INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

IRRU embraces the research activities of the industrial relations community at Warwick Business School (WBS). The aims of IRRU are to produce high quality, independent research which is critical in nature; thereby to contribute to the conceptual and empirical development of the field; and to improve the information and analysis available to national and European-level policy and practitioner communities. Achieving these aims requires securing research funding to support the employment of dedicated research staff and thus maintain a critical mass of active researchers. 2007 saw the formal completion of three major ESRC-funded projects, and the publication of the first findings from a fourth. Funding bids for new research projects are under preparation. IRRU has continued to supply features and reports on developments in UK industrial relations to the European Industrial Relations and Working Conditions Observatories, and to undertake comparative analysis, embracing all 27 EU member states, for the two Observatories. Achieving our aims also requires sustained engagement with the policy and practitioner communities, at national, regional and European levels. In addition to the activity detailed in section 3 of this report, IRRU continues to look for further opportunities to strengthen the impact of our research findings amongst policy makers and practitioners.

IRRU’s research projects are clustered around five main themes, and research activity around each is detailed in section 2 of the report. On one of these, equality and diversity, staff unavailability (variously due to significant sickness leave and maternity leave) means that there are few developments to report. Main developments on the other four themes during 2007 included:

- **Europeanisation and internationalisation of employment relations.**
  An overview of the findings from the large-scale survey of employment practice in organisational context in multinational companies (MNCs) operating in the UK was publicly launched at a high-profile event. Plans for cross-national, comparative analysis involving parallel surveys which have been undertaken by teams in Canada, Ireland and Spain were actively developed by the four teams.
  
  Exploratory research on the industrial relations implications of labour migration from the EU’s new member states focused on Polish migrants to the west Midlands.

- **Pay, performance and employment relations.**
  Analysis of employment relations in small and medium-sized enterprises under the ESRC/EPSRC AIM project focused on an empirically-informed, critical examination of the ‘low skills equilibrium’ thesis, and on the support networks which SMEs are embedded in and accounting for the marked sectoral variation in pattern.
  
  Comparative analysis of the company case studies from the four countries collaborating on the study of variable payments systems and collective bargaining was substantially advanced, including the preparation of three joint papers. The UK findings were presented at academic conferences and practitioner events. An initial study of annualised hours arrangements offered an explanation of their limited diffusion in the UK.

- **Employee representation and employee voice.**
  Interim findings based on the first wave of company case studies on the impact of the UK’s Information and Consultation of Employees legislation were published, and a second wave of case studies embarked upon.
Findings from a programme of interviews with graduates of the TUC’s Organising Academy were analysed and written up, identifying implications for initiatives for union renewal. A small-scale study of social movement unionism also identified implications relevant to union revitalisation.

Legal regulation of the employment relationship.

Early findings of research into new employment protections aimed at workforces being transferred out of public sector employment, question the extent to which they are proving effective given the scale and scope of contracting-out.

Internationally comparative and transnational analysis continues to be an important feature of several IRRU research projects. Europe continues to provide an important focus for such investigation. This includes the thematic-based comparative analytical reports prepared by IRRU members for the European Foundation’s industrial relations and working conditions Observatories. In addition, the canvass of comparative enquiry is being extended to north America. Collaboration with Canadian colleagues at CRIMT, based in Montréal, now embraces the analysis of employment practice in multinational companies as well as regimes of workplace employment relations, and is being developed further. Two visiting fellows from CRIMT were welcomed during 2007. IRRU is also developing links with the Industrial and Labor Relations School at Cornell University in the US, which during 2007 featured a workshop for doctoral researchers from the two institutions hosted by Cornell.

The speaker for the sixth annual Warwick-Lowry public lecture in honour of Sir Pat Lowry was the then Chair of the Health and Safety Commission, Sir Bill Callaghan. The lecture argued for a reintegration of policy and policy responsibility on health and safety and on employment relations, and restated the benefits, but also the challenges, of an approach which emphasises self-regulation. The West Midlands Employment Relations Forum, which is jointly organised by IRRU and Acas Midlands, together with the regional bodies of the CBI, TUC and EEF, held three successful events during 2007. A report commissioned from IRRU, profiling workplace employment relations in the region, formed a central part of the Forum’s submission to the Regional Development Agency’s consultation towards revising the region’s economic strategy. 2007 saw the first major congress of the International Industrial Relations Association (IIRA) to be held in the UK for over 30 years. This was the IIRA’s 8th European Congress, held in Manchester in September, to which IRRU members made a substantial contribution to the organisation and programme.

