) and a forthcoming one (with Palgrave Macmillan).

**Daniel G. Gallagher** is the CSX Corporation Professor of Management at James Madison University in Harrisonburg, Virginia. His current research interests include a variety of topics related to the study of independent contracting and other forms of work outside of the traditional employer–employee relationship. He also has an ongoing interest in the study of union member attitudes and behaviors. He is currently an Associate Editor of *Human Relations*, and serves on the editorial boards of *Industrial Relations* and the *Journal of Management*.

**Ray Gibney** is an Assistant Professor of Management at the Pennsylvania State University at Harrisburg. His primary research interests are positive and negative employee–collective social

exchange relationships. In addition, Ray is interested in labor unions in the political process and employee self-service technology in organizations.

**John Godard** is Professor at the Faculty of Management, the University of Manitoba. His work focuses on state policies and labor law, on comparative institutional environments, and on the implications of work and human resource practices for workers and their unions. It has been published in a number of edited books and in numerous academic journals, appearing most frequently in the *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* and the *British Journal of Industrial Relations*. He is a former editor of the *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, and serves on the boards of a number of scholarly journals.

**Irena Grugulis** is Professor of Employment Studies and head of the HR/OB teaching group at Bradford University School of Management. Her research interests cover most areas of skill, particularly the impact that national and organizational systems have on the people who experience them. Her latest book, published by Palgrave Macmillan in 2007 is *Skills, Training and Human Resource Development: A Critical Text*. Her current projects include research into employment in the film and TV industry and retail work in Britain. She is an associate fellow of SKOPE and edits the *Debates and Controversies* section of *Work, Employment and Society*.

**David Guest** is Professor of Organizational Psychology and Human Resource Management at King's College, London. His current research interests are the relationship between human resource management, organizational performance, and employee well-being in the public and private sectors; the individualization of employment relations and the role of the psychological contract; flexibility and employment contracts; partnership at work; and the future of the career.

**Rebecca Gumbrell-McCormick** is Lecturer in Management at Birkbeck, University of London, UK. She is a former international trade union official and official of the ILO. Her main research areas are international and European industrial relations and equal opportunities. Her most recent publications include 'Embedded Collectivism? Workplace Representation in France and Germany', in *Industrial Relations Journal*, 37(5), September 2006 (with Richard Hyman) and 'The ICFTU and the World Economy: A Historical Perspective', in R Munck (2003) (ed.) *Labour and Globalisation: Results and Prospects* (Liverpool University Press).

**Kerstin Hamann** is Professor of Political Science at the University of Central Florida in Orlando, US. Her research focuses on comparative political economy and industrial relations in Western Europe, and on Spanish politics and labor unions. Her work has been published in journals such as the *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, the *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, *Comparative Political Studies*, and *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*. Her current collaborative research with John Kelly analyzes the political dynamics of the origins of social pacts in Western Europe.

**Robert Hebdon** is the Chair of the Faculty Program in Industrial Relations and Associate Professor in the Desautels Faculty of Management of McGill University. His research interests include public sector restructuring and workplace conflict. His recent publications include articles on strike duration with Mike Campoletti and Doug Hyatt (*Industrial and Labor Relations Review*), workplace conflict (*Advances in Industrial Relations*), and comparative local government restructuring with Patrice Jalette (*Environment and Planning C*).

**Edmund Heery** is Professor of Employment Relations and Joint Director (with Peter Fairbrother) of the Centre for Global Labor Research at Cardiff University. His primary research interest in recent years has been union strategies of revitalization, which has included study of union organizing, union representation of contingent workers, and union bargaining over equality and work-life balance. His current research is a study of worker representation through 'civil society organizations'; charities, advocacy, and campaigning organizations. His recent publications include *The Future of Worker Representation* (edited with Geraldine Healy, Phil Taylor, and William Brown), Palgrave MacMillan, 2004.

**Charles Heckscher** is a Professor at Rutgers University and Director of the Center for Workplace Transformation. His research focuses on organization change and the changing nature of employee representation. His books include *The New Unionism*, *White-Collar Blues*, and *The Collaborative Enterprise*.

**Richard Hyman** is Professor of Industrial Relations at the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) and is founding editor of the *European Journal of Industrial Relations*. He has written extensively on the themes of industrial relations, collective bargaining, trade unionism, industrial conflict, and labor market policy, and is author of many books, including *Strikes* and *Industrial Relations: A Marxist Introduction*. He co-edited the 17-country text *Changing Industrial Relations in Europe* (Blackwell, 1998). His comparative study *Understanding European Trade Unionism: Between Market, Class and Society* was published by Sage in 2001.

**Paul Jarley** is Professor of Management and Dean of the College of Business at the University of Nevada Las Vegas. His research interests focus on trade union structures and strategies, interest arbitration, and social capital at work. His recent publications include *Unions as Social Capital, Justice and Union Participation* (with Nancy Brown Johnson), and *Change to Win: Can Structural Change Revitalize the American Labor Movement?* (with Jack Fiorito and John T. Delaney).

**Jean Jenkins** is Lecturer in HRM at Cardiff University. Her research interests center on employment relations in the manufacturing sector, particularly in the clothing sector, and employees' experiences in the increasingly internationalized market for labor. Her recent publications include *Key Concepts in Work* (with Paul Blyton), Sage 2007.

**John Kelly** is Professor of Industrial Relations in the School of Management Birkbeck College, University of London. His main areas of research are comparative labor relations, labor unions, and industrial relations theory and recent publications include *Varieties of Unionism* (OUP, 2004, co-editor), *Union Organization and Activity* (Routledge 2004, co-editor), and *Rethinking Industrial Relations* (Routledge, 1998).

**Russell D. Lansbury** is Professor of Work and Organizational Studies and Associate Dean (Research) in the Faculty of Economics and Business at the University of Sydney. He is the current President of the International Industrial Relations Association. His major research contributions have been in the fields of international and comparative studies of employment relations and management.

**David Lewin** is the Neil Jacoby Professor of Management, Human Resources and Organizational Behavior in the UCLA Anderson School of Management. His research interests include workplace/organizational conflict, human resource management and business performance, pay

and rewards, and new challenges to old wage and hour law. His recent publications include *Contemporary Issues in Employment Relations* (2006) and *Advances in Industrial and Labor Relations, Volume 15* (2007).

**Marick F. Masters** is a Professor of Business Administration and of Public and International Affairs at the University of Pittsburgh, where he directs the Center on Conflict Resolution and Negotiation. He has written more than 100 articles and several books. His current interests lie in negotiations, conflict resolution, the role of interest groups in politics, and the management of political campaigns. He is a senior partner with AIM Consultants, a management consulting firm, with offices in New London, CT and Pittsburgh, PA.

**Wanjiru Njoya** is Lecturer in Law at Oxford University, and a Fellow of Wadham College Oxford. Her publications include *Property in Work: The Employment Relationship in the Anglo-American Firm* (Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing, 2007). She specializes in labor law and corporate governance, and her research has appeared in the *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, the *Industrial Law Journal*, and the *Law Quarterly Review*.

**Barbara Pocock** is Director of the Centre for Work + Life at the University of South Australia. She has worked in a range of industries. Her past research includes analysis of trade unions, gender politics at work, the regulation of industrial relations systems, and effects on inequality. At present she is studying the changing nature of work and its intersections with changing household and social life, with Australia as her primary focus. Her latest books are *The Work/Life Collision* (2003) and *The Labour Market Ate My Babies* (2006), both published by Federation Press.

**Stephen Procter** is Alcan Professor of Management and Director of Research at Newcastle University Business School. His chief area of research interest is new patterns of work in the public sector, particularly teamworking and workplace flexibility. He is currently involved in projects looking at new working patterns in the mental health services workforce, multi-agency working in public services, and the management of public sector mergers. He is co-founder and co-organizer of the International Workshop on Teamworking, Chair of the Editorial Advisory Board of *Personnel Review*, and, in 2007–08, Chair of the British Academy of Management Special Interest Group on HRM.

**Iryna Shevchuk** is a PhD candidate at the University of Pittsburgh. Her research interests include the employer–employee relationship, employee turnover, and quantitative research methods and design.

**George Strauss** is Professor Emeritus at the Haas School of Management at the University of California, Berkeley. He is also a member of the Institute for Research on Labor and Employment (previously the Institute for Industrial Relations), also at UCB. He is the co-author (with Keith Whitfield) of *Researching the World of Work: Strategies and Methods of Studying Industrial Relations* (ILR Press).

**Franz Traxler** is Professor of Industrial Sociology at the University of Vienna. His research focuses on comparative industrial relations and organized interests. Book publications include *National Labour Relations in Internationalized Markets* (with S. Blaschke and B. Kittel) (Oxford University Press 2001), and *Handbook of Business Interest Associations, Firm Size and Governance* (with G. Huemer) (Routledge 2007).

**Nick Wailes** is a Senior Lecturer in Work and Organizational Studies at the University of Sydney, Australia. He teaches comparative industrial relations and strategic management. His two main areas of research are the impact of globalization on national relations systems and the study of organizational change associated with information and communications technology.

**Keith Whitfield** is Professor of Human Resource Management and Economics at Cardiff University, UK. His research focuses on the impact of human resource policies and practices on employee and organizational outcomes. He was recently a member of the steering group for the Fifth British Workplace Employment Relations Survey, and is currently the principal investigator for a project examining a quarter century of change in British Employment Relations.

**Adrian Wilkinson** is Professor of Employment Relations at Griffith University, Australia. His research interests include employee participation, high performance workplaces, and industrial relations and human resource management theory. Recent publications include *Human Resource Management at Work* (CIPD) with Mick Marchington and *Understanding Work and Employment* (OUP) with Peter Ackers.

**Tom Zagenczyk** is an Assistant Professor of Management at Clemson University. His research interests include the employer–employee relationship, social influence processes in organizations, developmental relationships, and the relationship between IT and employee attitudes.

# Preface

The purpose of this Handbook is to provide readers with an overview of current knowledge from Industrial Relations scholarship, and consider what issues and questions still need to be addressed. The scope of the different contributions is testament to a subject area that has broadened its perspective far beyond what many in the past considered the central areas of Industrial Relations interest: trade unions, collective bargaining, and strikes. It is now widely recognized that the different aspects of the employment relationship are what define the field of industrial relations: the various elements that comprise the employment relationship; the bases and assumptions on which employment relationships are formed and modified; the significance of different institutional arrangements within which those employment relationships are situated; and the relevance of broader economic, social, and technological developments that fundamentally affect contemporary society. Questions and concerns that first gave rise to industrial relations enquiry have not disappeared, but have been augmented by the recognition of a much broader set of issues and developments impacting on people's experience of work.

The international group of contributors brought together here are the leading experts of their fields and this provides them both with a solid base from which to review what is known about their area of study, but also what we as yet do not sufficiently know: what questions we have failed to answer satisfactorily to date, and what issues still clamor for attention.

It is a highly appropriate time to produce such a collection. With profound changes occurring within industrial relations practice over the past two decades – not least, changes in trade union presence, the coverage of union-management relations, and the state's role within the employment relationship – coupled with fundamental developments in national and international product and labor markets, it is apposite to take stock of what these developments signify for the field of industrial relations and what new questions and challenges they pose.

In bringing this collection to fruition, we wish to acknowledge the help we have had from various different quarters. First, our thanks to all the contributors who not only agreed to fit this task into their already busy schedules, but to respond willingly to comments on drafts that helped create a more cohesive and comprehensive collection that otherwise wouldn't have been the case. Second, thanks to the administrative efforts of Sue O'Brien and Penny Smith at Cardiff University who endeavored to keep a hold on where everything was, as drafts moved back and forth. Third, our thanks to the team at Sage – Chris Rojek, Mila Steele, and Kay Bridger – for putting the idea of the Handbook to us in the first place, for being patient as the delays that are probably inevitable in a large project of this kind duly occurred, and for allowing us the opportunity to work with such a thought-provoking group of academics.

# Introduction: The Field of Industrial Relations

Edmund Heery, Nicholas Bacon, Paul Blyton  
and Jack Fiorito

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Handbook is to profile the academic field of industrial relations (IR) at the start of the twenty-first century. To this end we have assembled an international roster of subject experts to reflect on the multiple facets of IR scholarship, summarize bodies of knowledge and theory and identify current developments and likely future trends. IR was a product of the great class compromise of the twentieth century between ruling elites and the rising working class. Many of its founding scholars were exercised by the 'labor problem' and the need for a practically oriented field of study to support the creation of new institutions that would regulate industrial conflict and integrate the working population into liberal democratic societies (Kaufman, 1993: 4–9; Lyddon, 2003). Much of this impulse (though not all) has faded as the decades have passed but the field of IR continues to evolve and address a broad and continually shifting set of issues within the employment relationship. This collection we believe, attests to the continuing vigor of,

what is now, a mature academic field and its continuing relevance at the start of a new century, very different from the old.

The purpose of this introduction is to provide a platform for the 33 chapters that follow. It does so by providing an overview of three core aspects of contemporary IR scholarship. We consider in turn the definition and scope of academic industrial relations, the multi-disciplinary nature of IR and the theoretical perspectives that shape its research program, and the normative orientations of IR scholars that provide a standard for evaluating IR practice and underpin the advice to governments, employers, unions and others that issue from an applied, policy-oriented field. In each of these areas our aim is to identify classic positions and defining characteristics of IR but also point to contemporary themes and developments. Our purpose is to show how the enduring features of the field continue to evolve. To conclude the introduction, we also describe the structure of the Handbook and introduce the separate chapters that comprise the volume.

## DEFINITION AND SCOPE

Twenty-five years ago Marsden (1982: 232) declared that, 'Everyone, instinctively it seems, knows what industrial relations is about, even those who have never studied the subject. It is "about" trade unions, managers and collective bargaining.' Undoubtedly many outside the field, if pressed, would provide a similar definition and it is certainly the case that the core of IR scholarship has focused, for a long time, on collective industrial relations. Studies of trade unions, collective employment law, collective bargaining and state-trade union relations continue to feature prominently in the field (Frege, 2005).

Definitions offered from within the field, however, typically cast their net much wider and effectively claim the non-union as well as the unionized segment of the economy as IR's province. This was true of some of the first attempts to specify the bounds of IR as an academic subject. Thus, in Dunlop's 1958 formulation of a 'general theory of industrial relations', the subject matter is defined as the 'industrial relations system', a distinct institutional domain within developed economies, comprising actors, processes, context and outcomes (Dunlop, 1993). Crucially, this definition includes but is not confined to the examination of trade unions and collective bargaining; the roster of actors embraces workers and their informal work groups as well as formal representative institutions, the list of processes covers management decision and legal regulation as well as bilateral regulation by unions and employers.

More recent attempts to designate the object of the study of IR have followed a similar tack and tend to define the field as the study of the employment relationship. This is true of authoritative statements by Kaufman (2004a: 45), who states that IR is 'the study of the employment relationship and all the behaviors, outcomes, practices, and institutions that emanate from or impinge on the relationship', and Edwards (2003: 1–2), who declares that the 'focus is employment:

all forms of economic activity in which an employee works under the authority of an employer and receives a wage for his or her labor.' Both authors state that 'employment relations' is a more satisfactory label for the field, if only because it has less connotations with smoke-stack industry, and in some parts of the world IR has begun to yield to this newer label.<sup>1</sup> We are sympathetic to this change of usage but have retained the established term to minimize possible confusion, as do Edwards and Kaufman.

Defining IR as the study of the employment relationship is only an initial step and the next is to identify the component elements of the employment relationship in order to further specify IR's domain. In our view, four elements can usefully be identified.

## Actors

Much IR research is focused on the parties to the employment relationship, typically labeled since Dunlop the industrial relations 'actors'. These include workers and their representative institutions, including trade unions and left political parties; employers, their managerial representatives within the firm and their collective organizations, employers' associations; and the state and its multiple agencies involved in the formation and regulation of employment relationships. The latter includes legislatures, judicial and police authorities and specialist agencies engaged in training and development and dispute resolution. As traditional, collective actors have declined in significance in many countries so the field has begun to research 'new actors in industrial relations' (Heery and Frege, 2006). With regard to employees there has been a growth of interest in non-union representatives, including work councilors elected or appointed under statutory provisions and representatives operating under voluntary arrangements established by employers (Frege, 2002; Kaufman and Taras, 2000). There has also been a growth of interest in identity-groups and social movement organizations that campaign on behalf of particular categories of employee, for

example, women, lesbian, gay and bisexuals, migrants, the disabled or older workers (Fine, 2006; Piore and Safford, 2006). A similar trend is apparent on the employers' side. Here there has been a growth of interest in organizations that can be regarded as forming and expressing the collective interests of employers, including management consultants developing new practice, employment agencies and other labor market intermediaries, and organizations providing standards and inspection in the field of corporate social responsibility (Kuruville and Verma, 2006: 48–51; Logan, 2006; Osterman et al., 2001: 144–6).

IR research focused on actors deals with a broad range of substantive issues. If one considers the classic subject matter of trade unions then the following main areas of research can be identified:

- 1) the formation and reproduction of unions including trends in membership and the basis of union joining;
- 2) the internal structure and functioning of unions including union democracy, governance and management;
- 3) the external structure of unions including the nature of union 'job territories' (enterprise, occupation, industry or general) and the degree of integration of the national trade union movement;
- 4) union functions and areas of activity including direct service provision to members, collective bargaining and dispute handling, legal advocacy and political action;
- 5) union strategies particularly in the context of union decline and attempts of renewal; and
- 6) union effects on business, economy and society and their effectiveness in representing their members.

Equivalent lists can be compiled readily for other IR actors though perhaps in all cases the key distinction that can be drawn is between the organizational characteristics of any given actor and the nature of its intervention within the IR system; that is between structure and strategy. Thus, for employers IR researchers are interested in the degree of centralization or decentralization of the management hierarchy and its composition, with a particular interest

in the presence and power of specialist HR managers. But they are interested also in management strategies of labor use and the multiple initiatives pursued to secure the compliance of workers or their active commitment to employer goals (Purcell and Ahlstrand, 1994).

### **Processes**

The second main focus of IR research is the processes through which the employment relationship is governed. Again according to Dunlop, it is common to define these processes in terms of rule-making or 'job regulation', with two primary types of rule being generated: substantive rules that specify the content of the employment relationship (wages, hours of work, methods of working, staffing levels, etc.) and procedural rules that govern the interaction and behavior of the parties (bargaining, consultation, information disclosure and dispute resolution). Both types of rule may be formal, inscribed in company policies, collective agreements or statutes, or informal, enshrined in customary expectations and relationships. The main way of classifying these regulatory processes is in terms of their authorship – which actor or combination of actors is the creator of rules. It is usual to distinguish unilateral regulation by employers (and less frequently) trade unions, joint regulation through collective bargaining, legal regulation by the state and tripartite regulation, in which government, employers and unions formulate 'social pacts' that govern the economy, including wage growth, welfare expenditure and employment (Hassel, 2006).

From this starting point theoretical and research work on IR processes has followed a number of avenues. One course has been to identify the component elements of each rule-making process; to break it down into its constituent elements. A classic venture of this kind was Clegg's (1976) identification of the structural components of national systems of collective bargaining, which varied in terms of bargaining coverage, level, depth, scope and degree of employer support for trade unions.

More recent contributions have identified the elements of other IR processes. Sisson and Marginson (2002), for example, have developed a framework that is similar to Clegg's for analyzing 'co-ordinated bargaining', the process through which discrete episodes of bargaining are linked in broader sectoral, national or, indeed, international systems of regulation.

A second development has been to identify separate forms of each process. Thus, with regard to legal regulation, it is common to distinguish 'hard' and 'soft' forms of regulation (Kuruvilla and Verma, 2006). The former consists of rights and employment standards established by statute and enforced both through application to courts and inspection by government agencies. The latter, in contrast, consists of opinions, advice, guidance, charters and codes of practice, which are issued by legislative bodies and intended to encourage the adoption of good practice but which are not reinforced by direct sanctions. Scholars have further refined this typology, identifying other forms of legal regulation. In the European Union (EU), for instance, there has been a growth of what has been labeled 'reflexive governance' (Barnard and Deakin, 2002), in which employers can derogate from legal standards and tailor regulations to their particular circumstances provided this occurs through consultation with employee representatives.