1 STAFFING

There are currently 17 academic staff in IRRU, twelve of whom are also members of the Industrial Relations and Organisational Behaviour (IROB) subject group of Warwick Business School. IRRU has 14 associate fellows. IRRU’s membership during 2007 is listed in Appendix A.

During 2007, John Purcell took up a part-time appointment as Research Professor in February. Andrew Charlwood also joined as an Associate Professor in February, but left at the end of the year to take up a position at York. Gillian Morris, a practising barrister, was appointed an Honorary Professor in November.

The ESRC/EPSRC AIM-funded project on employment relations in small firms, described in section 2 below, came to an end during the year. The two research fellows on the project, Sukanya Sen Gupta and Chin-Ju Tsai, were both successful in securing lectureships, at Cardiff Business School and Royal Holloway School of Management respectively. They are the latest in a long line of scholars who developed their research careers at IRRU, and we are delighted that IRRU has been able to maintain is established role in career development.
IRRU welcomed three international visitors during 2007: Mélanie Laroche (May-June) and Patrice Jalette (November), both from the University of Montréal, and Alessandra Sartori (December) from the University of Milan.

2 RESEARCH PROJECTS

Theme 1: Europeanisation and internationalisation of employment relations

Employment practice in multinational companies

The large-scale survey of employment practices in multinational companies (MNCs), funded by ESRC, involves Paul Edwards and Paul Marginson in collaboration with Associate Fellow Anthony Ferner and Olga Tregaskis, both from De Montfort University and Associate Fellow Tony Edwards from King’s College London. In 2006 we reported on the initial analysis of the main survey dataset, comprising findings from structured interviews with senior HR executives in the UK operations of 302 MNCs. An overview report of the findings, together with an executive summary, was circulated to respondents in the companies participating in the survey in early 2007, in advance of its general release. The overview report was subsequently launched publicly at a major dissemination event organised in London in June. Key findings were presented by the research team to an invited audience of 75 policy-makers, senior practitioners and academic researchers. Bob Scott (former European HR director of AT&T), Roger Jeary (Unite-Amicus section) and Profs John Purcell (Acas, Warwick) and Heinz-Josef Tüselmann (Manchester Metropolitan) acted as discussants. Brief highlights of findings from the parallel Canadian, Irish and Spanish surveys (see below) were presented by colleagues from the three respective teams. A summary of key findings is provided in the box below.

Further analysis of the findings provided the basis for conference papers presented at the 2007 SASE Annual Meeting in Copenhagen, on organisational networks and the cross-border diffusion of employment practices, and the 8th European IIRA Congress in Manchester, on the determinants of central control and subsidiary discretion in HRM and on channels of employee representation and voice in MNCs. A paper outlining the design and methods of the survey, and addressing the methodological challenges which its realisation involved, was presented at the annual conference of the UK section of the Academy of International Business in London and subsequently jointly published in Warwick Papers in Industrial Relations (no. 86) and Leicester Business School’s Occasional Papers (no. 83).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment practices in multinational: key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The main survey collected wide-ranging data on employment practice and organisational characteristics in 302 MNCs. These data provide the first detailed, authoritative portrait of employment relations and HRM in MNCs in the UK. Among the principal findings are that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MNCs in Britain are heterogeneous in terms of sector, size and national origin - though US firms predominate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Most MNCs have complex, multi-layered corporate structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The diversified conglomerate MNC, with few linkages between sites, seems to be quite rare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In a significant proportion of firms the UK operations play a ‘strategic’ role in the wider MNC, e.g. through R&amp;D activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Around 80% of firms identify a key group as a meaningful category, and it tends to be treated distinctively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The international HR function is often highly structured, with many mechanisms for the dissemination and monitoring of policy and practice.

On pay and performance, a picture emerges of firms paying their managers and key groups above the median, and making widespread use of formal performance appraisal and variable pay schemes.

Firms spend around 4% of their annual pay bill on training and development. Most have global succession planning systems and programmes for ‘high potentials’.

Multiple mechanisms of employee communication and participation are near-universal. The use of ‘bundles’ of high-performance involvement practices is also common.

On employee representation and consultation, almost half of firms recognise unions in at least some sites. Non-union representation is becoming more common. There has been substantial recent growth in consultation arrangements, probably in response to the UK’s Information and Consultation of Employees legislation.