A third line of development has been to explore the relationship between different forms and the degree to which they supplant or complement one another. National economies contain multiple processes of job regulation with management decision, collective bargaining, legal regulation and the inclusion of social partners, business and worker representatives, in government policy-making existing alongside one another, applied variously to different issues, different segments of the workforce or different industrial sectors. The separate processes may reinforce one another, with particular regulations establishing boundaries and ensuring integration. Thus, collective agreements frequently contain 'management rights' clauses

that specify those elements of the employment relationship that are subject to collective bargaining and those that are regulated through management decision (Sisson, 1987). A similar interface can be identified between collective bargaining and employment law. In Anglophone countries the prime function of the latter through much of the twentieth century was to serve as 'auxiliary legislation' (Davies and Freedland, 1993: 29), providing legal support for trade unions and collective bargaining rather than directly regulating the terms of the employment relationship. In Britain, auxiliary legislation famously took the form of 'statutory immunities', legal protection for trade unions from civil action under the common law if they organized industrial action that disrupted employers' business (Howell, 2005: 61–4, 149–50).

The decline of collective bargaining over the past two decades in many countries, however, has generated a fresh interest in the relationship between different forms of job regulation. It is asked with increasing frequency whether the rise of other forms is implicated in the decline of bargaining and researchers have focused on the interaction between joint regulation and both new forms of management regulation and the expanding volume of employment law. The central questions have been whether alternative regulatory processes supplant bargaining or whether collective bargaining and other forms can hybridize and support one another? Answers differ. For some writers the spread of human resource management and high-performance work systems poses a threat to joint regulation and is implicated in the de-unionization of industrial relations, essentially because it realigns worker and management interests and provides the basis for 'mutual gains' (Dickson et al., 1988; Fiorito, 2001). For others collective bargaining can support new work systems, union pressure serving to ensure that benefits are shared equitably between company and workforce and thereby helping to sustain innovation (Bacon and Blyton, 2006; Frost, 2001). A similar debate has emerged over the 'juridification' of

the employment relationship, the growth of individual employment law. On the one hand, it is argued that individual rights diminish worker need for collective bargaining (Metcalf, 2005: 114), while on the other hand it is suggested that new law can support collective bargaining, the platform of rights providing minima above which collective agreements can build and the threat of union-sponsored legal action serving as a lever to open up negotiations (Heery and Conley, 2007). Whichever of these positions is correct, the relationship between new and old forms of job regulation has emerged as one of the central themes in current IR research.<sup>2</sup>

### **Outcomes**

IR is also, indeed increasingly, concerned with assessing the outcomes of processes. The classic expression of this concern can be seen in the very substantial body of research exploring the relationship between trade union presence and collective bargaining and a broad range of economic, psychological and social phenomena. The latter include rates of productivity and profit, job satisfaction and organizational commitment and levels of income inequality (Turnbull, 2003). Although a well-established research theme, development continues with new datasets, new theories, and new research techniques adding to an established body of work (for example Belman and Voos, 2006; Fairris, 2006). Another area where outcomes research has blossomed in recent years is that concerned with the impact of HR practices on business performance. This work lies at the center of what Godard (2004a) has termed the 'high performance paradigm' within current IR research. Its distinguishing feature is the use of large datasets and econometric methods to establish a statistical relationship between measures of sophisticated human resource management, often expressed as the use of 'high performance work systems', and a variety of indicators of business performance (Wall and Wood, 2005; Whitfield and Poole, 1997). The broad aim is to validate employer

investment in the human resource and confirm that good management practice can have a bottom-line pay-off.

Research on outcomes within IR research has a number of dimensions. One marked feature is the emphasis on evaluating outcomes from the perspective of multiple stakeholders. Unlike other subjects taught in business schools, in IR there is no unreflexive adoption of the perspective of the employer and research on business outcomes sits alongside research on outcomes for workers and others. This is even apparent in the high-performance paradigm, where a notable development has been the growth of research on the effect of new work systems on employees, sometimes from a highly critical perspective that seeks to debunk the claim that all parties benefit from innovation (Thompson and Harley, 2007). In a related development researchers have also begun to apply ethical frameworks to employment issues, using normative criteria drawn from moral philosophy to judge IR outcomes (for example Budd, 2004; Guest, 2007; Legge, 2007). Another distinction that can be drawn in outcomes research relates to the issue of scale. A great deal of work is focused on the proximate effects of IR processes, such as the impact of work organization or union presence on job satisfaction. The distal effects of IR processes are also considered, however, and in a tradition that reaches back to the origins of the subject, there is a continuing interest in the contribution of IR to social integration and inclusion, the civilizing of the market order and the reproduction of liberal democracy (for example Adams, 1995; Estlund, 2003; Green, 2006). IR scholars are not just concerned with the minutiae of the workplace order, important though these are, but with the contribution of IR institutions to the making of a good society.

A final point to note about research on IR outcomes is that it is often comparative, in the sense that it seeks to evaluate the effects of *different* IR processes. Perhaps the clearest example today can be seen in the literature on gender equality. The outcomes of interest in this research include measures of pay inequality, vertical and horizontal

job segregation and the degree to which employment systems remain predicated on a male 'norm' of continuous, full-time employment (Blau et al., 2006). Researchers are interested in the contribution to narrowing these indicators of inequality of management decision, persuaded by a 'business case' for equality, unions prioritizing the needs of women workers through 'equality bargaining' and equal opportunity and other bodies of employment law (Dickens, 1999). For each process, moreover, researchers have tried to identify the conditions under which it is more or less effective. Management policy may be more developed and significant where there is a professional HR function that includes equality specialists (Colling and Dickens, 1998; Hoque and Noon, 2004), bargaining may be more effective when it is centralized or where women occupy negotiating positions (Colling and Dickens, 1989; Hunter and Rimmer, 1995) and law may be more effective when it imposes obligations on employers not to discriminate, backed up by inspection (Dickens, 2007). Whatever the precise question, however, the key thing is that in research of this stamp the central concern is comparative, to evaluate competing routes to the achievement of desired IR outcomes.

### **Levels**

Another feature of IR research is that it is conducted at different scales or levels, stretching from the workplace to the global and encompassing many points in-between (see Kochan et al., 1986: 15–20). Table 1.1 illustrates this range and identifies typical actors, processes and outcomes that are researched at each of four analytical levels. Thus, at the workplace or enterprise level, IR researchers have focused on workplace representation, bargaining and dispute-resolution and examined outputs such as productivity growth and innovation in working practices and work quality and employee well-being. At the meso-level, encompassing studies of particular industries, occupations or localities, researchers have examined industry and occupational unions, employers' associations and

industry or pattern bargaining. A particularly important branch of IR scholarship at this level has examined public sector industrial relations and the distinctive patterns of worker behavior and attitudes, union representation and employer policy within public service organizations (for example Bach et al., 1999). At the national level key actors have been national labor movements and union confederations, peak-level business organizations and state policies and institutions, with a pronounced emphasis in European IR research on the relationship between government and social partners (Teague, 2006; Traxler et al., 2002). Finally, and increasingly, IR research has focused on the supra-national level. There is an increasing volume of regional research examining the industrial relations of particular trading and political blocs, such as the EU and the North American Free Trade Area (NAFTA) and a growing body of work that examines IR at a global scale. The latter encompasses research on multi-national enterprises and their supply-chains, global trade unions and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that campaign for workers' rights and the activities of international regulatory bodies, such as the International Labour Organization.

Throughout IR's history as a field of study each of these levels has attracted research and scholarship. At different points in the subject's development, however, certain levels have attracted particular attention. In the 1960s and 1970s, for example, often regarded as a golden age of IR scholarship in some countries, there was a pronounced focus on workplace studies (Ackers and Wilkinson, 2003a: 11). This was partly driven by the changing nature of the 'problem of order'. The growth of workplace militancy, often beyond the control of official union representatives, prompted a search for the origins of 'disorder' and for policy solutions that would more effectively regulate workplace relations (for example Maitland, 1983). In addition, however, there was a growing volume of left scholarship in IR that was attracted to the rank-and-file challenge and sought both to record and identify the potential for social change of the

**Table 1.1 Levels of industrial relations analysis**

Levels		Actors			Processes		Outcomes	
	Worker	Employer	State	Management decision	Joint decision	State regulation	Business and performance	Social and justice
Workplace and enterprise	Work groups, shop stewards and works councilors	Supervisory and general management; HR function	Inspectorates, mediators and labor courts adjudicating workplace disputes	HR policies and practices; employee involvement	Workplace and enterprise level bargaining; consultation and co-determination	Third party mediation and arbitration	Labor productivity; innovation and quality enhancement; financial performance	Work quality and employee well-being
Industry, occupation and locality	Industry and occupational unions; professional associations; living wage and other local coalitions	Employers' associations; consultancy firms and labor market intermediaries	Industry and occupational regulatory bodies; occupational licensing authorities	Public sector management; state as 'model' employer	Industry-level and pattern bargaining	Training, educational and economic development programmes	Diffusion of high performance practices within industry sectors	Impact of privatization and deregulation on labor standards
National economy	Union confederations; social movements addressing issues at work	Peak-level business organizations	National legislature, judiciary and regulatory bodies	National systems of corporate governance and their impact on labor management	Economy-wide bargaining and the coordination of bargaining outcomes across sectors	National systems of labor law and vocational education and training; social partnership and social pacts	IR institutions and national economic performance	Wage and income inequality; gender, race and other forms of identity-based inequality
Regional and global	Global unions and international union federations; European and global works councils; NGOs monitoring labor standards	International employers' associations; multinational enterprises	European Union and other supra-state institutions; International Labour Organization	Diffusion of management policies within MNEs; corporate social responsibility within supply chains	International framework agreements; international bargaining and consultation within MNEs	Creation and enforcement of international labor standards	Labor standards and economic development; varieties of capitalism and relative economic performance	Diffusion and effectiveness of global labor standards

wave of workplace militancy that erupted at the end of the 1960s (for example Beynon, 1984; Herding, 1972). A feature of much of this work was a claim that workplace research possessed greater authenticity and generated a deeper insight into the nature of capitalist social relations. As such, it could be contrasted with an earlier tradition that focused on formal institutions erected above the workplace level – trade unions, employers' associations and industry-wide collective agreements and disputes procedures. As these institutions were challenged in the 1960s and 1970s so IR research switched focus and explored the source of that challenge at the point of production.

In the intervening period the focus of research has switched again and there has been a revival of work examining formal institutions, particularly at national level. As the long post-war boom faltered in the 1970s and as mass unemployment re-emerged, so academic attention switched to the forces shaping national economic performance. There was a growth of research on 'corporatism' and the systems of industrial relations in Northern Europe that co-ordinated wage bargaining and generated relatively low inflation and low unemployment (Goldthorpe, 1985). Although interest in corporatism has waned as the performance of once successful economies has faltered, the focus on national institutions of industrial relations has survived (Baccaro, 2003). This is most apparent in the 'varieties of capitalism' literature (Hall and Soskice, 1998) and its attempt to identify different types of national comparative advantage in a globalized economy. In this work a distinction is drawn between 'liberal market economies', such as the US, that excel at innovation and the development of new industries, and 'co-ordinated market economies', such as Germany and Japan, that dominate mature industries through incremental product and process development. In both types of economy, it is suggested, a complex of institutions embracing the financing and governance of industry, skill formation and wage bargaining reinforce one another and, in combination, underpin the trajectory of national economic

development. In this approach IR forms part of a broader comparative political economy that seeks to map and explain national sources of comparative advantage.

Another recent trend has been the growth of international IR research that examines the employment relationship on a regional or global scale. Much of this work is motivated by the threat to national systems of job regulation posed by globalization and the increasingly transnational scope of both product and labor markets. In the developed world there has been an export of jobs in manufacturing and an erosion of the position of trade unions as previously sheltered markets have been opened to competition. The result has been a policy interest in re-building or extending job regulation at an international level, which has generated academic research in its wake. There has been a growth of research on international unionism (Anner et al., 2006; Gordon and Turner, 2000), international collective bargaining (Lillie, 2006), the policies of multinational enterprises, including corporate codes of conduct on labor standards (Ferner et al., 2006; Tsogas, 2001: 61–85), and international regulatory bodies at regional and global levels (Marginson and Sisson, 2004; van Roozendaal, 2002). Like the research on gender equality described above, much of this work seeks to assess different ways of dealing with the same basic problem – establishing effective international labor standards that limit downward pressure on employment conditions from global competition.

The shifting focus of IR research, moving from different levels of analysis, as different types of 'labor problem' come into view, underlines the nature of IR as an applied, policy-oriented field (Ackers and Wilkinson, 2003a: 11; Hyman, 2004: 272). The research agenda for IR scholars has often been set by policy-makers or by the labor movement, seeking insight into pressing issues and help with institution building or reform. This is only one aspect of the field, however, IR research is also driven by an evolving theoretical impulse and the field contributes to the application, testing, refinement and

development of social theory. It is to this aspect of IR that we now turn.

## THEORY AND EXPLANATION

IR is commonly described as an academic field, rather than an academic discipline (for example Müller-Jentsch, 2004: 1). It has provided a territory that has been occupied by different core disciplines, which have entered, exerted influence and occasionally withdrawn to be replaced by rivals. One way of telling the theoretical story of IR therefore is to track the oscillating contribution of different core disciplines to the field. Indeed, in several recent collections the contribution to the study of the employment relationship of economics, psychology, sociology, law, geography and other subjects has been examined and assessed (Ackers and Wilkinson, 2003b; Coyle-Shapiro et al., 2004; Korczynski et al., 2006). Many scholars in the field, however, identify themselves as ‘industrial-relationists’ or as employment specialists who have long abandoned their home-discipline address (Adams, 1993: 128–31). A second way of telling IR’s theoretical history, therefore, is to identify the theoretical positions that IR specialists have developed or made on their own, regardless of their disciplinary provenance. This option necessarily takes us to the ground of middle-range theory and an attempt to categorize the models that IR specialists have used to analyze trade unions, management strategy, state policy and other areas of substantive inquiry (for example Heery, 2003). Neither narrative strategy can be fully attempted here but at the risk of over-heroic generalization we examine some of the current disciplinary influences on IR and the main types of explanatory argument developed by its practitioners.

### *Disciplinary influences*

The academic discipline that has exerted most influence over IR, at least in the US, is economics. The relationship of IR to economics is a complex one, however, with

different traditions within economics having influence at different times. According to Kaufman (1993: 30–5; see also Adams, 1993: 122), a key role was played in the foundation of IR by heterodox economists who rejected the assumptions of neo-classical orthodoxy and favored instead realistic accounts and inductive theorizing of the institutions that regulated the labor market. This branch of institutional economics focused on the solution of practical ‘labor problems’ and was broadly sympathetic to trade unions and other regulatory institutions that tamed both employer power and market forces. In John R. Commons, Selig Perlman, John T. Dunlop, Clerk Kerr and others it provided key figures in the founding and development of the field (Kaufman, 1993: 84–91).

From the 1960s, however, the institutional tradition lost ground within labor economics and neo-classical orthodoxy reasserted itself. The focus of labor economics switched from the analysis of labor problems to the analysis of the labor market with an associated methodological turn toward deductive theorizing and the statistical testing of models using secondary datasets. The earlier sympathy with the regulation of management and market diminished (Kaufman, 1993: 121–5). It is economics on this conventional model that now exerts influence over IR. Particularly in the US, IR journals are replete with articles based on conventional neo-classical assumptions that examine core issues within the field (Kaufman, 2004b: 365; see also Machin, 2006; Turnbull, 2003). *Inter alia* these include the economic effects of trade unions, the impact of minimum wage regulation on earnings and employment, the gender pay gap, the causes of rising income inequality and the basis of investment decisions in training and the returns to employers and employees. In a recent development economists have also begun to enter territory once occupied by psychologists, undertaking research on job satisfaction and the determinants of work quality (for example Clark, 2005; Green and Tsitisanis, 2005).

While economics is probably the strongest disciplinary influence in IR it is not the

only one and aspects of the field continue to be shaped by sociology, psychology, law, political studies and history. These non-economics influences are particularly apparent outside the US (Frege, 2005: 186–8). Other disciplines continue to be added to the list. Corporate strategy and other applied fields based alongside IR in business schools now exert influence (for example Bacon et al., 2004; Purcell and Ahlstrand, 1994) while there has been a recent surge of interest in social geography and the analysis of the spatial dimension of employment relations (Ellem, 2002; Rainnie et al., 2007; Turnbull, 2006).

It is not possible for us to trace these diverse influences and show how they have added to IR theory. What we can do, however, is demonstrate the continuing shaping of the field by outside disciplines in two particular areas. The first is the body of theory developed by political scientists and sociologists, which is variously labeled ‘contentious politics’ or ‘social movement theory’ (McAdam et al., 1996; McAdam et al., 2001; Tarrow, 1998). The purpose of this field is to understand and account for the origins of social movements, their development and degree of success in challenging political elites. Among the core propositions developed by scholars in this tradition are the following:

- 1) that social movements arise in response to a ‘political opportunity structure’, often characterized by a division within the elite that reduces state capacity for repression and allows movements to form alliances with alienated elite politicians;
- 2) while movements have a spontaneous element and emerge in deeply held grievances they rely also on a ‘mobilizing structure’, an organizational framework comprised of ‘movement entrepreneurs’, activists and networks that builds collective action amongst supporters;
- 3) the work of mobilization has a discursive component and movement leaders develop ideological ‘frames’ that legitimate grievances, attribute them to an oppressor and articulate means of redress;
- 4) movements often develop distinctive ‘repertoires of contention’; that is forms of mobilization and

protest that embrace both the exertion of power against opponents (for example strikes, boycotts, riots, harassment, media scrutiny) and the use of symbols that generate emotional attachment to the movement among its adherents (for example street theatre, costumes, songs, graffiti).

This set of ideas has begun to influence IR scholars, with a key bridge being supplied by Kelly’s (1998) landmark book on IR theory, *Rethinking Industrial Relations: Mobilization, Collectivism and Long Waves*. Kelly used what he termed ‘mobilization theory’ to analyze a broad set of developments in British industrial relations and others have followed in his wake. The social movement framework has been applied to studies of union organizing, union participation, employer counter-mobilization and the changing internal politics of trade unions (for example Badigannavar and Kelly, 2004; Brown Johnson and Jarley, 2004; Foley, 2003; Heery and Conley, 2007). It has been used to revitalize the study of workers’ collective action and to move beyond the stale opposition between rank-and-file and bureaucracy that for so long has underpinned analysis of unions on the radical wing of IR scholarship.

The second influence lies in the field of ‘political economy’ or ‘socio-economics’. This is a field developed by a new wave of institutional economists, political scientists and economic sociologists that is concerned with the institutional ‘embeddedness’ of capitalist economies. Central themes include the formation and shaping of markets by state and other institutions and the plasticity of the capitalist economy, which assumes a wide variety of forms across and within nation states and which generates highly variable outcomes (Coates, 2005). The Varieties of Capitalism school, described above, is one expression of this literature, which has attracted particular attention within IR (for example Godard, 2004b). A line of research that has emerged under this influence has focused on the relationship between IR actors, processes and outcomes and other (varying) institutions of the capitalist economy, including modes of

finance, corporate governance and different types of business enterprise. The link between forms of governance and IR has been a particular focus of research (for example Armour et al., 2003; Gospel and Pendleton, 2005; Konzelmann et al., 2006). Work of this kind updates the classic interest of IR scholars in the institutions of the labor market but links it to a broader resurgence of comparative political economy across several social science disciplines.

### ***Explanatory models***

The other way of looking at IR theory is to identify themes in the substantive, middle-range theories scholars use to account for IR phenomena. Of course, a colossal amount of theory of this kind has been accumulated over the decades. Nevertheless, we feel that this can be sorted into different types of explanatory model without doing excessive violence to the diversity of the subject and below identify four of these. These are: 1) societal models that account for IR developments in terms of adaptation to long-run social and economic change; 2) institutional models that offer explanations grounded in the structural characteristics of the IR system itself or the broader configuration of the national political economy; 3) organizational models that explain the behavior (strategy) of IR actors in terms of their organizational characteristics (structure); and 4) agency models that develop typologies of IR strategy and explore the identities of agents who promote them (see Heery et al., 2004).

### ***Societal***

There is a long tradition in IR of explaining the behavior of actors and shifting processes and outcomes as an adaptation to long-run change in economy and society. Causal variables identified in this tradition range from technical change, the globalization of product markets and the feminization of the workforce to less tangible developments such as the emergence of a more reflexive, individualistic population. It is also common to identify discrete

stages of development in the evolution of capitalist societies with each calling forth a set of matching IR institutions and practices. The current stage of capitalist development has been variously labeled, 'post-industrial', 'post-Fordist', 'neo-Fordist', 'the network society', 'disorganized capitalism' and an age of 'flexible specialization'. Assessments of its implications for IR diverge sharply. From one perspective, the diffusion of new high-performance practices presents an opportunity to recast IR on a more co-operative basis within the 'mutual gains enterprise' (Kochan and Osterman, 1994). From another, the latest stage of capitalist development threatens many of the achievements secured by working people in the twentieth century and the function of IR is to retard its evolution or mitigate its worst effects. A group of American writers has argued that the defining feature of 'post-industrialism' is the emergence of a more market-based system of employment relations, characterized by the hollowing out of large corporations, sub-contracting, the erosion of internal labor markets, the growth of contingent labor, de-unionization, rising income inequality and the collapse of employment standards (for example Cobble, 1991; Fine, 2006; Milkman, 2006).<sup>3</sup> Faced with this challenge, it is believed there is a need to develop new institutions to re-regulate the labor market and take wages out of competition. Accordingly, researchers have examined emerging practices, such as living wage ordinances, community-based movements of low-wage workers and labor-market organizing by trade unions, seeking to identify their potential to diffuse and contribute to a broader regulation of the new economy.

### ***Institutional***

A second form of explanation stresses the role of institutional structures in shaping the behavior of IR actors and the outcomes of IR processes. A classic statement of this argument was Clegg's (1976) comparative analysis of trade unions, which claimed that forms of union organization and patterns

of activity, including internal democracy and involvement in industrial conflict, were determined primarily by the structure of collective bargaining. Contemporary analysts of trade unions continue to make this type of argument, the best known example of which is Fairbrother's (1996) union renewal thesis with its claim that the decentralization of bargaining can prompt the revitalization of workplace unionism. Another example can be seen in comparative research on the gender pay gap, which indicates that progress in narrowing the gap between female and male earnings is a function of industry-wide pay bargaining and relatively strong minimum wage regulations (Almond and Rubery, 1998). These examples focus on the relationship between the structure of IR processes and patterns of actor behavior and outcomes. Other theoretical explanations focus on institutional structures beyond IR narrowly conceived. This is a feature of both of the new disciplinary influences outlined above. Those influenced by social movement theory, for instance, emphasize the role of broader political structures – the political opportunity structure – in channeling union behavior (Turnbull, 2006); those influenced by the Varieties of Capitalism school identify a causal link between union strategies and the institutional constraints imposed respectively by liberal- and co-ordinated-market economies (Frege and Kelly, 2004: 37–9). As these examples indicate, institutional models are frequently comparative, identifying differences in actor behavior and outcomes across national boundaries and explaining these in terms of distinctive national, institutional contexts. Unlike societal models, which stress broad, underlying causes that are universal in their effects (at least across developed societies), institutional models stress contingency and (particularly cross-national) variation.

### **Organizational**

In the third type of model the central interest lies in the causal relationship between the organizational structure of IR actors

and their patterns of behavior and effects. A classic illustration can be seen in the long-standing interest in the relationship between trade union democracy (and trade union oligarchy) and forms of union activity and effectiveness. Concern with this relationship continues to feature strongly in research on trade unions. An example can be seen in the examination of the link between union attempts to promote the interests of women and minorities – believed by many to be a precondition for union revitalization – and the reform of union governance structures to allow for gender democracy and the clearer expression of minority interests. There is a growing body of research on this linkage with different positions being adopted. In some contributions new democratic institutions within unions, such as women's committees and self-organized groups, remain marginalized and exert little influence over union bargaining and political activity (McBride, 2001). In others their effectiveness in pushing significant changes in union policy, which in turn have fed through into legal change and new collective agreements, is accepted (Heery and Conley, 2007). The same type of analysis, linking organizational characteristics to patterns of action, can be seen in research on IR actors besides unions. Thus, in research on management there is an interest in the influence of business structure and internal planning and control procedures on the content of IR policies. The trend toward the decentralization of collective bargaining in large, multi-divisional enterprises has been explained by the spread of new financial controls over operating divisions, in which corporate office monitors performance through financial ratios while conceding autonomy over operational matters, including pay determination, to business unit managers (Purcell and Ahlstrand, 1994: 75–7). Another example can be seen in the theory of corporatism, where it has long been argued that the capacity of states to develop effective tripartite regulation of the economy depends on the presence of strong, centralized and encompassing peak organizations of business and labor (Baccaro, 2003). Whichever actor is

considered, however, the common feature of this type of model remains the same; patterns of activity and their effects within the IR system are dependent on a particular form of organization being adopted – strategy flows from structure.

### **Agency**

The final type of model departs from the structural argument common to the other three and is voluntarist in its assumptions, holding that IR actors have scope for strategic choice (Kochan et al., 1986: 3–20). Choice is exercised within constraints but is not reducible to an external and structured context. For adherents of this position, indeed, strategic choices themselves shape organizational and wider institutional structures. Theory development within this strategic choice tradition has followed two broad avenues. The first has led to the elaboration of typologies of strategy; a listing of the options available to strategic actors. There are many, many examples developed for all of the main IR actors. Thus, Boxall and Haynes (1997) commenting on the renewal strategies of New Zealand trade unions identify two underpinning, dimensions of choice. Unions can adopt an adversarial or co-operative stance toward employers and an organizing or servicing approach to members. From this starting point a menu of four strategic options can be identified: ‘classic unionism’ (adversarialism plus organizing); ‘partnership unionism’ (cooperation plus organizing); ‘paper-tiger unionism’ (adversarialism plus servicing) and ‘consultancy unionism’ (cooperation plus servicing). A well-known equivalent for employers is Guest and Conway’s (1999) typology of management strategy that rests on the extent to which unions are accepted and recognized and the degree to which managers follow a sophisticated, high commitment approach to HRM. Once again four options are identified: ‘the new realism’ (sophisticated HRM plus union recognition); ‘traditional collectivism’ (union recognition with traditional HR practices); ‘individualized HRM’ (non-union with sophisticated HRM)

and ‘the black hole’ (non-union with poor HR practice).

The second avenue leads to an examination of choice-makers and choice-making. Explanation here is directed both at the identities of those leading organizations and deciding strategy and at the internal political and discursive practices that lead to the selection and legitimization of a particular strategic choice. The focus on choice-makers is most readily apparent in research on trade unions, where there is a wealth of material that explains patterns of union activity in terms of the gender, generation or ideological stamp of union leaders and activists (see Heery, 2003: 290–5). There has been a particular emphasis on gender, with the feminization of union policy and the recreation of union democratic and management structures to better represent diversity, being seen as dependent on the prior mobilization of feminist activists within unions (Ledwith and Colgan, 2002). Equivalent work on the employer side is perhaps less developed though analogous explanations can be found. They exist, for instance, in attempts to explain company cultures in terms of the imprint of charismatic founding fathers or mothers, whether Victorian Quakers or New Age entrepreneurs, like Anita Roddick of Body Shop, contriving a deliberate informality and seeking employee commitment to ethical standards (Purcell and Sisson, 1983: 116–7). They can also be seen in attempts to explain variation in HRM within multi-nationals through a parent-country effect; that HR is shaped by the transfer of a distinctive corporate identity from one national culture to another (Gunnigle et al., 2006).

Theories that focus on choice-making allocate a central part to the (frequently conflictual) social processes through which strategic choices are made. In a study of the emergence of social pacts in Ireland, Italy and South Korea, for example, Baccaro and Lim (2007) noted that the outcome of a fierce dispute between moderates and more radical elements in the labor movement was a crucial stage in each process. Decisive victories for the moderate, partnership wing

ensured the development of pacts in Ireland and Italy, while a radical victory in South Korea led to the pact's instability. There are numerous other examples. To take one, Ledwith and Colgan (2002: 16–18) identify a key stage of 'usurpation' in the feminization of unions, through which new activists challenge and overcome the resistance of the incumbent, male-dominated elite. There is also an element in this body of work that emphasizes discursive practice and the deployment of legitimizing frames for new strategic choices. Thus, Heery and Conley's (2007) study of union policy on part-time work in the UK, stresses the significance of distinct 'instrumental' and 'solidarity' frames in garnering support for new policy and rendering opposition non-legitimate.

The four types of explanation we have identified are in certain respects competing. They offer different accounts of IR phenomena and many empirical studies in IR seek to weigh the explanatory power of different structural explanations – societal, institutional and organizational – or the relative strength of structural and strategic choice perspectives. An example of this type of contest can be seen in the different explanations put forward of a widespread IR trend, the decentralization of collective bargaining to enterprise and workplace levels. On the one hand, this has been explained, as we have seen, as an artifact of the diffusion of new financial control systems within the management hierarchies of multi-divisional firms – an organizational account. On the other hand, it has been explained as an adjustment within IR to the diffusion of more flexible forms of production that require tailor-made, plant-specific systems of job regulation – a societal account (Katz, 1993). If pushed to their extreme, neither of these explanations can accommodate the other and much routine academic work within IR involves assembling evidence to choose between seemingly equally plausible explanatory models.

If extremes are avoided, however, then the different types of explanation can be combined; assembled in a complex, multi-factor model. This is also a common

development within IR theory. Again, we can provide a single illustrative case. Baccaro and Lim's (2007) full explanatory model for the emergence of social pacts combines different types of explanation. The search for a pact typically originates in a broad economic and social crisis, reflects a particular institutional context defined by a weak government that needs allies to develop a response to crisis, and depends on a strategic choice to co-operate within the labor movement which, in turn, is the outcome of a choice-making conflict between moderates and radicals. The latter also has an organizational dimension and Baccaro and Lim (2007) emphasize the importance of balloting procedures in both Ireland and Italy in registering union-member support for social pacts and isolating the opposition. Finally, social pacts become institutionalized if there is a subsequent buy-in by employers, which depends on the authority of employers' confederations (organizational), political opportunities to shape pacts (institutional) and calculations of strategic advantage amongst different employer groups (strategic choice). The supporting conditions, Baccaro and Lim (2007) note, were fully in place only in Ireland and it is in this single case that the social pact has been institutionalized and become an enduring feature of the IR system – in the other two cases the experiment faltered albeit after a period of success in Italy.<sup>4</sup> The essential point, however, is that a complex, abstract model, combining different types of explanation, has been devised to account for a significant IR development.

## NORMATIVE ORIENTATION

The dominant normative orientation amongst IR scholars is one of pluralism. This 'frame of reference' comprises core beliefs about the nature of the employment relationship, which provide a standard for evaluating IR practice and serve as a guide to developing policy advice, an essential component of an applied field. At the heart of the pluralist position is a conviction that the employment relationship embraces two equally legitimate

sets of interests, those of employers and those of employees. It is further believed that, while these interests are congruent in very large degree, there is an irreducible core of conflict. A preparedness to acknowledge conflicting interests at work and accept that the expression of conflict is not a pathological symptom has been held to be a defining feature of IR (Kochan, 1998: 37–9). A third core belief of pluralists is that there is an imbalance of power within the employment relationship and that the dependence of workers on employers for the means of subsistence places them in a vulnerable position. A fourth belief follows; that workers have the right to combine in trade unions and other types of collectivity in order to accumulate power, provide a counterweight to the otherwise dominant position of the employer and pursue their separate, legitimate interests (Budd, 2004: 26). The final component of the pluralist position is a conviction that collective organization by employees and the creation of a pluralist IR system based on trade unionism, collective bargaining and the regulation of conflict serves not only the interests of employees but can also serve a wider, general or public interest. The classic expression of this belief in the twentieth century was the claim that the IR system was functional for the wider society, addressing the ‘labor problem’ and successfully integrating the working population into liberal democratic societies (Budd, 2004: 4).

Several features of IR flow from this pluralist conception of the employment relationship. One is that the research agenda has often focused on the experiences, concerns and needs of workers and their institutions and has not slavishly reflected the interests of employers. This aspect of IR, moreover, has persisted despite the fact that most of the field’s members now work in business schools. Research on the quality of work experienced by individual employees (for example Barley and Kunda, 2004; Green, 2006) or exploring the revitalization strategies of unions (for example Wheeler, 2002) is testament to the continuing vitality of the pluralist tradition. Another feature is that a

considerable body of IR research is critical of employers and their practices, identifying unethical, exploitative, oppressive and inefficient aspects of management practice, particularly in a context of light regulation or non-unionism. Sisson’s (1993: 207) judgement on the non-union workplace in Britain as something of a ‘bleak house’ is indicative of a much wider orientation amongst IR scholars.<sup>5</sup> There is little faith in employers’ capacity to manage the employment system for the benefit of multiple stakeholders and IR commentators frequently identify market failures that arise from employers pursuing sectional or short-term interests. Partly for this reason there is broad acceptance of the need for intervention in both the market order and the order of management control within firms. IR pluralists have a bias toward regulation of employer behavior through law but also through collective representation of workers and the joint regulation of the employment relationship.

The classic policy position adopted by IR pluralists, therefore, has been support for collective bargaining and the associated auxiliary legislation that can underpin it (Ackers, 2007). The main qualification to this position has occurred when pluralists have identified a tension between collective organization and a putative general interest; a tension that was particularly apparent in the long period of full-employment and relatively strong trade unionism after the Second World War. Pluralists have accepted constraints on collective action by employees to minimize general economic costs (for example restricting collective bargaining to reduce inflationary wage pressure) or preserve state functions and sovereignty (for example restricting strikes in essential services). Indeed, much policy ink has been spilt designing IR systems that retain collective organization by employees while reducing dysfunctional effects for the wider society. For much of the second half of the twentieth century IR pluralists were quintessential reformists, seeking to update and eliminate the flaws from established IR institutions founded on collective bargaining.

### ***Challenge and critique***

While pluralism has been the dominant orientation, it has not gone unchallenged. This challenge has been threefold and has come from Marxism, feminism and neo-liberalism. In each case, it should be noted, the critique has been fundamental in that it has targeted the core beliefs of IR pluralists and offered a different interpretation of interests within the employment relationship. The main elements of this three-headed critique are as follows.

#### ***Marxism***

Marxism shares pluralism's focus on the dyadic relationship between employers and employees and a belief that interests are separate and conflicting, but it differs in one fundamental aspect. For Marxists there is only one set of *legitimate* interests, those of workers. Thus, in Kelly's (1998: 4–15) attempt to recast the field of IR around mobilization theory the starting point are the interests of workers, with main themes being the accumulation of power resources by workers and the strategies of counter-mobilization adopted by state and employers in response. The other distinctive feature of the Marxist normative position is a belief that workers' fundamental interest lies in challenging and overturning the capitalist mode of production. Two orientations flow from this belief. On the one hand, there is criticism of institutions that stabilize the economic order and integrate the working population into society. Unlike pluralists, Marxists do not believe that a 'balance is best' (Budd et al., 2004) and are typically highly critical of the regulatory institutions of capitalist societies that channel industrial conflict into compromise solutions while leaving the broader configuration of the economy unchanged (Hyman, 1975). Thus, since Lenin, Marxists have sharply criticized trade unionism, recognizing it as an expression of worker rebellion against capital but decrying its limited goals. On the other hand, there is a celebration of industrial conflict (Darlington and Lyddon, 2001) and a continual searching for new

points of challenge to capital beyond the established institutions of IR. The policy prescription for Marxists is typically one of militancy and support for rank-and-file movements that promise the renewal of trade unionism from below (Darlington, 1994; Fairbrother, 2000). The challenge to pluralist IR from Marxists has diminished somewhat as Marxism has lost influence generally in the social sciences since the 1980s. The division between pluralists and Marxists is still an active front, however, and continues to structure debate in IR. It is a particularly notable feature of the field in Britain with pluralists and Marxists offering competing interpretations of contemporary phenomena, such as the vogue for labor-management partnership agreements (cf. Samuel, 2005; Tailby et al., 2004) or the record of the Labour Government elected in 1997 (cf. Brown, 2000; Smith and Morton, 2006).

#### ***Feminism***

The distinctive feature of the feminist critique is that it has not accepted the dyadic relationship between employer and employee as a satisfactory basis for the subject. In particular, it is argued that a focus on the gender-neutral category of 'worker' obscures the fact that the employment relationship is profoundly gendered and that the experiences of men and women employees are divergent and their interests often conflicting.<sup>6</sup> Accordingly, the separate and gendered interests of male and female workers must be acknowledged and incorporated within the core research and normative concerns of IR scholars. However, feminist commentators have also problematized the category of 'women' and noted that 'multiple "women" exist' (Pocock, 1997a: 3), as a consequence of the 'intersectionality' of gender and other forms of social identity (Holgate et al., 2006: 310). A critique that started with a call to acknowledge distinct gender interests, therefore, has progressed to encompass diversity of interests based in multiple identities: race, ethnicity, faith, age, disability and sexuality.<sup>7</sup> All of these must now receive their due recognition within IR scholarship.

An extensive research agenda has developed from this attempt to reorient the subject toward gender and minority interests. One course has been to map and seek explanations of patterns of inequality at work. In many cases this has focused on the strategies used by men to maintain the subordination of women; whether male workers seeking to monopolize skilled trades, male-dominated unions prioritizing a traditional bargaining agenda or male employers designing low-skilled, part-time jobs for women workers (for example Beechey and Perkins, 1987; Cockburn, 1983; Colling and Dickens, 1989). A second course has been to broaden the subject matter of IR in two distinct ways. On the one hand, feminist researchers have noted that the gendered employment contracts of men and women reflect a prior 'sexual contract' and rest on an unequal domestic division of labor (Wacjman, 2000: 193–5). This has encouraged work on the interrelationship of the domestic sphere and forms and experiences of paid work, a theme that has been given added impetus by public policy interest in the issue of work-life integration. On the other hand, there has been a drive to examine questions of sexuality and emotion at work that has encompassed research on the design of jobs to incorporate emotional and sexual display and the issue of sexual harassment (Forrest, 1993: 424; Wacjman, 2000: 192–3).

A third theme in feminist IR research has been to uncover women's resistance to oppression at work; to rediscover events, actors and movements that have been 'hidden from history' and neglected systematically by a male-dominated field (Forrest, 1993: 416). This concern has generated a substantial volume of work on women's trade unionism, which has emerged as a major theme in IR research in recent years (for example Briskin and McDermott, 1993; Cobble, 1993; Colgan and Ledwith, 2002; Pocock, 1997b). A fourth main area of research identified by feminist IR scholars is the evaluation of equality and diversity policies developed by states, unions and employers. Much of this work is highly critical, pointing to the persistence of gender inequality at work and

the superficial character of policies to deal with it. Nevertheless, a body of work has been accumulated that can inform evidence-based policy-making. This work points to the conditions under which employment law, collective bargaining and management policy are more or less likely to contribute to the narrowing of workplace inequality (for example Grimshaw and Rubery, 2001).

A characteristic that feminist IR scholars share with the pluralist mainstream is a belief in the need for law and collective bargaining to shape the behavior of employers. There is often a deep skepticism about the potential for employer policy to secure significant advancement toward equality, which is expressed in a critique of the 'business case' for equal opportunities and the 'diversity management' programs to which it gives rise (Kirton and Green, 2000). Effective external regulation (and the mobilization of women and minority groups themselves against employers), are deemed necessary because business pressures to eliminate inequality will only be felt by a proportion of employers. The ugly fact motivating much feminist comment on IR policy is that many employers gain from unequal treatment and consequently cannot be relied upon to act as agents for social justice. Partly for this reason the main feminist orientation to policy stresses the continual strengthening of legal regulation in particular to make it more exacting from the employers' perspective. An international manifestation of this orientation is the pressure to rewrite equality law so that it not only confers rights not to suffer discrimination but imposes a positive duty on employers to provide for equality at work (McColgan, 1994).

Feminist commentators differ in their evaluation of trade unions but there is a strong current of belief that 'social regulation' through unions and collective bargaining can supplement law and indeed ensure that it is more effectively 'mediated' at workplace level (Dickens, 1999). The policy advocated for unions is twofold. On the one hand, it is suggested that there must be more effective 'external' representation of women and

minorities by unions through the development of 'equality bargaining' (Colling and Dickens, 1989); that is through the incorporation of issues of discrimination, equality and diversity into the routine representative work of unions. On the other hand, it is argued that there must be more effective 'internal' representation of women and minorities through the reform of union government systems to ensure that their interests gain expression. Each type of reform can reinforce the other and both are deemed essential (Bercusson and Dickens, 1996).