Finally, the data depict a pattern of international organisational learning in MNCs based on informal networks of managers, international project groups, and expatriate assignments. There is extensive learning on HR issues from the UK subsidiary by units elsewhere in the company.

Among the key factors shown to be important in explaining patterns of employment practice are the following:

- **Nationality** of ownership affects patterns of practice in all the above areas of HR/ER, but is especially important for pay and performance and for training and development. It is also linked to process – e.g. the extent of higher-level control over HR in UK operations.

- **International business structure** – e.g. the presence of intermediate international levels such as region, international business division and global business function – has a significant impact on a variety of employment practices including organisational learning.

- The extent of **international integration of operations** influences patterns of HR. E.g. the more products or services are standardised internationally, the less is the UK operation’s discretion over employment practice.

- **International HR structures** – notably mechanisms of international contact between national HR managers – influence HR practice, especially pay and performance, organisational learning, subsidiary discretion, and the diffusion of practices to other parts of the MNC.

Last year’s report also referred to the parallel surveys being undertaken by research teams in Canada, Ireland and Spain. Fieldwork for the Canadian and Irish surveys has been completed and overview reports prepared; in Spain field interviews are continuing into the early months of 2008. In the summer of 2007 a team in Mexico secured funding for a fifth survey of MNCs’ operations, using adapted versions of the core instruments from the four earlier surveys. A team in Australia is completing a funding proposal for submission in early 2008 for a further parallel survey. Members of the international teams met in London for a two-day workshop in June. Discussion focused on addressing the challenges involved in combining the national datasets into an integrated cross-national one, issues and academic debates to be addressed in comparative analysis and funding requirements for this further phase of the study. Subsequently, encouraging progress has been made in combining the Canadian, Irish and UK data sets and the Canadians have submitted a proposal to SSHRC under a funding call promoting international collaboration in business and management studies, involving the UK, Irish and Spanish teams. Edwards (P) and Marginson, along with Edwards (T), Ferner and Tregaskis are also amongst the international researchers who participated in a much larger, successful programme bid submitted to Canada’s SSHRC by the Montréal/Québec-based CRIMT (the Inter-University Centre for Research on the Globalisation of Work and
Employment), which houses the Canadian team. The programme includes a strand of activity building on the comparative analysis of the multinational surveys.

**Multinational companies and employee participation practice in the EU’s new member states**

Guglielmo Meardi’s research on multinationals in the Czech Republic, in co-operation with the University of Vienna and funded by the Austrian government, has proceeded through case studies in the automotive and the finance sector. Early evidence points to the lack of coherent strategies by companies’ headquarters for the transfer of industrial relations and participation practices from western Europe to their local operations. It also points to the popularity of direct communication practices rather than representative-based participation. This is despite clear limits to the effectiveness of the former, for instance in the retention of skilled workers. It also emerges that foreign investors introduce more changes in local practices in service industry than in manufacturing. The latter have stronger local traditions and are not undergoing such radical product-market reorganisation.

**Labour migration from the EU’s new member states**

Extensive migration from the EU’s central east European member states to the UK, and other ‘older’ member states, has confounded expectations prior to the 2004 enlargement in two senses. First, the scale has been much greater than foreseen by official estimates. Second, migration has not been primarily motivated by securing access to the better-resourced welfare states of western Europe. Rather it has been driven by employment opportunities, at comparatively high wage rates, in the UK and elsewhere. An international workshop organised by Guglielmo Meardi at Warwick in June 2007, with experts from several European countries, focused on the unprecedented nature of this migration wave, which combines EU citizenship rights with strong exploitation pressures. Meardi’s own exploratory research on Polish migration in the West Midlands points to the important role of labour market institutions, such as temporary employment agencies, in processes which segregate migrant workers into particular areas of the labour market. It also draws attention to innovative organising practices such as the co-operation between trade unions and Polish ethnic associations. The findings were also presented at the European Migration Conference in Vienna and the SASE annual meeting in Copenhagen. This research was conducted with financial support from the University’s Research Development Fund and the Undergraduate Research Scholarship Scheme.