Calls for legal and union-based regulation have to do with the means to ends – how the cause of equality can be advanced. Feminist IR scholars have also written extensively on the objectives of policy. Several themes stand out from this work. Perhaps the most fundamental is the need for policy to extend beyond mere equality of opportunity and secure equality of outcome, if needs be through positive/reverse discrimination. A second theme derives from the identification of the separate and distinct interests of women and minorities, the corollary of which is the need to tailor work and employment systems and surrounding regulations to accommodate this diversity (for example Baird, 2006). While feminists have developed a critique of 'diversity management', there is nevertheless a common policy emphasis on difference and the need to develop flexible systems of employment that accommodate the distinct interests of women and minorities (Dickens, 2005: 201–3).<sup>8</sup> A third theme extends beyond the world of work and targets the domestic sphere through policies that socialize childcare and either encourage or require men to assume a greater domestic workload (for example through state paternity and family leave policies). As the origins of workplace inequality have been located in a broader 'sexual contract', so IR policy has leaned toward social and family policy and sought to reconstruct domestic as well as workplace relations. This, in turn, reflects an abiding theme of feminist IR scholarship; in both its analysis and in its normative stance it has extended the scope of the

subject and tried to erase the lines that separate IR from adjacent fields of (gendered) social life.

### *Neo-liberalism*

The third challenge to pluralist orthodoxy has come from the neo-liberal right and although its proponents constitute only a tiny minority of IR scholars the ideas they expound reflect major themes in recent public policy in the US, Britain, Australia, New Zealand and other countries. In certain respects this normative orientation is the mirror image of Marxism, choosing to privilege the interests of employers rather than labor. This is not fully the case, however. Neo-liberals accept that employees have legitimate interests that they inevitably will pursue but suggest that inefficiencies will result and the interests of consumers suffer, if they are not restrained by a combination of competitive markets and management hierarchy. Competition and control, from this perspective, are the necessary disciplines that must keep 'producer' interests in check. It follows that, regulatory institutions which inhibit competition or which restrict the operation of management hierarchies are inevitably viewed with suspicion, if not hostility. The actions of the state in regulating the labor market and of trade unions in raising wages and challenging management prerogative have been particular targets. The same institutions that are seen to offer solutions to labor market problems in pluralist analysis are viewed as the source of problems by neo-liberals.

Following Hirschman (1991), we can identify the main types of argument that neo-liberals have mounted against pluralist industrial relations. One response has been to question the severity of the social problems that are the target of regulatory intervention by pluralists. Thus, it has been suggested that there is less need for unions to redress the power imbalance in the employment relationship when second jobs, self-employment and the ownership of shares and other private property render workers less dependent on wages earned from a single employer (Hanson and Mather,

1988: 36). An equivalent argument made against minimum wage legislation is to point to the fact that many low-wage workers live in multi-income households and so are not solely dependent on their own income. A second response, labeled the 'futility thesis' by Hirschman (1991), questions the capacity of regulation to moderate market outcomes, at least in the longer term. Examples of the futility thesis include the claim that minimum wage laws simply displace employment into the informal sector or Troy's (1999: 24) argument that union pattern-bargaining can never truly 'take wages out of competition' and simply displaces employment into the non-union economy. A third response, the 'perversity thesis', states that regulation rebounds against the very group it is intended to help, in most versions of the argument by destroying the jobs of unionized workers or those protected by legal regulation. To quote from Troy (2004: 70), '...high Franco-German unemployment, lower productivity, downsizing, and the export of production to other countries...can be traced to an important extent, to the works councils (and unionism) that [pluralists] extol and urge [the USA] to impose on its own workplaces'. The final argument, the 'jeopardy thesis', submits that regulation destroys other desirable states, such as national competitiveness. To quote once more from Troy (2004: 72) the effect of strong trade unions in the American school system is to raise the costs of education and impose 'externalities', including 'uneducated children who are ill-equipped to compete in America's labor markets...' For Troy, as for many neo-liberals, the effect of unionism is to create low quality and inefficiency by imposing work rules on managers that elevate producer interests above those of the consumers of goods and services.

The prescription which flows from this analysis is for the deregulation of industrial relations. Neo-liberals routinely call for the withdrawal or weakening of legislation that interferes with market forces or inhibits the capacity of managers to respond to market signals. Where regulation is unavoidable, as

is the case in the UK required to implement European social policy directives, there is a preference for 'soft law' or other, relatively weak forms of regulation. Employment legislation is continually weighed in the balance to identify potential costs and dysfunctional consequences. An even closer scrutiny has been directed at regulation stemming from trade unions and collective bargaining (Minford, 1985) and the weakening of union capacity to regulate labor markets has been a notable feature of jurisdictions where neo-liberalism has shaped public policy. The long catalogue of anti-union reform in Britain under Margaret Thatcher in the 1980s or the more recent Work Choices policy of John Howard's government in Australia, provide examples. For some neo-liberal commentators the only legitimate role for trade unions is in providing labor market services to their members; that is in helping the labor market to operate more efficiently through the provision of skills and information (Roberts, 1987; Shenfield 1986).

If deregulation is the negative side of neo-liberal prescription for industrial relations, what is the positive element? Perhaps the clearest neo-liberal agenda for reconstructing work relations focuses on the use of financial incentives to alleviate principal-agent problems and re-align the interests of shareholders, managers and employees. Thus, one of the reasons Troy inveighs against the actions of educational unions in the US is because of their opposition to incentive and merit pay. Many neo-liberals have a particular enthusiasm for profit-sharing and employee share-ownership (for example Bell and Hanson, 1987) and the diffusion of neo-liberal ideas has been accompanied by an international trend to promote worker shareholding through tax incentives and other policy instruments (see Vaughan-Whitehead, 1995). The objective of re-aligning worker and employer interests was cogently expressed by the late President Reagan, 'Could there be a better answer to the stupidity of Karl Marx than millions of workers individually sharing in the means of production?' (quoted in Bradley and Gelb, 1986: 22).

### ***Pluralist responses***

Notwithstanding the challenge from Marxism, feminism and neo-liberalism, pluralism remains the dominant normative orientation within academic IR. The mainstream has stretched to accommodate aspects of each critique, however, and many recent developments in the field have emerged from the tension between pluralism and its opponents.

The classic pluralist response to the Marxist challenge has been to point to the effectiveness of IR reform in civilizing the market order, both in a material sense of raising workers' living standards and in a procedural sense of protecting workers from arbitrary treatment and importing due process into the employment relationship. Thus, Flanders (1970) defending UK unions in the 1960s from the Marxist charge of economism, declared that, 'by doggedly sticking to their immediate ends and refusing to be captured and exploited by any political party, they have gradually transformed society'. This search for evidence of reform, and for the capacity of capitalist economies to undergo significant reform, continues within the pluralist tradition. Its clearest contemporary expression can be seen in the attraction of many IR scholars to the *Varieties of Capitalism* literature. Particularly for IR pluralists in Anglophone countries, evidence of sustainable alternative forms of capitalism, which are more receptive to the interests of workers or which foster less adversarial relations between managers and employees, is deeply appealing (for example Adams, 1995). In recent years the labor market institutions of 'coordinated market economies' have served as a menu for Anglophone IR reformists, a new set of recipes for civilizing capitalism. German works councils, in particular, have been identified as an institution that can provide a model for reform, helping to create 'the mutual gains enterprise' in the USA and other 'liberal market economies' (Kochan and Osterman, 1994: 204–207).<sup>9</sup>

The response to feminism has been more accommodating and, as some feminist critics of mainstream IR acknowledge, there has

been greater recognition of gender and the issue of equality in textbooks and research literature (Healy et al., 2006). IR may still lag behind other fields of social inquiry in drawing from feminist theory and the accommodation may be limited (and largely ignore the gendered experience of men) but a shift has occurred. There remains a line of division, however, that has recently been sketched by Edwards (2003: 28–30). He makes two key points. The first is that the field of IR will lose its coherence if it extends too far beyond the employment relationship to embrace the domestic sphere and the wider cultural expression of gender relations. Edwards likens the walls of the workplace to a 'semi-permeable membrane', which 'filters influences from outside and also shapes how processes within the workplace affect relations elsewhere'. Clearly relations at work are shaped by forces beyond, including the sexual division of labor within the home, but they are not reducible to them and for this reason the proper focus of IR scholarship should remain the employment relationship. The second point is that the extent to which institutions involved in regulating the workplace are gendered is a matter of degree and to be established by empirical research. Edwards is at pains to concede that the use of gender-neutral categories by IR academics has often shielded important features of working life from inquiry, but holds that their use may be legitimate in particular circumstances. A related theme has recently appeared in empirical work asking if gender is of 'declining significance'; that is, if sex differences are becoming less apparent in the distribution of earnings and other indicators of workers' experiences (Blau et al., 2006).

If many pluralists have wanted to accommodate a feminist perspective, the typical response to neo-liberalism has been defensive, striving to rebut elements of the neo-liberal attack. One important service discharged by pluralist IR researchers has been to disprove the wilder claims of free marketers that protective regulation of the labor market generates perverse and other effects. For example, a series of careful studies of the UK's cautious

experiment with minimum wage regulation in recent years have shown little evidence of significant job losses (Dickens and Manning, 2003). A more offensive position has been to develop ‘business case’ arguments in support of the regulatory institutions favored by pluralists. One of the earliest and best known examples of this type of argument was Freeman and Medoff’s (1984: 162–80) defense of US trade unionism, particularly on the grounds that it stimulated higher productivity. Since then other researchers have trod the same path, using empirical data to make a positive case for trade unionism and employment law (for example Turnbull et al., 2004). At a theoretical level pluralists have also developed the concept of ‘beneficial constraints’, as a counterweight to the neo-liberal predilection for perversity (Streeck, 1997). Institutions that inhibit the market or management decision, it is suggested, promote long-term efficiency by shutting off the low-road to cost-minimization and encouraging managers to forge long-term, co-operative relations with employees. The final and most ambitious pluralist response has been not to accept but to transcend the standards of evaluation employed by neo-liberals. There has been a turn to ethical reasoning and the revival of social justice arguments as a basis for labor market regulation, independently of economic effects (Budd, 2004). While many pluralists have fought neo-liberals on their own ground, there is a growing trend to reach beyond their Gradgrind values to mount the case for decent conditions for working men and women.

## THE STRUCTURE OF THE HANDBOOK

The themes, developments and issues outlined above are reflected in the chapters that follow. In the first part, the contributors provide an overview of the theoretical and ideological underpinnings of the field, its interconnections with other disciplines, links with developments taking place both within and outside the work organization and the questions these raise for optimum ways of

studying contemporary industrial relations. In Chapter 2, Carola M. Frege considers the historical development of industrial relations research, examining to what extent the approach and focus of that research reflects particular national conditions. She highlights significant variation in the influence of particular disciplines in different countries (most notably the relative strengths of economic vs. sociological approaches to industrial relations) and the continuing influence of different academic structures, epistemological traditions and political discourses on the ways in which industrial relations research is pursued. The theme of the relationship of industrial relations to social science disciplines is developed further by Peter Ackers and Adrian Wilkinson in Chapter 3. They argue the case for a renewed dialogue not only with economics, politics, sociology and history, but also with psychology, law and geography. A key contribution of industrial relations to this dialogue is seen to be an institutional analysis of the employment relationship that incorporates much more than trade unionism and collective bargaining.

In Chapter 4, Edmund Heery considers different theoretical approaches to industrial relations. He contrasts ‘cross-sectional’ models that specify the different elements comprising the industrial relations field, their interrelationships and outcomes, with other models that focus more on types and rates of change occurring over time. Given evident shortcomings in the former approach, which has dominated the field in the past (mainly in the form of systems theory), Heery identifies the need for an approach that incorporates a sophisticated model of change, combining elements of the different models of change he outlines. In Chapter 5, John Budd and Devasheesh Bhawe explore the different underlying values, ideologies and frames of reference held by those studying and practicing industrial relations. They view the different frames of reference existing within the field as both a weakness and strength of the subject: a weakness when it leads to different groups ‘talking past each other’ and a strength when it helps to interpret the complexity of the

world of work. For the latter to thrive however, Budd and Bhawe emphasize the need for a clearer exposure of the values and ideologies within industrial relations discourse.

In Chapter 6, William Brown draws on three decades of research into pay setting to examine the central influence of product market conditions on industrial relations. He explores the relationship between greater competition and increased unwillingness on the part of employers to reach the sort of agreements with unions that were widespread in the past. In the light of this, Brown notes the growing importance of other means for workers to seek influence, including working to secure more state support for employment standards and gaining consumer backing for fair labor conditions.

In Chapter 7, Kerstin Hamman and John Kelly broaden the theme of influences on industrial relations systems by considering the links between different models of capitalism (focusing particularly on the Varieties of Capitalism typology) and the characteristics and trajectories of different national systems of industrial relations. While their analysis points to a number of identifiable clusters of industrial relations systems, they demonstrate the inability of simple dichotomous classifications – such as between liberal market economies and co-ordinated market economies – adequately to categorize patterns and developments in industrial relations. Hamman and Kelly argue that systematic comparisons of industrial relations systems need a greater sensitivity to, for example, the particular roles of national states, political parties and different welfare systems than is represented by the broad Varieties of Capitalism categories.

In Chapter 8, Stephen Procter shortens the horizon of analysis to consider changes occurring within the workplace. This is one of a number of contributions in the volume that draw on current debates regarding human resource practices and firm performance. In exploring what is known (and less known) in this area, Procter argues that the employment relationship has yet to be fully considered in questions such as the factors influencing

the diffusion of human resource practices, or more generally how management actions have ‘effects’ on practice and performance.

In the final chapter in Part One, George Strauss and Keith Whitfield discuss recent trends in research approaches by industrial relations scholars. Analyses of journal contents are used to gauge the extent of change in industrial relations research: the trend toward more deductive and less inductive approaches, for example and the growing use of large data sets and multivariate statistical methods. To avoid the danger of becoming too detached from the people and contexts they are purporting to study, Strauss and Whitfield discuss the potential for designing studies that benefit from both qualitative and quantitative approaches.

Part Two focuses on developments among the different actors engaged in industrial relations, considering not only the ‘usual suspects’ of employers and management, trade unions and national state institutions, but also other relevant actors such as transnational institutions, works councils and a range of other actors whose activities have a bearing on industrial relations processes and outcomes. In the first of two chapters on trade unions, Jack Fiorito and Paul Jarley consider in Chapter 10 the main developments in union structure, including trends toward general unionism and how union governance and administrative structures relate to outcomes. Implications of ‘organizing model’ and ‘social network’ conceptions of unions are also considered. In noting the difficulties facing many individual unions and national trade union movements, Fiorito and Jarley advocate greater investigation both of the relationship between union structure and practice and the relationship between local and national union structures and outcomes, together with a more thorough evaluation of the consequences of different union choices. This latter aspect is considered in detail by Peter Boxall in Chapter 11, in which he examines the strategic choices facing trade unions in the difficult environments many now confront. Drawing on the notion of organizational life cycles, Boxall argues the inappropriateness

of universal union renewal strategies, such as 'organizing' or 'servicing' strategies. He contends that different types of worker, facing diverse conditions and working for employers who have varying responses to trade union representation, require union revitalization strategies that are capable of responding to these different conditions.

In Chapter 12, Franz Traxler examines the relevance of the changing structure of employer organizations for the conduct of industrial relations. He notes the inevitable tensions that exist within employer organizations, and the extent to which the incentives for employers to join such organizations have declined, reflecting not only widespread reductions in union power, but also the internationalization of markets and the reduced significance of multi-employer agreements. Traxler argues that broadening their range of activities and developing roles in ways encouraged by the state, could become increasingly significant for the maintenance of employer organizations in the future.

In Chapter 13 Nicolas Bacon explores management's central position within industrial relations and the scope for, and constraints upon management in developing particular industrial relations approaches, such as those designed to build a 'high commitment' workplace. He emphasizes the need for greater understanding of the degree to which management can exercise choice in their approach to industrial relations given the constraints imposed by, among other things, product markets (and nature of competition), labor markets, financial systems and institutional contexts.

In the first of three chapters examining different aspects of the state's role in industrial relations, Richard Hyman in Chapter 14 points to the peripheral way in which the state has been investigated much in industrial relations research. He argues that this has acted to underplay the close interrelationship between states and markets and the centrality of the state within industrial relations, as employer, legislator, economic manager and welfare provider. Hyman develops a three-fold typology of the way that states shape

industrial relations, each representing a different balance of priorities in the weight attached to pursuing economic efficiency, social stability and the rights and standards accorded to its citizens.

In Chapter 15 Simon Deakin and Wanjiru Njoya reassess the position of labor law within broader industrial relations inquiry. Drawing on the examples of several countries, they trace the development of labor law and the different interests and wide range of objectives that it attempts to regulate. Identifying a continuing diversity across different national systems, Deakin and Njoya also point to common challenges facing established legal concepts and categories stemming from, for example, changes occurring in organizational forms and the global spread of business operations.

In Chapter 16, Marick Masters, Ray Gibney, Iryna Shevchuk and Tom Zagenczyk focus on developments in the state's role as an employer. The picture drawn is again one of substantial change, not least in the spread of different business practices from the private into the public sector, and increased pressures on public sector workers to improve their performance. They anticipate these pressures intensifying further, potentially signaling important industrial relations implications regarding work pressure, and the nature of the work-effort bargain among public sector workers. In Chapter 17, Rebecca Gumbrell-McCormick turns her attention to the international regulation of the employment relationship, through the influence of such bodies as the International Labour Organization, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization, as well as international federations of trade unions and employers' organizations. She identifies significant areas of development of an international industrial relations system; such developments are judged to have been restricted, however, by the limited powers ceded to organizations such as international trade union federations by national constituent members concerned to maintain their autonomy.

In Chapter 18, Jean Jenkins and Paul Blyton examine the development and prospects for

works councils within industrial relations systems. While they identify a number of factors potentially challenging the future of works councils, other developments appear to signal fresh impetus for the expansion of works council arrangements. However, without active support from the different industrial relations parties, the prospects for the latest generation of works councils exerting significant influence are seen to be limited.

In Chapter 19, Charles Heckscher charts the emergence of new industrial relations actors, distinguishing between issue groups (such as consumers and environmentalists) and identity groups (based on race, sex or disability, for example). Though such groups show a growing preparedness to press their own demands, for the most part he notes the lack of adaptation of existing industrial relations processes to integrate these different stakeholders. Heckscher identifies a need for improved internal and external organization among the new actors, as well as for increased attention by trade unions to building effective relations and coalitions with these emerging stakeholders.

Part Three of the Handbook focuses mainly on processes of industrial relations. In Chapter 20, John Godard considers the factors influencing the formation of trade unions, particularly what determines individuals to seek collective representation. He reviews the different evidence on individual predispositions, the role of trade unions and employers, and the broader relevance of legal structures and economic and political contexts. Godard's analysis points to a long list of influencing factors, but also how different national institutional environments – and the norms that these give rise to – shape the particular influence of specific factors in different circumstances.

In Chapter 21, Robert Flanagan assesses the impact of changing bargaining structures on the exercise of bargaining power. He considers the widespread trend toward more decentralized industrial relations arrangements, that in turn have contributed to increased pay dispersion and a broadening of the agenda

discussed within more localized industrial relations. Pressures for decentralization are seen by Flanagan as continuing, giving rise to an expected greater industrial relations focus on productivity issues, and more generally signaling a degree of convergence among industrial relations systems toward more decentralized structures. In Chapter 22, Ann C. Frost picks up the theme of high performance work systems and considers the impact on the broader field of industrial relations. In questioning the longevity and diffusion of such human resource initiatives, she points to the general lack of evidence of accompanying mutual gains relationships, or significantly greater worker autonomy over decisions, particularly in many low-paid service environments. Frost highlights the need for more research involving a broader range of work sectors, better to reflect the diversity of working environments and the growing scale of non-union settings.

The issue of employee involvement in decision-making is also addressed in Chapter 23 by Russell D. Lansbury and Nick Wailes, who consider the extent to which certain institutional systems are more conducive to employee participation than others. They also cast doubt on the sustainability of work reorganization initiatives based on greater worker participation, particularly in those (liberal market) economies that otherwise do not provide an environment conducive to extending worker influence over decision-making. Looking to the future, Lansbury and Wailes note that even within coordinated market economies, participation traditions may be more difficult to sustain as pressures on firms increase for short-term financial returns.

In Chapter 24, David Lewin examines different theories of why employer-employee conflict occurs and charts the changes taking place in patterns of conflict resolution. He notes the significance of the shift away from collective toward more individual expressions of conflict, and the resulting expansion of conflict resolution methods outside collectively-agreed grievance procedures. In reviewing

the different individual methods of conflict resolution, Lewin points to a need for further evaluation of the effectiveness of different procedures, for individuals and organizations.

The contributors to Part Four primarily address the outcomes of industrial relations. The nature of these outcomes varies considerably and the ten chapters in this part reflect this diversity. In Chapter 25 Daniel Gallagher reviews trends in workforce structure and how that structure is shaped by the system of industrial relations. He particularly explores the development of different forms of temporary work contract and the implications of these for our understanding of the 'typical' employer-employee relationship or indeed the 'typical' organization. One of the future research issues identified is the need for further assessment of different union strategies being adopted for increasing recruitment among temporary workers. In Chapter 26 Alex Bryson and John Forth examine the different explanations of wage determination. They identify the many variables that impact on pay setting, giving rise among other things, to continuing wage inequality between the sexes, full- and part-time workers, and across occupations. Bryson and Forth emphasize the importance for those researching pay determination, of incorporating a sufficient degree of complexity into their analyses.

In Chapter 27, Paul Blyton considers another major focus of union-management relations: the determination of working time patterns. He examines the shifting influence of different forms of regulation over working time by the state, collective agreement, management and by employees themselves. Blyton also assesses the centrality of working time within the current debate over work-life balance, and the way in which current trends in working time potentially act both to facilitate and to inhibit workers achieving a successful work-life balance. In Chapter 28, David Guest broadens the discussion of industrial relations outcomes by considering worker well-being, with a particular focus on job satisfaction, insecurity, workload and stress. He identifies little relationship between trade

union presence and aspects of well-being, and notes that traditional industrial relations have rarely directly addressed questions of worker well-being in the past. However, with growing concerns over issues such as workplace stress, Guest identifies worker well-being as a potential area for greater attention by trade unions and industrial relations in the future.

In Chapter 29 Ali Dastmalchian reviews the research conducted on industrial relations climates. Drawing insights on the climate concept from organizational theory, he highlights a number of methodological issues which remain unresolved. Dastmalchian nonetheless identifies the influence of industrial relations climate on the outcomes of union-management relations, and notes the significance of the research on climate for current debates, including the question of whether unions and management should pursue greater 'partnership' relations. In Chapter 30 Barbara Pocock considers inequalities in employment outcomes. She emphasizes the multiple sources and manifestations of inequality and the ways in which recent developments both in industrial relations (such as decollectivization and decentralization) and labor markets (for example increased casualization) have contributed to widening inequalities. Pocock highlights the importance of a perspective that incorporates international as well as national and local comparisons; the chapter also underlines the broader importance of maintaining a focus on inequality in a field where it is prone to being crowded out by other issues such as economic performance.

In Chapter 31, Gregor Gall and Robert Hebdon examine issues surrounding how conflict is manifested at work. In reviewing the range of forms that conflict can take, and the widespread decline in strike levels that has taken place over the past two decades, they highlight the increased significance of more individualized conflict expressions and the degree to which these are currently substituting for other, more collective forms. In considering the future, Gall and Hebdon anticipate the continuation of both collective and individual forms of conflict,

and the possible further development of cross-national conflict expression coordinated through international trade union campaigns.

In Chapter 32, Irena Grugulis notes the central role that 'skill' has played within industrial relations, acting as a basis for union formation, wage demands and pay differentials, among other things. She examines national variations in skill formation systems, together with firm-level and trade union influences. Grugulis explores the factors that are putting established systems of vocational education and training under pressure, and identifies the dangers of weaker skill formation systems for continuing job quality. In Chapter 33, John Delaney considers the evidence on the relationship between industrial relations and business performance. While noting the overall lack of evidence that industrial relations enhance business performance, he questions the significance of this in terms of measuring the contribution that industrial relations actually makes. Rather than relying on a yardstick of economic efficiency, he identifies the need for developing other measures of performance, such as worker well-being or social justice, and poses the broader question of how industrial relations can be developed to make a more significant contribution in a rapidly-changing world.

In the final chapter, Richard Freeman questions to what extent differences in economic performance between countries can be attributed to differences in labor market institutions. While he finds clear evidence that centralized wage setting is associated with narrower pay gaps, more generally the results on any broader relationships between labor institutions and, for example, economic efficiency, growth and employment, are inconclusive, despite previous pronouncements and even policy advice based on seeming consensus. Freeman calls for more firm-level and other types of evidence, together with the development of more sophisticated theories concerning the contribution of labor institutions.

Together the chapters provide a wide-ranging review of the issues currently shaping and challenging the industrial relations field.

They identify too a series of questions about the future purpose and contribution of industrial relations within contemporary society. These questions underline the continuing importance of the subject in a world of work in which vital issues concerning the conditions under which that work is undertaken, remain to be resolved.

## NOTES

1 Fiorito (2005) notes that although the term 'industry' or 'industrial' connotes heavy industry for many, its use by IR scholars serves to differentiate 'industrial' or developed societies, from agrarian societies based largely on peasant production. Service businesses, public services, small enterprises and, indeed, contemporary agricultural production all exhibit industrial relations, to the extent that economic activity rests on the hiring of formally free labor to perform work tasks on the employer's behalf. Fiorito also notes that, while independent production for the market by the self-employed falls beyond IR's purview, bogus self-employment, in which dependent self-employed work for larger enterprises, and various forms of contingent labor, such as those based on the supply of contractors to employers through agencies, do not. In fact the study of contingent labor has been a notable theme in recent IR literature (for example Carré et al., 2000; Forde and Slater, 2005). In developed economies the employment relationship is the dominant institution through which work is organized – Edwards (2003: 2) estimates that 88 per cent of the UK's economically active population is engaged in an employment relationship – a fact that, in principle, underlines the continuing relevance of the study of industrial relations.

2 Another case can be identified along the boundary between state regulation and management decision. It is often suggested that managers (at least in Anglophone liberal market economies) are now the dominant actor in employment relations with the freedom to design systems of human resource management in a largely non-union context. Much of the prescriptive writing on HRM echoes this analysis with its emphasis on managers designing HR policies and practices that complement particular business strategies (see Legge, 2005: 19–25). In an important series of empirical articles, however, Dobbin and colleagues have cast doubt on this interpretation (Dobbin et al., 1993; Dobbin and Sutton, 1998; Kelly and Dobbin, 1999; Sutton et al., 1994). They argue essentially that the development of HR systems in US business since the early 1960s has been driven by the passage of equality law, which prompted US corporations to strengthen

the HR function and formalize and professionalize HR practice. The elaboration of HR systems, on this analysis, therefore, flowed from the interaction of management decision with legal regulation (see also Piore and Safford, 2006).

3 Stage-models seem to be used particularly by US writers. The scale of the US, the size of its economy and its dominance in the world system encourages indigenous scholars to treat it as a paradigmatic case. In Europe, in contrast, a continent crammed full of nation states each with their own traditions (Crouch, 1993), there is more emphasis on comparative studies and institutional analysis.

4 In Italy, although there was union support secured by a moderate victory, employer buy-in was limited and evaporated once Berlusconi's strong right-wing government was elected. Italian employers at that point had no need of a social pact to secure their objectives: 'When the 2001 elections gave a right-wing government the strongest majority of the post-war period, employers chose the more confrontational strategy of lobbying government for labor market deregulation'. (Baccaro and Lim, 2007: 40).

5 We note in passing, however, that despite this orientation there is little interest in IR amongst those engaged in what has come to be labeled 'critical management studies'.

6 Thus, Holgate et al. (2006: 325) note that, '...a dominant theme throughout has been the way in which "mainstream" IR has often reduced workers' experiences to the manifestation of class relations that are defined purely in economic terms, or which are theorized in terms of a single conflict between managers and employees'. Forrest (1993: 410) similarly observes both pluralism and Marxism that, '...these diverse approaches share a world-view that discounts the importance of gender as an analytical concept. Both presume that workers and trade unionists are quintessentially male; neither analyzes the way in which social relations at work are rooted in gender relations'.

7 Healy et al. (2006: 293) describe the contribution of feminist research within IR in terms of, 'putting women, and gender, and more recently, race/ethnicity, sexuality, disability and age, back in...'

8 Dickens writes of the need to abandon the 'Procrustean bed' of full-time continuous employment, designed to match the needs of male workers supported by a dependent care-giver. It must be pointed out, however, that feminist commentators are often critical of the actual work-life balance or family-friendly policies employers develop to accommodate diversity. Systems of flexible working time that allow women better to integrate paid and domestic labor, for instance, may simply reinforce a 'sexual contract' in which male interests are dominant.

9 The response of Marxists, in turn, has been to argue that differences between the 'varieties of capitalism' are exaggerated or that the force of

globalization will in due course erode institutional differences with an accompanying leveling down of employment standards (see Coates, 2000).

## REFERENCES

- Ackers, P. (2007) 'Collective bargaining as industrial democracy: Hugh Clegg and the political foundations of British Industrial Relations pluralism', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 45 (1): 77–101.
- Ackers, P. and Wilkinson, A. (2003a) 'Introduction: the British industrial relations tradition – formation, breakdown and salvage', in P. Ackers and A. Wilkinson (eds) *Understanding Work and Employment: Industrial Relations in Transition*. Oxford, Oxford University Press. pp. 1–27.
- Ackers, P. and Wilkinson, A. (eds) (2003b) *Understanding Work and Employment: Industrial Relations in Transition*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Adams, R.J. (1993) "'All aspects of people at work": unity and division in the study of labor and labor management', in R.J. Adams and N.M. Meltz (eds) *Industrial Relations Theory: Its Nature, Scope and Pedagogy*. Metuchen NJ and London, IMLR Press/Rutgers University and the Scarecrow Press. pp. 119–60.
- Adams, R.J. (1995) *Industrial Relations under Liberal Democracy: North America in Comparative Perspective*. Columbia SC, University of South Carolina Press.
- Almond, P. and Rubery, J. (1998) 'The gender impact of recent European trends in pay determination', *Work, Employment and Society*, 12 (4): 675–93.
- Anner, M., Greer, I., Hauptmeier, M., Lillie, N. and Winchester, N. (2006) 'The industrial determinants of transnational solidarity: global interunion politics in three sectors', *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 12 (1): 7–27.
- Armour, J., Deakin, S. and Konzelmann, S.J. (2003) 'Shareholder primacy and the trajectory of UK corporate governance', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 41 (3): 531–55.
- Baccaro, L. (2003) 'What is alive and what is dead in the theory of corporatism', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 41 (4): 683–706.
- Baccaro, L. and Lim, S-H. (2007) 'Social pacts as coalitions of the weak and moderate: Ireland, Italy and South Korea in comparative perspective', *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 13 (1): 27–46.
- Bach, S., Bordogna, L., Della Roca, G. and Winchester, D. (eds) (1999) *Public Service Employment Relations in Europe*. London, Routledge.

- Bacon, N. and Blyton, P. (2006) 'Union co-operation in a context of job insecurity: negotiated outcomes from teamworking', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44 (2): 215–38.
- Bacon, N., Wright, M. and Demina, N. (2004) 'Management buyouts and human resource management', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 42 (2): 325–47.
- Badigannavar, V., and Kelly, J. (2004) 'Union organizing', in J. Kelly and P. Willman (eds) *Union Organization and Activity*. London, Routledge. pp. 32–50.
- Baird, M. (2006) 'The gender agenda: women, work and maternity leave', in M. Hearn and G. Patmore (eds) *Rethinking Work: Time, Space and Discourse*. Melbourne, Cambridge University Press. pp. 39–59.
- Barley, S.R. and Kunda, G. (2004) *Gurus, Hired Guns and Warm Bodies: Itinerant Experts in a Knowledge Economy*. Princeton and Oxford, Princeton University Press.
- Barnard, C. and Deakin, S. (2002) 'Corporate governance, European governance and social rights', in B. Hepple (ed.) *Social and Labour Rights in a Global Context: International and Comparative Perspectives*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. pp. 122–50.
- Beechey, V. and Perkins, T. (1987) *A Matter of Hours: Part-time Work and the Labour Market*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Bell, D.W. and Hanson, C.G. (1987) *Profit-sharing and Profitability*. London, Kogan Page.
- Belman, D. and Voos, P. (2006) 'Union wages and union decline: evidence from the construction industry', *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 60 (1): 67–87.
- Bercusson, B. and Dickens, L. (1996) *Equal Opportunities and Collective Bargaining in Europe: Defining the Issues*. Dublin, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.
- Beynon, H. (1984) *Working for Ford*, 2nd edition. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Blau, F.D., Brinton, M.C. and Grusky, D.B. (eds) (2006) *The Declining Significance of Gender?* New York, Russell Sage Foundation.
- Boxall, P. and Haynes, P. (1997) 'Strategy and trade union effectiveness in a neo-liberal environment', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 35 (4): 567–91.
- Bradley, K. and Gelb, A. (1986) *Share Ownership for Employees*. London, Public Policy Centre.
- Briskin, L. and McDermott, P. (eds) (1993) *Women Challenging Unions: Feminism, Democracy and Militancy*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press.
- Brown, W. (2000) 'Putting partnership into practice in Britain', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 38 (2): 299–316.
- Brown Johnson, N. and Jarley, P. (2004) 'Justice and union participation: an extension and test of mobilization theory', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 42 (3): 543–62.
- Budd, J.W. (2004) *Employment with a Human Face: Balancing Efficiency, Equity and Voice*. London and Ithaca NY, ILR Press.
- Budd, J.W., Gomez, R. and Meltz, N.M. (2004) 'Why a balance is best: the pluralist industrial relations paradigm of balancing competing interests', in B.E. Kaufman (ed.) *Theoretical Perspectives on Work and the Employment Relationship*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Industrial Relations Research Association. pp. 195–227.
- Carré, F., Ferber, M.A., Golden, L. and Herzenberg, S.A. (eds) (2000) *Nonstandard Work: The Nature and Challenges of Changing Employment Arrangements*. University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign IL, Industrial Relations Research Association.
- Clark, A.E. (2005) 'Your money or your life: changing job quality in OECD countries', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 43 (3): 377–400.
- Clegg, H.A. (1976) *Trade Unionism under Collective Bargaining: A Theory Based on Comparisons of Six Countries*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.
- Coates, D. (2000) *Models of Capitalism: Growth and Stagnation in the Modern Era*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Coates, D. (ed.) (2005) *Varieties of Capitalism, Varieties of Approaches*. Basingstoke, Palgrave MacMillan.
- Cobble, D.S. (1991) 'Organizing the post-industrial workforce: lessons from the history of waitress unionism', *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 44 (3): 419–36.
- Cobble, D.S. (ed.) (1993) *Women and Unions: Forging a Partnership*. Ithaca and London, ILR Press.
- Cockburn, C. (1983) *Brothers: Male Dominance and Technological Change*. London, Pluto Press.
- Colgan, F. and Ledwith, S. (eds) (2002) *Gender, Diversity and Trade Unions: International Perspectives*. London, Routledge.
- Colling, T. and Dickens, L. (1989) *Equality Bargaining – Why Not?* Equal Opportunities Commission Research Series, London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Colling, T. and Dickens, L. (1998) 'Selling the case for gender equality: deregulation and equality bargaining', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 36 (3): 389–411.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A-M., Shore, L.M., Taylor, M.S. and Tetrick, L.E. (eds) (2004) *The Employment Relationship: Examining Psychological and Contextual Perspectives*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Crouch, C. (1993) *Industrial Relations and European State Traditions*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

- Darlington, R. (1994) *The Dynamics of Workplace Trade Unionism*. London and New York, Mansell.
- Darlington, R. and Lyddon, D. (2001) *Glorious Summer: Class Struggle in Britain 1972*. London, Chicago and Sydney, Bookmarks.
- Davies, P. and Freedland, M. (1993) *Labour Legislation and Public Policy*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Dickens, L. (1999) 'Beyond the business case: a three-pronged approach to equality action', *Human Resource Management Journal*, 9 (1): 9–20.
- Dickens, L. (2005) 'Walking the talk? Equality and diversity in employment', in S. Bach (ed.) *Managing Human Resources: Personnel Management in Transition*. Oxford, Blackwell Publishing. pp. 178–208.
- Dickens, L. (2007) 'The road is long: thirty years of equality legislation in Britain', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 45 (3): 463–94.
- Dickens, R. and Manning A. (2003) 'Minimum wage, minimum impact', in R. Dickens, P. Gregg and J. Wadsworth (eds) *The Labour Market under New Labour: The State of Working Britain*. Basingstoke, Palgrave MacMillan. pp. 201–13.
- Dickson, T., McLachlan, H.V., Prior, P. and Swales, K. (1988) 'Big Blue and the unions: IBM, individualism and trade union strategy', *Work, Employment and Society*, 2 (4): 506–20.
- Dobbin, F., Sutton, J.R., Meyer, J.W. and Scott, R. (1993) 'Equal opportunity law and the construction of internal labor markets', *American Journal of Sociology*, 99 (2): 396–427.
- Dobbin, F. and Sutton, J.R. (1998) 'The strength of a weak state: the rights revolution and the rise of human resource management divisions', *American Journal of Sociology*, 104 (2): 441–76.
- Dunlop, J.T. (1993) *Industrial Relations Systems*, revised edition. Boston MA, Harvard Business School Press.
- Edwards, P. (2003) 'The employment relationship and the field of industrial relations', in P. Edwards (ed.) *Industrial Relations: Theory and Practice*, second edition, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing. pp. 1–36.
- Ellem, B. (2002) 'Power, place and scale: union recognition in the Pilbara, 1999–2002', *Labour and Industry*, 13 (2): 67–89.
- Estlund, C. (2003) *Working Together: How Workplace Bonds Strengthen a Diverse Democracy*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Fairbrother, P. (1996) 'Workplace trade unionism in the state sector', in P. Ackers, C. Smith and P. Smith (eds) *The New Workplace and Trade Unionism*. London, Routledge. pp. 110–48.
- Fairbrother, P. (2000) *Trade Unions at the Crossroads*. London and New York, Mansell.
- Fairris, D. (2006) 'Union voice effects in Mexico', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44 (4): 781–800.
- Ferner, A., Quintanilla, J. and Sánchez-Runde, C. (eds) (2006) *Multinationals, Institutions and the Construction of Transnational Practices: Convergence and Diversity in the Global Economy*. Basingstoke, Palgrave MacMillan.
- Fine, J. (2006) *Worker Centers: Organizing Communities at the Edge of the Dream*. Ithaca and London, ILR Press.
- Fiorito, J. (2005) 'Industrial relations', in S. Cartright (ed.) *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Management*, second edition. Malden, MA, Blackwell. pp. 183–85.
- Fiorito, J. (2001) 'Human resource management practices and worker desires for union representation', *Journal of Labor Research*, 22 (2): 335–54.
- Flanders, A. (1970) *Management and Unions: The Theory and Reform of Industrial Relations*. London, Faber and Faber.
- Foley, J.R. (2003) 'Mobilization and change in a trade union setting: environment, structures and action', *Work, Employment and Society*, 17 (2): 247–68.
- Forde, C. and Slater, G. (2005) 'Agency working in Britain: character, consequence and regulation', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 43 (2): 249–72.
- Forrest, A. (1993) 'Women and IR theory: no room in the discourse', *Relations Industrielles*, 48 (3): 409–40.
- Freeman, R. and Medoff, J. (1984) *What Do Unions Do?* New York, Basic Books.
- Frege, C.M. (2002) 'A critical assessment of the theoretical and empirical research on works councils', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 40 (2): 221–48.
- Frege, C.M. (2005) 'Varieties of industrial relations research: take-over, convergence or divergence?', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 43 (2): 179–207.
- Frege, C.M. and Kelly, J. (2004) 'Union strategies in comparative context', in C.M. Frege and J. Kelly (eds) *Varieties of Unionism: Strategies of Union Revitalization in a Globalizing Economy*. Oxford, Oxford University Press. pp. 31–44.
- Frost, A. (2001) 'Reconceptualising local union responses to workplace restructuring in North America', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 39 (4): 307–33.
- Godard, J. (2004a) 'A critical assessment of the high performance paradigm', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 42 (2): 349–78.
- Godard, J. (2004b) 'The new institutionalism, capitalist diversity and industrial relations', in B.E. Kaufman (ed.) *Theoretical Perspectives on Work and the Employment Relationship*. Champaign IL, Industrial Relations Research Association. pp. 229–64.
- Goldthorpe, J.H. (1985) 'The end of convergence: corporatist and dualist tendencies in modern western societies', in B. Roberts, R. Finnegan and D. Gallie