**Theme 2: Equality and Diversity**

**Women in trade unions**

Jane Parker has continued to collaborate with Canadian colleagues Janice Foley (University of Regina, Saskatchewan) and the late Patricia Baker (Mount Saint Vincent University, Nova Scotia), so as to bring a comparative perspective to her earlier research on women’s groups in British trade unions. In 2007, this mainly involved researching and writing a chapter for a cross-nationally comparative volume compiled by the two Canadian colleagues. The main findings of Parker’s chapter, based on a thematic analysis of interview, observation-based and documentary evidence, were as follows:

- union women’s groups (WGs) are widely regarded by their ‘insiders’ to contribute to union revival efforts via organising, recruiting and internal reform measures but it is difficult to quantify the scale of these impacts;
- WGs are also regarded as valuable conduits for the dissemination of a wider gender or diversity consciousness within their respective unions, as well as for directly
providing effective voice mechanisms for oft-neglected constituencies in traditional union structures;

- WGs exhibit a tendency, as networking, identity-based, activist mechanisms, to develop alliances and links with political, social and campaigning groups/orrganisations. This presents an opportunity for unions to benefit from closer links to the wider community, and provides a further means for the inward flow of fresh ideas, issues and experiences;

- unions and WGs do not always coordinate their activities or appear familiar with each others’ strategies and activities, with the union likely to ‘pull rank’ on WGs when an apparent conflict of interests is suspected. One practical implication is that WGs need to take greater action to demonstrate their impact and worth to their union. Likewise, unions may need to monitor WG activity in a more positive way in order to recognise their wider value and disseminate mutual learning. Both parties have to look outwards in order to raise the stature of WGs, and those closest to WGs generally feel that they have the potential to make a larger contribution to union revival strategies;

- WGs hold multiple meanings for their unions in terms of different forms of revival strategy. They have significance as union instruments for furthering extant strategies. However, they also nuance and encourage changes to those strategies - and help develop additional ways forward via new or alternative ‘maps’ that emphasise union inclusivity (e.g. via coalition building).

- the findings raise bigger questions as to how union vitality should be assessed. Union strategies are conventionally measured in terms of changes in membership size and density. The connection with qualitative characteristics of union strength (e.g. political influence, internal efficiency) is more oblique and thus difficult to quantify and trace in causal terms. Moreover, there is an assumption that the impacts of specific revival efforts can be isolated and measured when many strategies work dynamically and in concert. Ultimately, measures of union strength need to reflect unions’ capacity to effect change in all members’ lives at work and beyond, and not be limited to gauges of unions’ organisational parameters.

**Theme 3: Pay, performance and employment relations**

*Employment relations, business support and performance in small firms*

This project involves Paul Edwards, Sukanya Sen Gupta and Chin-Ju Tsai. It was funded for three years (2004-07) as part of the work of the ESRC/EPSRC Advanced Institute of Management Research. The project came to an end formally in September, and an end-of-award report was submitted to ESRC in December. ESRC’s subsequent evaluation assessed the project as “outstanding”. As noted in section 1 above, the two research fellows have moved on to academic posts in the UK.

The project examines small firms in three sectors: information and communication technology; creative and media firms, mainly those working in television and film; and food manufacturing. Some key results from the project were outlined in last year’s report. These formed the basis of a paper published in *Human Relations*. Work proceeded on two more papers. These are summarized in the box below. They appeared, respectively, as a SKOPE working paper and a conference paper; the former will also be presented at conferences in 2008.
The policy implications of the project were outlined at a ‘forum’ jointly organized with the East Midlands Development Agency. As well as showcasing the project’s findings, this forum included presentations from other researchers and from companies. It attracted about 40 participants, and interest from a much wider group who were sent a detailed summary of the proceedings. Edwards was also invited to discuss the results with the Acas Small Firms Advisory Group.

Employment relations in SMEs: findings on two themes

1. Low-wage firms

The food firms provided a means to test the influential model of the ‘low skill equilibrium’ (LSE). The bulk of the LSE debate has turned on skill formation at national and to a degree sectoral level. Yet it is increasingly argued that we need to examine skills at the level of the firm. Small firms are particularly likely to lack the resources to develop employee skills and therefore act as a key test of LSE expectations. Three expectations can be derived from the LSE literature.

1 There is a single syndrome of low skills. The research found substantial variation, which stemmed in part from different market conditions and also from firms’ own strategies. Not all were locked into an unchanging equilibrium.

2 An equilibrium is sustained by weak support institutions and a product marked dominated by low value-added goods. Support institutions were indeed weak, and this weakness helped to reinforce low-skills policies. Product markets played some role but, crucially, they did not determine strategies so that even firms in relatively up-market contexts were not led to raise worker skills. There were some, albeit weak, opportunities to escape the LSE but these tended to be closed off by a ready supply of cheap and low-skilled labour.