- (eds) *New Approaches to Economic Life*. Manchester, Manchester University Press. pp. 124–53.
- Gordon, M.E. and Turner, L. (eds) (2000) *Transnational Cooperation among Labor Unions*. Ithaca and London, ILR Press.
- Gospel, H. and Pendleton, A. (eds) (2005) *Corporate Governance and Labour Management*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Green, F. (2006) *Demanding Work: The Paradox of Job Quality in the Affluent Economy*. Princeton and Oxford, Princeton University Press.
- Green, F. and Tsitsianis, N. (2005) 'An investigation of national trends in job satisfaction in Britain and Germany', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 43 (3): 401–29.
- Grimshaw, D. and Rubery, J. (2001) *The Gender Pay Gap: a Research Review*. Research Discussion Series, Manchester, Equal Opportunities Commission.
- Guest, D. (2007) 'HRM and performance: can partnership address the ethical dilemmas?' in A. Pinnington, R. Macklin and T. Campbell (eds) *Human Resource Management: Ethics and Employment*. Oxford, Oxford University Press. pp. 52–65.
- Guest, D. and Conway, N. (1999) 'Peering into the Black Hole: the downside of new employment relations in the UK', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 37 (3): 367–89.
- Gunnigle, P., Collings, D.C. and Morley, M.J. (2006) 'Accommodating global capitalism? State policy and industrial relations in American MNCs in Ireland', in A. Ferner, J. Qunitanilla and C. Sánchez-Runde (eds) *Multinationals, Institutions and the Construction of Transnational Practices: Convergence and Diversity in the Global Economy*. Basingstoke, Palgrave MacMillan. pp. 86–108.
- Hall, P.A. and Soskice, D. (1998) 'An introduction to varieties of capitalism', in P.A. Hall and D. Soskice (eds) *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*. Oxford, Oxford University Press. pp. 1–70.
- Hanson, C. G. and Mather, G. (1988) *Striking out Strikes: Changing Employment Relations in the British Labour Market*. Hobart Paper 110, London, The Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Hassel, A. (2006) *Wage-Setting, Social Pacts and the Euro*. Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press.
- Healy, G., Hansen, L.L. and Ledwith, S. (2006) 'Editorial: still uncovering gender in industrial relations', *Industrial Relations Journal*, 37 (4): 290–8.
- Heery, E. (2003) 'Trade unions and industrial relations', in P. Ackers and A. Wilkinson (eds) *Understanding Work and Employment: Industrial Relations in Transition*. Oxford, Oxford University Press. pp. 278–304.
- Heery, E. and Conley, H. (2007) 'Frame extension in a mature social movement: British trade unions and part-time work', *The Journal of Industrial Relations*, 48 (1): 5–29.
- Heery, E. and Frege, C. (2006) 'New actors in industrial relations', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44 (4): 601–4.
- Heery, E., Healy, G. and Taylor, P. (2004) 'Representation at work: themes and issues', in G. Healy, E. Heery, P. Taylor and W. Brown (eds) *The Future of Worker Representation*. Basingstoke, Palgrave MacMillan. pp. 1–36.
- Herding, R. (1972) *Job Control and Union Structure*. Rotterdam, University of Rotterdam Press.
- Hirschman, A.O. (1991) *The Rhetoric of Reaction: Perversity, Futility, Jeopardy*. Cambridge MA and London, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Holgate, J., Hebson, G. and McBride, A. (2006) 'Why gender and "difference" matters: a critical appraisal of industrial relations research', *Industrial Relations Journal*, 37 (4): 310–28.
- Hoque, K. and Noon, M. (2004) 'Equal opportunities policy and practice in Britain: evaluating the "empty shell" hypothesis', *Work, Employment and Society*, 18 (3): 481–506.
- Howell, C. (2005) *Trade Unions and the State: The Construction of Industrial Relations Institutions in Britain, 1890–2000*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Hunter, L.C. and Rimmer, S. (1995) 'An economic exploration of the UK and Australian experiences', *Gender, Work and Organization*, 2 (3): 140–56.
- Hyman, R. (1975) *Industrial Relations: A Marxist Introduction*. London and Basingstoke, The MacMillan Press.
- Hyman, R. (2004) 'Is industrial relations theory always ethnocentric?', in B.E. Kaufman (ed.) *Theoretical Perspectives on Work and the Employment Relationship*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Industrial Relations Research Association. pp. 265–92.
- Katz, H.C. (1993) 'The decentralization of collective bargaining: a literature review and comparative analysis', *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 47 (1): 3–22.
- Kaufman, B.E. (1993) *The Origins and Evolution of the Field of Industrial Relations in the United States*. Ithaca NY, ILR Press.
- Kaufman, B.E. (2004a) 'Employment relations and the employment relations system: a guide to theorizing', in B.E. Kaufman (ed.) *Theoretical Perspectives on Work and the Employment Relationship*. Champaign IL, Industrial Relations Research Association. pp. 41–75.

- Kaufman, B.E. (2004b) *The Global Evolution of Industrial Relations: Events, Ideas and the IIRA*. Geneva, International Labour Office.
- Kaufman, B.E. and Taras, D.G. (eds) (2000) *Nonunion Employee Representation: History, Contemporary Practice and Policy*. Armonk, NY, M.E. Sharpe.
- Kelly, E. and Dobbin, F. (1999) 'Civil rights law at work: sex discrimination and the rise of maternity leave policies', *American Journal of Sociology*, 105 (2): 455–92.
- Kelly, J. (1998) *Rethinking Industrial Relations: Mobilization, Collectivism and Long Waves*. London, Routledge.
- Kirton, G. and Greene, A-M. (2000) *The Dynamics of Managing Diversity: A Critical Approach*. London, Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Kochan, T.A. (1998) 'What is distinctive about industrial relations research?', in K. Whitfield and G. Strauss (eds) *Researching the World of Work: Strategies and Methods in Studying Industrial Relations*. Ithaca and London, ILR Press. pp. 31–45.
- Kochan, T.A., Katz, H.C., McKersie, R.B. (1986) *The Transformation of American Industrial Relations*. New York, Basic Books.
- Kochan, T.A. and Osterman, P. (1994) *The Mutual Gains Enterprise: Forging a Winning Partnership among Labor, Management and Government*. Cambridge MA, Harvard Business School Press.
- Konzelmann, S.J., Conway, N., Trenberth, L. and Wilkinson, F. (2006) 'Corporate governance and human resource management', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44 (3): 541–67.
- Korczynski, M., Hodson, R. and Edwards, P. (eds) (2006) *Social Theory at Work*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Kuruville, S. and Verma, A. (2006) 'International labor standards, soft regulation and national government roles', *The Journal of Industrial Relations*, 48 (1): 41–58.
- Ledwith, S. and Colgan, F. (2002) 'Tackling gender, diversity and trade union democracy: a worldwide project?', in F. Colgan and S. Ledwith (eds) *Gender, Diversity and Trade Unions: International Perspectives*. London, Routledge. pp. 1–27.
- Legge, K. (2005) *Human Resource Management: Rhetorics and Realities*, anniversary edition. Basingstoke and New York, Palgrave MacMillan.
- Legge, K. (2007) 'The ethics of HRM in dealing with individual employees without collective representation', in A. Pinnington, R. Macklin and T. Campbell (eds) *Human Resource Management: Ethics and Employment*. Oxford, Oxford University Press. pp. 35–41.
- Lillie, N. (2006) *A Global Union for Global Workers: Collective Bargaining and Regulatory Politics in Maritime Shipping*. New York and London, Routledge.
- Logan, J. (2006) 'The union avoidance industry in the United States', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44 (4): 651–76.
- Lyddon, D. (2003) 'History and industrial relations', in P. Ackers and A. Wilkinson (eds) *Understanding Work and Employment: Industrial Relations in Transition*. Oxford, Oxford University Press. pp. 89–118.
- McAdam, D., McCarthy, J.D. and Zald, M.N. (eds) (1996) *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*. Cambridge and New York, Cambridge University Press.
- McAdam, D., Tarrow, S. and Tilly, C. (eds) (2001) *Dynamics of Contention*. Cambridge and New York, Cambridge University Press.
- McBride, A. (2001) 'Making it work: supporting group representation in a liberal democratic organization', *Gender, Work and Organization*, 8 (4): 411–29.
- Machin, S. (2006) 'The economic approach to analysis of the labor market', in M. Korczynski, R. Hodson and P. Edwards (eds) *Social Theory at Work*. Oxford, Oxford University Press. pp. 182–207.
- McColgan, A. (1994) *Pay Equity – Just Wages for Women?* London: The Institute of Employment Rights.
- Maitland, I. (1983) *The Causes of Industrial Disorder: A Comparison of a British and German Factory*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Marginson, P. and Sisson, K. (2004) *European Integration and Industrial Relations: Multi-level Governance in the Making*. Basingstoke, Palgrave MacMillan.
- Marsden, R. (1982) 'Industrial relations: a critique of empiricism', *Sociology*, 16 (2): 232–50.
- Metcalf, D. (2005) 'Trade unions: resurgence or perdition?', in S. Fernie and D. Metcalf (eds) *Trade Unions: Resurgence or Demise?* London and New York, Routledge. pp. 83–117.
- Milkman, R. (2006) *L.A. Story: Immigrant Workers and the Future of the U.S. Labor Movement*. New York, Russell Sage Foundation.
- Minford, P. (1985) 'Trade unions destroy a million jobs', in W.E.J. McCarthy (ed.) *Trade Unions: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth, Penguin. pp. 365–75.
- Müller-Jentsch, W. (2004) 'Theoretical approaches to industrial relations', in B.E. Kaufman (ed.) *Theoretical Perspectives on Work and the Employment Relationship*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Industrial Relations Research Association. pp. 1–40.
- Osterman, P., Kochan, T.A., Locke, R.M. and Piore, M.J. (2001) *Working in America: A Blueprint for the New Labor Market*. Cambridge MA, The MIT Press.

- Piore, M.J. and Safford, S. (2006) 'Changing regimes of workplace governance: shifting axes of social mobilization and the challenge to industrial relations theory', *Industrial Relations*, 45 (3): 299–325.
- Pocock, B. (1997a) 'Gender and Australian industrial relations theory and research practice', *Labour and Industry*, 8 (1): 1–19.
- Pocock, B. (ed.) (1997b) *Strife, Sex and Politics in Labour Unions*. St Leonards, Allen and Unwin.
- Purcell, J. and Ahlstrand, B. (1994) *Human Resource Management in the Multi-divisional Company*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Purcell, J. and Sisson, K. (1983) 'Strategies and practice in the management of industrial relations', in G.S. Bain (ed.) *Industrial Relations in Britain*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell. pp. 95–120.
- Rainnie, A., Herod, A. and McGrath Champ, S. (2007) 'Spatializing industrial relations', *Industrial Relations Journal*, 38 (2): 102–18.
- Roberts, B. (1987) *Mr Hammond's Cherry Tree: The Morphology of Union Survival*. Eighteenth Wincott Memorial Lecture, Occasional Paper 76, London, The Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Samuel, P. (2005) 'Partnership working and the cultivated activist', *Industrial Relations Journal*, 36 (1): 59–76.
- Shenfield, A. (1986) *What Right to Strike?* Hobart Paper 106, London, The Institute for Economic Affairs.
- Sisson, K. (1987) *The Management of Collective Bargaining: An International Comparison*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.
- Sisson, K. (1993) 'In search of HRM', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 31 (2): 201–10.
- Sisson, K. and Marginson, P. (2002) 'Co-ordinated bargaining: a process for our times?', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 40 (2): 197–220.
- Smith, P. and Morton, G. (2006) 'Nine years of New Labour: Neoliberalism and workers' rights', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44 (3): 401–20.
- Streeck, W. (1997) 'Beneficial constraints: on the economic limits of rational voluntarism', in J.R. Hollingsworth and R. Boyer (eds) *Contemporary Capitalism: The Embeddedness of Institutions*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. pp. 197–219.
- Sutton, J.R., Dobbin, F., Meyer, J.W. and Scott, W.R. (1994) 'The legalization of the workplace', *American Journal of Sociology*, 99 (4): 944–71.
- Tailby, S., Richardson, M., Stewart, P., Danford, A. and Upchurch, M. (2004) 'Partnership at work and worker participation: an NHS case study', *Industrial Relations Journal*, 35 (5): 403–18.
- Tarrow, S. (1998) *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*, second edition. Cambridge and New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Teague, P. (2006) 'Social partnership and local development in Ireland: the limits to deliberation', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44 (3): 421–43.
- Thompson, P. and Harley, B. (2007) 'HRM and the worker: labor process perspectives', in P. Boxall, J. Purcell and P. Wright (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Human Resource Management*. Oxford, Oxford University Press. 147–65.
- Traxler, F., Blaschke, S. and Kittel, B. (2002) *National Labour Relations in Internationalized Markets: A Comparative Study of Institutions, Change, and Performance*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Troy, L. (1999) *Beyond Unions and Collective Bargaining*. Armonk, NY, M.E. Sharpe.
- Troy, L. (2004) *The Twilight of the Old Unionism*. Armonk, NY, M.E. Sharpe.
- Tsogas, G. (2001) *Labor Regulation in a Global Economy*. Armonk, NY, M.E. Sharpe.
- Turnbull, P.J. (2003) 'What do unions do now?', *Journal of Labor Research*, 24 (3): 492–526.
- Turnbull, P.J. (2006) 'The war on Europe's waterfront – repertoires of power in the port transport industry', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44 (2): 305–26.
- Turnbull, P.J., Blyton, P. and Harvey, G. (2004) 'Cleared for take-off? Management-labor partnership in the European civil aviation industry', *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 10 (3): 287–307.
- Van Roozendaal, G. (2002) *Trade Unions and Global Governance*. London and New York, Continuum.
- Vaughan-Whitehead, D. (ed.) (1995) *Workers' Financial Participation: East-West Experiences*. Geneva, International Labour Office.
- Wacjman, J. (2000) 'Feminism facing industrial relations in Britain', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 38 (2): 183–201.
- Wall, T. and Wood, S. (2005) 'The romance of HRM and business performance, and the case for Big Science', *Human Relations*, 58 (4): 429–62.
- Wheeler, H.N. (2002) *The Future of the American Labor Movement*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Whitfield, K. and Poole, M. (1997) 'Organizing employment for high performance: theories, evidence and policy', *Organization Studies*, 18 (5): 745–64.

PART ONE

# Perspectives and Approaches





# The History of Industrial Relations as a Field of Study

Carola M. Frege

Industrial relations (IR) broadly defined as the study of work and employment, was established as an independent academic field in the 1920s in the US and subsequently after WWII in Britain and other Anglophone countries.<sup>1</sup> Though originally established by US institutional economists it soon became to be seen as an interdisciplinary field incorporating labor economists, social psychologists, personnel management scholars, industrial sociologists, labor lawyers as well as political scientists working on labor issues. In continental Europe and indeed in the rest of the world research on work and employment remained, however, a subject within those social science disciplines.

This chapter starts by outlining the different historical developments of IR research in the US and Britain as two examples of Anglophone countries with the longest traditions in IR research. It is then contrasted with the developments in Germany as an example of continental Europe. A major finding is that research traditions and outcomes differ from country to country and challenge the

classical notion of the universality of scientific research. This chapter argues instead for the embeddedness of IR research in national-specific path dependencies.

## INSTITUTIONAL HISTORIES OF IR RESEARCH

The industrial revolution and its social consequences in Europe and the US in the nineteenth and early twentieth century increasingly drew scholars from a variety of emerging social sciences (for example law, economics, political science, sociology) to engage in the analysis of the mechanics of capitalism and the ‘social question’, in particular the ‘labor problem’ (poverty and social unrest related to the industrialization) (Katznelson, 1996). In the US and Britain (and subsequently in other Anglophone regions) an independent field of study of employment, industrial or labor relations, developed at the beginning of the twentieth century.

As outlined before, this development did not occur in the rest of the world, in particular not in continental Europe, where IR research remained multi-disciplinary, conducted mainly by sociologists, political scientists and lawyers. The different institutional developments across countries are accompanied by specific research traditions exemplified in different methods, theories and paradigms.

In the following sections I will briefly outline the historical development of IR research in the three countries.<sup>2</sup> Generalizing and classifying national traditions is a potentially problematic task. Research is never homogeneous and there are always alternative lines of research. Note that this chapter does not attempt to achieve a complete coverage of the field of study in each country but merely wishes to outline its main, comparatively distinctive features.

### **United States**

The first IR course in the US was created at the University of Wisconsin in 1920. Other universities such as the University of Pennsylvania (Wharton Business School, 1921) and Princeton (1922) and Harvard (1923) followed. In the same year the National Association of Employment Managers changed its name to the IRAA (Industrial Relations Association of America), which was a forerunner of the current professional association, IRRA/LERA (Labor and Employment Relations Association), which was created in 1947. After the end of World War II IR became increasingly institutionalized as an independent field of study in various US universities.

Historically IR as an academic field was founded in the US by institutional or political economists, such as Richard Ely, Henry Carter Adams and John Commons (the founder of the Wisconsin School), who were heavily influenced by the German historical school of economics and felt increasingly alienated in their economics departments which began to turn towards neo-classical paradigms at the beginning of the twentieth century

(Hodgson, 2001). One can argue therefore that the 'new political economy' or institutional economics arose in reaction to the ascendancy of the laissez-faire perspective within economics. The institutional economists found in IR a niche to pursue pragmatic, behaviorist, public-policy oriented research which took institutional constraints in the labor market into account (Jacoby, 1990; Kaufman, 1993). Ideally, this perspective focused on the rules and norms underpinning economic activity, viewing institutions of work and employment as embedded within, and largely inseparable from, broader social, economic, and political institutions (Godard, 1994: 1).

One should note that these early theorists were not radical progressives however, but liberals and conservatives at the same time. They were liberals in their desire for reforming some of the social processes operating in the US society and conservatives in their desire to preserve the contours of a capitalist system and the parameters of wealth and power therein (DeBrizzi, 1983: 8). As Commons would have put it, they wanted to preserve capitalism by making it good. It comes as no surprise that when the IRAA was established in 1920 the top positions were taken over by pro-management conservatives. Their publication *personnel* became dominated by the conservatives and adopted a strident anti-communist tone that spilled over into more general anti-labor sentiments (in particular against militant workers) but continued to remain agnostic on the question of collective bargaining (Kimmel, 2000: 197).

Moreover, the pioneers of the field in the Anglophone world, Commons in the US and the Webbs in Britain, were heavily engaged in the world of public policy (Hyman, 2001). IR was therefore developed as a policy-oriented field of research, thus devoted to problem-solving (Kaufman, 2004: 117).

IR in the US arose as a relatively pragmatic, socially progressive reform movement, thus

occupying a position in the progressive centre to moderate left on issues of politics and economics, and spanning a diverse and not entirely consistent range of opinion with liberal business leaders on the

more conservative side of the field and moderate socialists on the more radical side. (Kaufman, 2004: 2)

The aim was to solve the labor problem without threatening capitalism. As Kaufman (2004: 121) states 'the goals of efficiency, equity and human self-development were mutually served by an active, broad-ranging program of social and industrial reform'. In other words, IR sought major change in the legal rights, management, and conditions of labor in industry, but at the same time was conservative and non-Marxist in that it sought to reform the existing social order rather than replace it with a new one. In fact, Marxists were antagonistic to the new field of IR since it sought to save through reform what they hoped to replace by revolution (Kaufman, 1993: 5).

At the same time, HR practitioners (or what was formerly called personnel management) and managerial scholars also became interested in the wider field of work and employment (Kaufman, 1993: 19). Already in the 1910s there was increasing interest in the scientific engineering of human capital, as symbolized in the work by Frederick W. Taylor (*Principles of Scientific Management*, 1911). According to Kimmel (2000: 5), by the end of WWI, however, academic researchers and practitioners in personnel management split in two camps, the 'reformists' and 'managerialists'. The reformists adopted liberal values and continued to support progressive ideas of capitalist reforms and saw a role for personnel managers to mediate between workers and employers interests. 'They defined their professional task as the regulation of labor relations in the public interest and the oversight of collective dealings between employers and employees' (Kimmel, 2000: 6). These scholars and practitioners would borrow from the theory and methods of the institutional labor economists. They were part of a wider progressive group of policy makers and scholars from different disciplines who came to the joint conviction that modern industries would need reform such as an employment department which would promote

employee welfare, for example (Commons, 1919: 167).

The managerialists, on the other side of the spectrum, embraced, according to Kimmel (2000), scientific expertise and objectivity as the defining features of their profession and assumed a harmony between employers and employees. Their task was to discover the source of problems in 'sick' companies where workplace relations were not harmonious and then to cure them. They used scientific techniques for 'adjusting' workers to industry, drawing in particular on industrial and social psychology. The idea was to improve workplace relations by a special profession which would apply in particular the new science of psychology to the 'human factor' in industry.

Over time, the more reform-oriented HR members of the management profession found themselves increasingly marginalized (Shenhav, 2002: 187). The triumph of managerialists meant a sharp split between psychological approaches and political and economic approaches to the study of IR. Managerialists favored psychological approaches which were seen as more objective. Industrial psychology became very popular during WWI and thereafter and was increasingly regarded as the solution to the labor problem (Shenhav, 2002: 183). This shift of the new profession of personnel management away from reform and toward 'science' also entailed a move away from a broad treatment of work and employment as involving economic and political, as well as psychological and social factors, towards a narrow treatment of IR/HR as a fundamentally psychological concern (Kimmel, 2000: 311). This approach gained dominance during the 1930s and 1940s. In 1922 business leaders even found their own rival organization to promote the field of employment/personnel management. The American Management Association (AMA), as it was named, campaigned vigorously for the open shop and against organized labor. Thus, increasingly in the early twentieth century the rising academic field of management excluded concerns with labor from their industry and personnel studies

and pushed those reformist scholars interested to the evolving field of study of IR (Shenhav, 2002: 187).

As a consequence, institutional economists interested in IR and reformist HR scholars shared in the beginning a common interest in pragmatic research leading to solutions of the labor problems. However, over time disagreements arose in particular over trade unions and collective bargaining (as one possible regulatory solution) and the two factions eventually split but learnt to co-exist and to divide the problem of work and employment between them, with personnel types handling the 'human element' and IR experts handling the material and collective aspects of labor relations (Kimmel, 2000: 312). For Kaufman (1993: 20), this divide remained a characteristic feature of the field over the following decades. These complicated developments partly explain why today there are two sorts of HR scholars in the US: the ones in the IR field under the umbrella of LERA and the HR and OB scholars which belong to the Academy of Management. Another reason may also be the growing divide between business schools and free-standing schools of labor relations.

It comes as no surprise that the broad field of IR was perceived as an interdisciplinary study rather than a distinctive discipline (Kaufman, 1993: 12). For example, as the director of the IR section at Princeton 1926–1954, J. D. Brown, states, IR should include 'all factors, conditions, problems and policies involved in the employment of human resources in organized production or service' (quoted in Kaufman, 1993: 201). However, interdisciplinarity was in reality pretty narrowly defined. The leading assumption was that the field should investigate a broad terrain by combining economics as well as psychology (see for example the Committee on Industrial Relations in their overview of the field of study in 1926, quoted in Kimmel, 2000: 304). Interdisciplinary research did not mean the dynamic interplay of related disciplines such as political science, sociology or history and their different methodologies and paradigms. Labor economics and social psychology

(in the tradition of the Hawthorne experiments) were clearly the leading disciplines in the field of IR in the US.

After WWII the split between the two economic and psychological groups became larger and the field became increasingly dominated by labor economists and other institutionally oriented scholars interested in collective bargaining (Jacoby, 2003; Kaufman, 1993). Thus, the quasi-stable co-existence of HR and IR started to disintegrate in the 1970s and 1980s when the New Deal system of collective labor relations began to break down. Labor economists have since then increasingly dominated the LERA activities and research programs as well as publications (Kaufman, 1993: 193). According to Kaufman (*ibid.*: 155) it is no surprise that the past academic presidents of the LERA were all labor economists. Similarly, Mitchell (2001: 375) agrees that IR research in the US was always dominated by labor economic paradigms, and probably now even more than in its high days, in the 1950s and 1970s.

As mainstream economics developed during the 1970s toward a sharply focused analytical discipline with a strong methodological consensus centering on model-building and on the statistical-empirical verification of largely mathematical theoretical hypotheses (Solow, 1997) this unsurprisingly also had an impact on labor economics and IR and ended up marginalizing the institutionalists. Thus, labor economics developed from an original institutional focus towards increasingly neo-classical (rational choice) paradigms (Boyer and Smith, 2001; Jacoby, 1990). Strauss and Feuille (1978: 535) argue that 'if collective bargaining represents industrial relations central core, then labor economics has largely divorced itself from that core'. Labor economists are currently more interested in micro level studies such as skill-wage differentials, labor contracts or training (for example the leading Cambridge School in US labor economics) than institutional research. Thus, institutionalism may have lost its theoretical link to labor economics (Jacoby, 2003). This development can be linked to the

declining importance of institutions in the US labor market such as trade unions or collective bargaining.

In sum, it comes as no surprise that labor economics has dominated much of US IR research from its very beginning. Not only are most authors of American IR publications labor economists but research methods, theories and paradigms of the majority of US publications are also shaped by labor economics (Frege, 2005). As outlined above, this does not deny the existence of a large contingent of US labor scholars who use non-economic, multi-disciplinary theories and methodologies, but compared to other countries the share of labor economists dominates the field. Thus, mainstream American IR research is commonly characterized by empirical, quantitative, deductive research with multi-variant statistics and mid-range hypotheses and focused on the micro-level (individual or groups of employees) (Frege, 2005; Mitchell, 2001; Whitfields and Strauss, 2000). Moreover, most IR theories are borrowed from economics or psychology and produce rational choice or strategic choice hypotheses or behavioristic, social-psychological approaches (Cappelli, 1985: 98; Godard, 1994). There is also evidence that research published in American IR journals, has increasingly focused on HR rather than IR issues (Frege, 2005). Finally, with regard to the underlying research paradigms it is commonly suggested that mainstream US research has generally interpreted IR as a labor market outcome and has been driven by a paradigm of contractual *laissez-faire* which was traditionally defined as free collective bargaining and is now increasingly perceived as an individualistic contractual system (Finkin, 2002).

## **Britain**

British universities were initially more reluctant than their US counterparts to welcome a new field of social science research and the first university course in IR appeared in the early 1930s when the Nobel-prize economist John Hicks offered a lecture series at the

London School of Economics (LSE) entitled 'Economic problems of industrial relations'. Only in the 1950s were academic appointments in IR made, first at the LSE, and then Manchester and Oxford. The British counterpart to LERA, BUIRA (British Universities Industrial Relations Association), was established in 1950 and in the beginning only targeted academics and hesitated to accept practitioners for a long time. This was very different to LERA, respectively IRAA, of course which in the beginning was composed largely of business people with an interest in HR (Kaufman, 1993: 5).

Scholarly work on IR issues in Britain however started much earlier with Beatrice and Sidney Webb, who wrote the first classics in the field (*Industrial Democracy*, 1897; *History of Trade Unionism*, 1920) with their insights into the dynamics of unionism and bargaining and which have been constantly referred to by later generations of IR scholars. It could easily be argued that the Webbs were the true founders of the Anglophone field of IR rather than Commons (Gospel, 2005: 5). Also G. D. H. Cole, the outstanding Fabian of the post-Webb generation (McCarthy, 1994: 201) had a huge influence on the field. Cole founded Labor Studies in Oxford. Cole's early 'memorandum' advocated public ownership and workers' control (McCarthy, 1994: 202). However, most of these scholars, though utterly political and interested in transforming the country by reforming the institutions of capitalism ultimately stayed within the parameters of liberalism similar to their counterparts in the US (Katznelson, 1996: 27).

In contrast with the US however, though British economists had an interest in the field, IR as a more institutionalized study was mainly developed by a heterogeneous group of scholars who founded the so-called Oxford School of Industrial Relations, such as Fox and Clegg who studied PPE (Politics, Philosophy and Economics) in Oxford and Flanders (who did not have an undergraduate degree at all). The field was characterized by 'a strong current of positivist Fabian social engineering, common sense and Anglophone

empiricism' not too dissimilar to the early US research (Ackers and Wilkinson, 2003: 8) though it stayed more inter-disciplinary and kept its institutional and historical approach to IR for much longer. Gospel (2005: 3) characterized this approach as mainly focused on the 'institutions of job regulation', especially trade unions and collective bargaining.

There was no real split between IR and HR scholars in Britain. This was partly because the field was less under the control of institutional economists than in the US, partly because behavioral sciences such as industrial psychology were much less developed in British universities at that time. Moreover, the leading paradigm was a pluralistic approach to IR, thus the acceptance of different interests between labor and capital and the conviction that conflict can be regulated benefiting both parties (positive sum game). This pluralistic perception of the labor market and of industrial unrest became a defining characteristic of the academic field in Britain, more so than in the US. It was also more accepted by the wider British public.

The 1970s saw the rise of a more radical Marxist frame of reference which opposed the pluralist desire of reaching stable employment relations and focused instead on class struggle and the subversion of the capitalist system. The radicalization of the 1968 student revolution affected IR scholars and a new generation of academics, in particular sociologists, rejuvenated the personnel of the discipline and added much needed rigor to its theoretical and methodological approaches (Gall, 2003). Prominent examples are Hyman's *Industrial Relations: A Marxist Introduction* (1975), or Fox's later work *Beyond Contract: Work, Power and Trust Relations* (1974). This Marxist stream was much less dominant in the US. The general absence of Marxist social sciences in the US has been widely documented (Ross, 1991) and British social sciences are commonly perceived as more progressive and ideological than those in the US (but less progressive and more pragmatic compared to continental Europe) (Katznelson, 1996: 18 and 40).

What developed from this Marxist approach were sophisticated ethnographic case studies mainly by industrial sociologists such as Batstone et al. (1977), for example, and studies of the 'Labor Process' school. Yet, this radicalization did not last. As Wood (2000: 3) describes, 'in the 1980s sociology as the key discipline within IR tended to give way to economics. This partly reflected the advent of neo-liberalism, as well as the past failings of the institutionalists to analyze economic problems such as productivity'. Ackers and Wilkinson (2003: 12) put it into a political perspective:

the discipline's best response to [Thatcher and] the New Right was a skeptical empiricism. Following political defeat, and in the absence of any new ideas, there grew a highly quantitative new empiricism, centered around the Workplace Industrial Relations Surveys (Cully et al., 1998; Millward et al., 2000), a unique national, longitudinal data set on the state of British workplace relations. IR spent much of the 1980s and early 1990s counting, measuring, and at times denying, the very obvious dismantling of Clegg's 'system of industrial relations'.

In a nutshell, British IR developed a co-existence of sociological qualitative and econometric quantitative studies, the latter being as exemplified in particular in the publications of the *British Journal of Industrial Relations*.

Finally, with regard to the research practices there is evidence to suggest that the field has been traditionally dominated by IR/HR scholars rather than by labor economists as in the US but also that the field remains more inter-disciplinary than in the US. Based on a longitudinal cross-country survey of IR journal publications during the 1970s and 1990s authors publishing in the UK are mostly affiliated as HR/IR scholars rather than economists but that there is nevertheless a wider range of other affiliations compared to the US (Frege, 2005). Also, there is no evidence that the decline of traditional IR institutions such as trade unions and collective bargaining in Britain has led to a declining academic interest. In contrast, research on IR issues such as unions has been stronger during the 1990s in British publication

outlets compared to the 1970s, for example. Moreover, the majority of British IR research has been characterized as mainly empirical but more qualitative, inductive and if quantitative then less based on econometrical analysis compared to the US (Capelli, 1985). The major focus of research tends to be the level of the firm rather than of the individual as in the US (Frege, 2005). Finally, IR has been traditionally defined as labor market outcomes as in the US though over the years the state and legislation became to be seen as increasingly important in shaping IR. Moreover, there is a long tradition of analyzing workplace relations in political terms (labor process debate). The traditional research paradigm can be described using Kahn-Freund's famous terminology 'collective laissez-faire' (Davies and Freedland, 2002) though individual employment contracts are increasingly taking over collective regulations.

### Germany

In Germany employment studies have a long tradition going back to Karl Marx, Max Weber, Lujo Brentano and Goetz Briefs. During the twentieth century the field became dominated by law, political science, but most prominently by sociology with the first university institute specializing in industrial sociology in 1928 at the Technical University Berlin (Keller, 1996; Mueller-Jentsch, 2001). Despite the fact that the relationship between capital and labor and the emergence of interest institutions were discussed in German social sciences from the mid-nineteenth century, IR was, however, not established as an independent academic discipline (Keller, 1996: 199). There is no IR department in any German university. The same is true for all other continental European countries.

Research on work and employment issues remained the subject of various social science disciplines. A few indicators should suffice to support this observation. First, although there have been increasing attempts in recent years to establish an IR discipline in Germany (for example the establishment of *Industrielle Beziehungen* – the German journal of

industrial relations) the academic community directly associated with IR is still quite small. The German section of the IIRA (GIRA, established in 1970) counted 80 members in 1995 (verses 520 BUIRA members in Britain or 3850 LERA members in the US in 1995). Of those members virtually all are affiliated with a department of sociology or another social science discipline.

Moreover, an overview of *Industrielle Beziehungen*, the only specialized IR journal in Germany, between 1994 (its founding date) and 2004 reveals that published research has been conducted by researchers with a wide array of specializations: industrial sociologists, labor lawyers, political scientists, business administration scholars and economists (Frege, 2005). Rarely does anyone call themselves an IR scholar. Industrial sociologists are in the clear majority. One should also note that there is hardly any cross-disciplinary communication. Business administration or law scholars for example are rarely cited in the industrial sociology literature and vice-versa (Muller, 1999: 468). The field is really multi-rather than inter-disciplinary.

Industrial sociology has made the most significant contribution to the study of IR (Keller, 1996). Its central focus are core IR issues such as bargaining policies, working time, technical change and rationalization, and their impact on work organization and social structure, but not labor market issues (Baethge and Overbeck, 1986; Kern and Schumann, 1984; Schumann et al., 1994). From its very beginning industrial sociology included a much larger field of topics compared to industrial sociology in Anglophone countries. German industrial sociology was closely connected to social philosophy and general sociology and in fact regarded as its major sub-discipline (Mueller-Jentsch, 2001: 222; Schmidt et al., 1982). It positioned itself within the broader societal context of industrialization, and focused in particular on the role of organized labor.

Max Weber initiated the first systematic sociological research on German industry under the patronage of the 'Verein fuer Socialpolitik' (first empirical research on

industrial work in large German firms) in the late nineteenth century. The famous 'Verein fuer Socialpolitik', founded in 1872 by academics of the German historical school, intended to establish social fairness between capital and labor (Mueller-Jentsch 2001: 223). Goetz Briefs developed the field of 'Betriebssoziologie' (sociology of the firm), later subsumed under 'Industriesoziologie' (industrial sociology) which became a major approach of research during the 1920s and 1930s (Mueller-Jentsch, 2001: 222). Another major research project of the 'Verein' was launched in the first decade of the twentieth century on the selection and adjustment of workers in different segments of German industry (1910–15). According to Mueller-Jentsch (ibid.: 224) this was the beginning of systematic industrial research in Germany. The core question was what kind of men are shaped by modern industry and which job prospects (and indirectly life chances) do big enterprises offer them? Weber wrote a long introduction to the research project and outlined various questions to be addressed: social and geographical origins of the workforce; the principles of their selection; the physical and psychological conditions of the work process; job performance; pre-conditions and prospects of careers; how workers adjust to factory life; their family situation and leisure time (Mueller-Jentsch ibid.: 224). Methodology was based on interviews and participant observation in selected companies.

Mueller-Jentsch (2001) argues that industrial sociology at that time was heavily shaped by the notion of workers exploitation and this was advanced not just by Marxists but also by liberal scholars. Lujo Brentano, for example, was an early liberal economist and antipode of Marx and Engels but argued that 'trade unions play a constitutional role in capitalist economies since they empower employees to behave like sellers of commodities. Only the unions enable workers to adjust their supply according to market conditions' (ibid: 225).

After WWII sociology was gradually (re)established as an academic discipline

(Mueller-Jentsch, 2001: 229). Industrial sociology quickly became a major focus (Maurer, 2004: 7). In the early years after the war sociologists were primarily concerned with whether the political democracy introduced by the Allies would stabilize in Germany. There was a common conviction that democracy is not only about institutions but that it also needs a cultural basis in society. According to v. Friedeburg (1997: 26) the fear was that class conflicts either become too strong that they endanger the democratization process or that they become too weak and endanger the reform potential of the labor movement. Thus, the belief was that only self-conscious workers could be a counterweight to the restorative forces in post-war Germany. As a consequence many sociologists focused on exploring worker consciousness and beliefs, traditional IR topics.

The first explicit project on IR after WWII was conducted by industrial sociologists in the late 1970s at the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt (Bergmann et al., 1979). The project entailed a large empirical project on trade unions in Germany from an explicitly sociological point of view (Mueller-Jentsch, 1982: 408). In the same year IR was first introduced as an official topic at the German sociological congress (Berliner Soziologentag, 1979). It is also symptomatic that the first German textbook on IR was written by an industrial sociologist, Walther Mueller-Jentsch (1986) and called *Sociology of Industrial Relations*.

To conclude, German IR research has traditionally been dominated by industrial sociologists. Research focuses on IR rather than HR issues, is more theoretical or essayistic than empirical and if empirical favors qualitative, inductive research (Frege, 2005; Hetzler, 1995). The focus is on the firm level like in Britain. The dominant paradigm is to interpret IR as a socio-political process, thus as being shaped by economic as well as political forces, and the emphasis is on corporatist social partnership approaches rather than collective bargaining (Hyman, 1995: 39; 2004).

## RESEARCH VARIATIONS AND THEIR NATIONAL EMBEDDEDNESS

The above brief overview has revealed different national developments in the IR research field. In the US labor economics was, from the early days, the leading discipline in IR research, initially with a strong institutional, policy orientation which was subsequently taken over by a more neo-classical approach to labor markets. In Britain prominent social reformers started the field and hence IR developed a strongly pragmatic public policy orientation which was less influenced by labor economists. Moreover, it received a strong Marxist influence during the 1970s which was unparalleled in the US. The field became more inter-disciplinary than its US counterpart and became dominated by scholars who received a degree in IR. Finally, Germany has a long intellectual (Marxist and liberal) tradition on researching work and employment issues which has been traditionally dominated by industrial sociologists. Whereas the field has not established institutional independence in Germany but remains multi-disciplinary, IR became an independent academic field in the US and Britain.

At the same time it comes to no surprise that all three countries reveal variations in their research practices: their major methodologies, theories and research paradigms. These variations have been shown to be long-standing national academic profiles (Frege, 2005; Kaufman, 2004; Whitfield and Strauss, 2000). Such diversity of research styles undermines assumptions of a universal, linear evolution of social sciences and it also challenges recent claims that globalization will evoke a convergence of scientific research to a universal, if not US-led model. Thus, at this stage there is evidence of a continuing national embeddedness of IR research despite the growing internationalization of academia (international conferences, cross-national research collaborations, exchange programs etc.) and despite the increasing globalization of IR practices throughout the advanced industrialized world. To conclude, there remains distinctive national research

patterns which seem, so far, astonishingly resistant to processes of universalization.

How then can we explain the ongoing diversity and persistence of national research traditions? The chapter now turns to explore the longstanding roots of national IR research profiles in specific structural, institutional and political constellations within which social scientists have tried to develop discursive understandings of their IR systems. For example, a theory may gain acceptance in the field not simply because it provides the most 'adequate' explanation for a phenomenon, but, rather, because the explanation it does offer is in a form that is particularly attractive to a specific national culture or a particular group of scholars who are leading in the field.

Explaining research variation is of course an ambitious enterprise. No one single factor can explain the variations across the different research traditions. The inquiry seems to require a complex set of multiple factors, reaching into various disciplines, and in need of a historical and comparative analysis. Thus, for the study of IR research, ideally, it seems one would need a comparative history of IR and its ideas in Britain, Germany and the US, a history of knowledge production, a history of the relations between IR and related disciplines, a history of influential academics in the field and a social history (students and their background). We would also need a theory to interconnect historical, structural and cognitive determinants and the actions of scientific community (Weingart, 1976). However, as Fourcade-Gourinchas (2001: 398) argues, we do not yet have a satisfactory encompassing theory of knowledge formation that would allow us to account simultaneously for the social structures and institutions of knowledge production and for the latter's intrinsic, substantive ideational nature. And we have no theoretical framework to analyze cross-cultural variations between social science disciplines.

The remaining part of this chapter, therefore, introduces three preliminary approaches which highlight the embeddedness of IR research in its national-specific context.

These are heuristic tools rather than a tight theoretical framework, exploring interrelations between variables rather than determining causalities. The first provides a substantive approach and focuses on how the subject field of academic inquiry and national IR practices, shape research traditions. The second approach highlights the institutional embeddedness of IR research in national scientific traditions. The third and final approach discusses the relationship between national political traditions, in particular the conception of political and industrial democracy, and IR research.

### ***IR practices***

This approach provides a contextual explanation of cross-country research variations by linking 'external' IR practices to 'internal' research practices. It is assumed that in particular research topics, author affiliations and academic paradigms will mirror the development and practice of IR institutions in a specific country. This position is essentially functionalist since it assumes an independent scientific space organized around specific self-referential understandings of the subject field, thus in our case IR practices (Wagner, 1990: 478). In other words, academic disciplines and specializations develop essentially as structural reactions to changes in the external environment.