3 The LSE will lead to workplace regimes characterised by work intensification. As explained above, this expectation was not met. The key reasons were a low level of Taylorisation and the maintenance of face-to-face relationships between managers and workers.

It is argued that the LSE model can become self-fulfilling in that, until an entire high-skills alternative is in place, analysts may tend to assume that firms are locked into a low-skills syndrome and thus withdraw from offering suggestions as to how to make changes from the current situation. Yet some of the firms studied were open to new ideas; targeted changes in the support and advice that they receive might lead them to think constructively about skills. In their present circumstances they were neither forced nor actively encouraged to do so. All that said, the main spur to change would be – in the absence of a compulsion to train which would be highly unlikely – constraints on labour supply, and these are currently weak.

2. Firms and support networks

The project’s analysis of firms’ relationships to networks starts from the resource-based view of the firm, a perspective that has been increasingly applied to small firms but that has lacked empirical development. It has also addressed resources in the firm rather than external linkages. The research thus addresses firms’ strategies and their connections with the environment of business support. Four aspects of this environment are identified: official bodies such as RDAs; industry associations; locally-based associations; and the supply chain.¹

- The project identified the dependent variable as embeddedness in support networks, and developed a measure of such embeddedness for each firm. It found very different patterns between the sectors. In Information and Communication Technology (ICT), firms related mainly to their supply chains, and their interest in support through official bodies was accordingly limited.

¹ A preliminary version of the results was presented at the Institute for Small Business and Entrepreneurship conference 2006, and is on ESRC’s Society Today web site.
• Creative and Media (C&M) firms demonstrated a surprising pattern. The extreme competitiveness of the industry might be expected to promote atomistic behaviour. In fact, the firms were engaged in strong networks which embraced all four aspects of the support environment. This in turn promoted a common approach to the development of skills. The reasons for this reflected a shared interest in the public good of skills, together with a tradition of networking that put this interest into effect.

• In the food industry, there was much more diversity, reflecting varying market circumstances and the absence, in contrast to the other sectors, of a set of basic parameters that determined the ability to operate successfully.

As for the support agencies, the research supported the hypothesis that they are most likely to be perceived as effective when they are non-bureaucratic and able to engage directly with the specific strategic contingencies of a firm. These conditions were most closely met in the C&M sector. Among ICT firms, supply linkages were sufficient, and industry associations played little role. In the food sector, there were patchy examples of local initiatives, but these were under-resourced and hard to generalize.

The key analytical implication is that firms’ responsiveness to external conditions is mediated by strategic contingencies. The policy implication is the apparently obvious need to tailor advice to the circumstances of firms. It is only apparently obvious, because it has been pursued more in the breach than the observance; the research demonstrates concretely relevant contingencies within specific firms and sectors, and thus indicates what tailoring would in fact entail.

**Employee commitment in small firms**

As reported last year, Paul Edwards and Sukanya Sen Gupta collaborated with Prof. David Storey and George Saridakis (of WBS’s Centre for Small and Medium-sized Enterprises) and Prof. Robert Blackburn (Kingston University) on a study of employee ‘satisfaction’ in small firms as compared to large ones. During the year, they refined the conceptualisation of ‘satisfaction’ and identified their measure as one of employee reports of the quality of jobs. They show that this measure is relatively high in small firms, a result that is explained in part by high levels of informality in small firms but also by an additional size effect. The paper is currently with a journal.

**Related studies on small firms**

*Informal and illegal labour:* Paul Edwards continued his successful collaboration with Monder Ram and Trevor Jones (de Montfort University). The year saw the publication of a paper in *Work and Occupations*. It examines 17 firms in two sectors that formed part of the ‘informal economy’. It finds substantial illegal employment practices, notably the payment of wages below the National Minimum Wage and also breaches of the Working Time Regulations. It identifies a small number of legally compliant firms and argues that the pressures towards compliance remain very weak; the informal economy was thus able to reproduce itself.