This assumption is widely acknowledged among social scientists today and is in stark contrast to the original positivist position which argued that scientific inquiry is independent of the phenomenon observed (Delanty, 1997). Moreover, because IR is a problem-oriented field of study it is even more likely to be shaped by the real world of IR which differs from country to country. As Dunlop states, 'different interests of academic experts seem largely a reflection of their type of IR system' (1958: 329). Hyman (2001) points out that the different national IR systems provoke different research topics: for example an emphasis of Anglophone research on collective bargaining and in Germany on social partnership and co-determination.

Thus, the traditional lack of academic interest in the state or in social partnership in the US can be explained by the traditional absence of the state and of workplace democracy in American IR, whereas their dominance in German research mirrors their continuing relevance for the German employment system.

In a similar vein, scholars have highlighted that research follows changing policy questions (Derber, 1964; Dunlop, 1977; Strauss and Feuille, 1978). In particular, Capelli (1985) argues that shifts in research topics easily occur as a reaction to shifts in government, union or employer policies. For example, the increasing interest in HR issues in the US can be understood as a reaction to the increasing number of non-union workplaces and anti-union employer and/or state strategies. Moreover, should IR regulations and practices increasingly converge in a globalizing world (see Chapter 7) one would expect a simultaneous convergence of research patterns across countries. So far however this does not seem to have happened (Frege, 2005).

There can be no doubt that this approach helps to explain research shifts over time in one particular country (for example the decline of IR and the increase of HR topics in the US) but also cross-country variations in research. Moreover, this approach provides an explanation of why different professions get interested in researching IR topics. For example, the more legalistic and corporatist IR systems in continental Europe attract more legal scholars, political scientists and sociologists whereas labor economists are primarily attracted in Anglophone countries where market forces play a larger and more accepted role in determining IR outcomes. The substantive approach is not a sufficient explanation, however, and for example is not helpful in exploring the different development of the field of study, thus its institutionalization.

### ***Scientific traditions***

A second approach is introduced which is historical in nature and embraces the

embeddedness of IR research within national social science traditions.

It is now widely recognized that social sciences and their disciplines are social constructs, embedded in specific historical contexts and shaped by national cultures and philosophies (Levine, 1995: 100). They are not just the outcome of a universal, automatic progress of science, nor are they natural, pre-determined categories, but can vary from country to country. In Ross' words (1991: 1), 'the content and borders of the disciplines that resulted in the beginning of the twentieth century were as much the product of national cultures, local circumstances and accidental opportunities as intellectual logic'. In particular, the development of social sciences was closely connected to the rise of modern universities and were shaped by national epistemological traditions.

### *University structures*

It is during the late-nineteenth century in particular that universities were resurrected as primary knowledge-producing institutions and that the idea of a research-oriented university became predominant in Europe and the US (Wittrock, 1993: 305). This development was closely related to the rise of the modern nation-state and the new economic capitalist order. Universities therefore came to be key institutions both for knowledge production, in particular technological progress and for strengthening a sense of national and cultural identity (ibid.: 321). As we will see, however, they developed in different ways in different countries. Major questions which were debated in all countries were, for example, between the pros and cons of a liberal versus vocational education and pure versus applied research.

The national-specific structures of universities are useful in explaining the institutional differences within IR research, thus its institutionalization as a field of study in the Anglophone world but not in continental Europe.

The close relationship between knowledge structures and research practices has been widely accepted in the literature. Already Merton (1968: 521) observed that research patterns are influenced by specific forms of knowledge organization. Fourcade-Gourinchas (2001: 400) points out that 'scientific discourses [research patterns] are inevitably driven by broader, nationally constituted, cultural frameworks embodied in specific institutions of knowledge production'. And Ringer (1992: 26) convincingly proposes that intellectual communities such as academic disciplines cannot be adequately discussed without reference to the history of educational systems in each country which are heavily dependent on the specific relationship between state and society.

Applied to our context, this trajectory links the existence or absence of the institutionalization of the IR field to the different national university structures. Arguably, the development of the German university structure of professorial chairs enabled a broader research agenda for the individual professors but hindered the institutionalization of inter-disciplinary fields. In contrast, the more formal departmental structure as developed in the US in the early-twentieth century, which was later also introduced to British universities, narrowed the individual's research area but facilitated the creation of institutionalized inter-disciplinary fields.

In other words, the strict classification of disciplines in US universities, which became more dominant than in Europe (Wagner, 1990: 236), made it more difficult for individual scholars to integrate IR topics into their own discipline but on the other hand created the opportunity to establish specific inter-disciplinary programs. US social science disciplines tend to follow a strict methodological and theoretical canon and are more likely to discriminate alternative views. In Ross' (1991: 10) words,

the importance of disciplines and disciplinary professions to stabilize academic positions in the US system lead frequently to an ontological purification of disciplinary discourses by excluding outside factors to strengthen disciplinary identification

whereas in Europe disciplines were less inhibited to use theoretical concepts from other disciplines.

The fact that in the US, IR institutes were first created by institutional economists who felt increasingly left out of their own discipline, substantiates this point.

In Germany, the Humboldtian reforms in the second part of the nineteenth century supported an organizational structure around chairs which traditionally allowed a slightly less rigid definition of the disciplines. Individual professors were more able to follow their own interests independent of the mainstream. Thus, a sociology or law professor interested in labor found it easier to follow this research topic even if it did not fit completely with disciplinary boundaries. Therefore there was less need to establish inter-disciplinary forums. An additional reason was that inter-disciplinary, specialized or vocational fields had less chance to get accepted because of the traditional German emphasis on general, pure knowledge creation which was fostered by Humboldt.

Finally, Britain is characterized by a less rigid disciplinary structure than the US but also by weaker professorial chairs than in Germany. Britain for a long time almost exclusively focused on elitist undergraduate education dominated by colleges and neglecting the development of graduate or professional schools like in the US (Fourcade-Gourinchas, 2001: 165). The great British universities in the nineteenth century were strongly anti-professional. Professional education was dominated by practitioners outside universities (Burrage, 1993: 155). Moreover, British universities for a long time developed as relatively insular, elitist institutions emphasizing the classical subjects while neglecting natural as well as social sciences. The first social science research which arose out of a response to the increasing social problems of industrialization developed outside the university such as in the famous Manchester Statistical Society (1833) (Manicas, 1987: 196). Thus, all these factors help to explain why IR as an inter-disciplinary study was delayed for a long time in Britain.

### *Epistemological traditions*

In addition to the university structures, epistemological traditions also shaped the development and patterns of scientific disciplines in each country. These traditions help explain, for example, why a German and a US sociologist working on similar labor issues may use different research tools, in particular different methodologies, despite their shared profession. And why a British economist and a British sociologist may have something in common despite their different professions. In other words, it may provide an explanation as to why the US is generally leaning toward quantitative empirical research whereas German IR research is usually characterized by qualitative research and Britain exhibits traces of both; or why both US and British IR research tend to produce intermediate, middle-range theories whereas Germany is biased toward more abstract, general social science theories (Bulmer, 1991).

Modern philosophies of knowledge developed during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and influenced the countries' conception of knowledge creation. In short, the idealist philosophy and humanistic university reforms during the nineteenth century in Germany were strongly oriented toward science for its own sake ('pure science') rather than to be an instrument for larger societal purposes (for example improving social conditions) as it became the norm in particular in the US. There was an emphasis on holistic thinking in broad historical cultural categories and being informed by a philosophy which rejected narrow-minded specialization which provided a challenge to mechanistic and compositional thinking prevalent in Europe at that time. As a consequence, when social sciences (including the academic treatment of work and employment) were slowly established at the end of the nineteenth century they became mostly concerned with elaborating a coherent theoretical framework for societal analysis based on philosophical foundations (Wittrock et al., 1991: 41). Social sciences were originally interpreted as historical sciences embedded

in the humanities. This shaped the tendency of the social sciences toward descriptive, historical, qualitative and theoretical research as we can still observe today, for example in the case of IR research. Efforts at empirical research were very fragmented as well as policy-oriented research which could hardly develop in the shadow of formal theorizing (Wittrock, *ibid.*). This may have induced the strong presence of hermeneutic and Marxist epistemological approaches and heuristic methodologies in German social sciences. In a nutshell, one can argue that these traditions may have facilitated a more political and critical awareness of social conditions and problems. Social science was understood as a tool to explore the genesis of modern society and it fostered the importance of academic freedom and supported the pursuit of pure knowledge rather than of instrumental, pragmatic research.

In Britain social sciences were caught in the bind between the positivistic heritage of moralistic reformism and administrative (empirical) knowledge (Delanty, 1997: 26). Thus, they were characterized by a strong positivist-utilitarian tradition, methodological individualism and a naturalistic morality. British social sciences essentially go back to Hobbes' utilitarianism and his ideas based on the methods of natural science (Halevy, 1966: 153). J. S. Mill for example, who was heavily influenced by Hobbes, was critical of scientific politics and stood for a model of 'useful' knowledge. Empiricism was praised as an inductive science of general causal laws. On the other side, British social science was characterized by a moral focus and science was linked to the idea of moral improvement and a humane secular ethic (Delanty, 1997: 26). As Manicas (1987: 197) highlights, the social problems of the industrializing British Empire were interpreted by the British academic elite as a moral problem and were, accordingly, a problem of how to restore the morals of individuals.

The US developed in similar ways to Britain but with a more scientist, pragmatic approach to the sciences, in particular social sciences which was seen as a tool to improve

the social conditions of modern society. Thus, whereas British social sciences started as a fusion of analysis and (moral) prescription, the US eventually favored a more scientific, detached approach to social questions which was modeled upon natural sciences (Bulmer, 1991: 152). This ultimately induced a bias toward an empiricist ideology with a focus on quantitative scientific methods in the US (Ross, 1991).

In sum, these national knowledge systems, which originated in the nineteenth century, shape the different ways in which social sciences and therefore IR research have been organized and practiced in the three countries. British IR research, for example, always had a stronger public-policy agenda than the US and was less interested in perfecting econometric tools for measuring IR practices and outcomes. German IR research on the other hand has been heavily theory driven and if empirical has mainly pursued hermeneutic, descriptive methods.

### ***Political traditions***

The cross-national variation of subject fields, as well as, the scientific traditions are a necessary but not sufficient explanation for cross-national research variation. For example, similar research topics can be researched in very different ways. The fact that the US traditionally has a strong interest in HR policy whereas German academics are more interested in the labor process – both approaches look at the workplace – indicates the existence of different paradigms and aims of research. German social scientists have traditionally been more concerned about the labor process and its outcomes for workers as a social class than their mainstream US counterparts who are more interested in individual work attitudes and workplace efficiency. These variations cannot be sufficiently explained on the basis of different subject fields or scientific traditions.

A third and final factor then, is the political embeddedness of the research field. The assumption is that political traditions have a certain independence of their subject matter

and of their academic institutionalization and can shape research patterns in different ways. In particular research paradigms, aims and also theories are likely to be influenced by political ideas.

I focus on the national political discourse on work and democracy which originates in the nineteenth century. I argue that the philosophical traditions of idealism in Germany or of liberalism and positivism in Britain and the US shaped the political understanding and subsequent writings on the state, democracy and the economy during the nineteenth century. In particular, the relationship between political and industrial democracy crucially influenced the development of different research paradigms. The three countries developed during the nineteenth century rather different political traditions on the relationship between state, society and economy which shaped two different streams of interpretations of industrial democracy: an Anglophone and a German (continental European) stream. Germany developed a legalistic, state-oriented approach (co-determination) whereas Britain and the US developed a free collective bargaining approach (and eventually voluntary, employer-led direct participation schemes). Both constitutional traditions are based on two distinct concepts of industrial democracy which I call '*contractual*' and '*communal*'.

In essence, the US and Britain regarded the capitalist enterprise as a 'private affair' (firm as private property) and the economy as an assembly of free individuals joining in contractual relationships. Private contracts rule. Industrial democracy is therefore focused on the free bargaining between employers and employees. Moreover, the law privileges individual rather than collective employment rights. One should note the differences between Britain and the US: between a social democratic and a liberal divide on industrial democracy the US emerge virtually exclusively on the liberal side of the line (Katznelson, 1996: 40). Britain, on the other hand, is slightly more infatuated with markets and experienced times, in particular after WWI and II, of socialist attempts to

nationalize important industries and is in general more committed to state intervention than the US (Jacoby, 2003: 49).

In Germany, the main understanding was to perceive the firm as a 'quasi-public affair', as a social community, a state within the state, a constitutional monarchy, where workers would receive certain democratic rights and the monarch/owner would not have absolute power as in a constitutional monarchy. 'The employment relationship is not seen as one of free subordination but of democratization'. This was the declaration of the famous Weimar labor law scholar, Hugo Sinzheimer (Finkin, 2002: 621). One could also say that the US and Britain focused on 'private contracts' whereas Germany focused on a 'social contract' within the firm, to adopt Rousseau's phrase.

The distinction between a private and public view of the firm has a clear reminiscence to the mechanic and organic state theories and to civil and common law traditions. The role of the entrepreneur is seen differently in both traditions. In the Anglophone common law tradition the enterprise is the property of the entrepreneur with workers relegated to contractual claims, at best, on the surplus from production (Deakin, 2005: 12). The continental or in our case German entrepreneurs are members of the enterprise community and share duties and privileges that this position entails.

One can conclude therefore that democracy in the US and to a lesser extent in Britain has been mainly conceptualized at a political level and developed a much weaker place in economic life where democracy is limited to certain individual rights and a minimum of collective rights (for example free labor contracts and collective bargaining). In other words, the individual has only very limited democratic rights at work, the main right being to be in a free contractual relationship and therefore to be able to leave the contract. The focus of Anglophone labor law on individual rights therefore has a long tradition. Today this is emphasized even more in the increasing decline of collective labor law and the dominance of identity-based employee

rights in particular in the US. In contrast, in Germany industrial democracy has been much more linked to the development of political democracy and has legally restrained managerial discretion. The focus of labor law is on collective rights.

In sum, this approach highlights the importance of linking national research patterns to the historically embedded discourses on democracy at work. The different state philosophies as they developed in Germany, Britain and the US during the nineteenth century shaped the perception of the capitalist firm and subsequently the conception of industrial democracy.

Applied to the context of IR the different intellectual traditions of political and industrial democracy can explain certain cross-national research differences. For example, the fact that German scholars traditionally work on topics related to worker participation may not just be due to their labor institutions promoting democracy at work ('subject field'), but also because of a long-standing intellectual tradition in German social sciences to interpret industrial democracy as an important adjunct to political democracy and hence as a value itself. This also explains the interest of German political scientists and lawyers in IR research. In contrast, industrial democracy in the US for example has not generally been seen as a precondition or attribute of political democracy and has been traditionally perceived as individual rights, property rights on one side and no forced labor on the other side. Recent discussions on employee voice (Freeman and Rogers, 1999) exemplify this individualistic conception of industrial democracy (but see exceptions such as Derber, 1964).

## CONCLUSION

This chapter has offered a brief description of the historical development of IR as a field of research in Britain, Germany and the US, which represent trends in the Anglophone world as well as in continental Europe. It suggested that social sciences, such as the

IR field, do not necessarily develop in similar ways across countries but are embedded in broader national-specific cultures. There is no reason to assume that these varying research styles are deviations from a standard, or delays in reaching that standard. On the contrary, the persistence of national intellectual profiles over time undermines assumptions of a universal, linear evolution of the social sciences and instead highlights their national historical embeddedness.

This chapter further explored the embeddedness of these research patterns in their national contexts. On one hand it highlighted the significance of national institutions and practices of IR in shaping research outcomes. On the other hand, the chapter also reminded us to conceptualize IR research as a social scientific field of study which is inevitably embedded in long-standing national traditions of scientific knowledge production, such as university structures and philosophical traditions of knowledge creation. Finally, the chapter outlined the importance of intellectual conceptions of political and industrial democracy and to what extent and how the workplace was regarded as part of a wider political democracy.

To conclude, IR research has developed differently in different countries and there is reason to suggest that this will continue for some time. As of today there is no evidence of a significant convergence of research styles across countries. Sustained divergence is the result so far. This also challenges predictions of various globalization and convergence theories of the diminishing significance of the nation state. This chapter argues instead for the nation state's enduring importance at least for the field of scientific knowledge creation.

However, this does not mean that research patterns should be seen as historically deterministic. They are potentially open for change. Scholars may have had good reasons for choosing their scientific path, which was subsequently institutionalized, but there were reasons consistently shaped by specific historical and cultural intentions (Ross, 1991). Given hindsight, we may find that there are

better reasons for choosing differently in the future, in particular given the increasing academic crisis of the IR discipline. Becoming aware of different national approaches, and thus of different research options, is a first step. What should follow is a dialogue between the research patterns; how one could benefit from each other to ensure the long-term viability of the discipline.

## NOTES

1 For the purposes of this paper, I use this term to refer to the following countries: Great Britain, Ireland, United States of America, Canada, Australia and New Zealand (see Crouch 2005).

2 For more detailed country overviews see Frege (2007) and Kaufman (2004).

## REFERENCES

- Ackers, P. and Wilkinson, A. (eds) (2003) *Understanding Work and Employment: Industrial Relations in Transition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baethge, M. and Overbeck, H. (1986) *Zukunft der Angestellten. Neue Technologien und berufliche Perspektiven in Büro und Verwaltung*. Frankfurt: Campus.
- Batstone, E., Boraston, I. and Frenkel, S. (1977) *Shop Stewards in Action: The Organization of Workplace Conflict and Accommodation*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bergmann, J., Jakobi, O. and Mueller-Jentsch, W. (1979) *Gewerkschaften in der BRD*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Boyer, G. and Smith, R. (2001) 'The development of the neoclassical tradition in labor economics', *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 54 (2).
- Bulmer, M. (1991) 'National context for the development of social-policy research: British and American research on poverty and social welfare compared', in P. Wagner, C. Hirschoff, B. Wittrock and H. Wollmann (eds) *Social Sciences and Modern States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 148–67.
- Burridge, M. (1993) 'From practice to school-based professional education: patterns of conflict and accommodation in England, France and the United States', in S. Rothblatt and B. Wittrock (eds) *The European and American University Since 1800: Historical and Sociological Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Capelli, P. (1985) 'Theory construction in IR and some implications for research', *Industrial Relations*, 24 (1): 90–112.
- Committee on Industrial Relations (1926) Advisory committee on industrial relations, memorandum, 'to the Committee on Policy and Problems', August 1926, Box 59, Folder 331. R.G. 1.8 SSRC. RAC.
- Commons, J. (1919) *Industrial Goodwill*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Crouch, C. (2005) *Capitalist Diversity and Change: Recombinant Governance and Institutional Entrepreneurs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cully, M., Woodland, S., O'Reilly, A. and Dix, G. (1998) *Britain at work: as depicted by the 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey*. London: Routledge.
- Davies, P. and Freedland, M. (2002) 'National styles in labor law scholarship', *Comparative Labor Law and Policy Journal*, 23 (3).
- Deakin, S. (2005) 'Coevolution of law and the economy: industrialization and labor law in Britain and Continental Europe', conference paper, *Workshop on Making Markets Through the Law: Legal Claim and Economic Possibility*. Paris, June 2005.
- DeBrizzi, J. (1983) *Ideology and the Rise of Labor Theory in America*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Delanty, G. (1997) *Social Science: Beyond Constructivism and Realism*. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.
- Derber, M. (1964) 'Divergent tendencies in IR Research', *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, XVII, July: 598–616.
- Dunlop, J. (1958) *Industrial Relations Systems*. New York: Henry Holt & Co.
- Dunlop, J. (1977) 'Policy decisions and research in economics and industrial relations', *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, April: 275–82.
- Finkin, M. (2002) 'Menschenbild: the conception of the employee as a person in western law', *Comparative Labor Law and Policy Journal*, 23 (2): 577–637.
- Fourcade-Gourinchas, M. (2001) 'Politics, institutional structures, and the rise of economics: a comparative study', *Theory and Society*, 30: 397–447.
- Fox, A. (1974) *Beyond Contract: Work, Power and Trust Relations*. London: Faber.
- Freeman, R. and Rogers, J. (1999) *What Workers Want*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Frege, C.M. (2005) 'Varieties of industrial relations research: take-over, convergence or divergence?', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 43 (2): 179–207.
- Frege, C.M. (2007) *Employment Research and State Traditions. A Comparative History of Britain, Germany, and the United States*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.