*Small firms in the Chinese clothing industry:* we reported last year on a paper by Min Li, who visited IRRU from the South China University of Technology, and Paul Edwards. This paper will be published by the *Industrial Relations Journal* in 2008. It argues that the firms in question – very small firms in a highly competitive industry in an economy with a huge supply of cheap labour – are prime candidates for highly exploitative employment relations. It shows that exploitation was tempered by face-to-face mutual obligations and by firms’ dependence on experienced workers; labour supply was not unlimited. The paper speculates that the most intense exploitation will occur in larger firms, where personal ties are absent and also where the production process is more rationalized.
Variable payments systems

This project investigating the relationship between variable payments systems and collective bargaining, funded by ESRC under a European Science Foundation scheme, was completed during the year. In ESRC’s subsequent evaluation the project was graded as ‘outstanding’. As reported in previous years, the study involved Jim Arrowsmith and Paul Marginson (together with Molly Gray up to the end of 2006) working in collaboration with teams based at the University of Vienna, the FAFO research institute in Oslo and the Autonomous University of Barcelona / University of Barcelona. The study focused on developments in two sectors: banking and the manufacture of machinery and equipment. It addressed the forms of variable pay utilised; management’s goals in introducing such schemes; problems of implementation; and the impact of (differing) collective bargaining arrangements on the introduction, forms and operation of variable pay schemes (VPS). The four countries have very different systems of collective bargaining, enabling investigation of the impact of these systems on the diffusion of different types of variable pay scheme and the extent to which the introduction, implementation and ongoing operation of VPS are the subject of collective regulation.

A report of the main findings from the UK study was prepared and circulated to the managers and employee representatives in the twelve participating companies, and to employers’ associations and trade union officials in the two sectors who had assisted in the research. A summary of findings is provided in the box below. Findings were presented in a plenary address and paper to the 4th Pay and Rewards Conference in Manchester in March, and at the CIPD’s ‘Research into Practice’ conference in July.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable pay: undermining collective bargaining?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two major trends characterise recent developments in pay setting in the UK: the continued retreat of collective bargaining in the private sector, and growing emphasis on variable pay systems (VPS). Yet little is known about the actual relationship between VPS and collective bargaining, where it remains in place: whether the former undermines, leaves in place or reconfigures the latter. The findings indicate a complex relationship, which varies according to the type of VPS and features of firms and sectors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Profile of VPS. Variable pay looms larger, and operates at more levels, in the payments systems of banks than of the machinery and equipment companies. The three main types of VPS (individual performance-related pay (IPRP); team or group bonuses; and profit-related bonuses) are widespread amongst banks, most of which operate multiple schemes. Machinery and equipment companies mostly operate a single scheme, with collective forms of profit-related pay being most widespread. In contrast to the banks, IPRP is largely absent in machinery and equipment.

Quantitative significance. Comparing the proportion of earnings accounted for by variable pay, a greater proportion of pay is ‘at risk’ in banks than in machinery and equipment companies, where the amounts involved are modest.

Managerial objectives. Managerial objectives are similar in the two sectors though sometimes realised through different forms of VPS. Incentive goals are most apparent for localised productivity bonuses. Cost-control objectives are identified for IPRP in banks, and profit-related pay in both sectors. Employee development goals are evident for IPRP, but are increasingly overlaid by the ‘harder’ goals associated with performance management. Profit-related pay is utilised to communicate business and corporate objectives to employees. Stakeholder reward is also a prominent rationale for profit-related pay. Union exclusion goals are not immediately apparent.

Union responses. Unions in both sectors are uncomfortable with the principles and premises of IPRP. The crucial difference is that the banking unions have had to accommodate to their introduction and operation, and have been able to gain influence. In machinery and equipment companies this antagonism reflects a marked union preference for VPS based on ‘objective’ rather than ‘subjective’ criteria. Yet trade
unions are not necessarily opposed to VPS, insofar as schemes offer additional earnings opportunities for members, provide the opportunity to engage more closely with members, or hold the promise of improving site viability and employment security.

Consultation and negotiation. A shared priority for union negotiators is to maximise increases in basic pay. Under IPRP, this translates into pressure to ensure that the ratings accorded to the great majority of staff who are deemed to be average performers or above are translated into pay increases which at least match the cost of living.

Union involvement in regulating VPS varies markedly according to type of VPS. Key dimensions of banks’ IPRP schemes, including size of the overall pay pot and its distribution between rating bands, are the focus of negotiation. Negotiation over bonus schemes is rare, and both negotiation and consultation are largely confined to those which are more local in character. Consultation over supra-site profit-related pay, relating to group and divisional performance, is conspicuous by its absence. The effect is to establish a management-determined element of pay beyond the scope of collective bargaining.

The findings signal that although unions can on occasion block management proposals to introduce VPS, their more general impact is in moderating schemes through negotiation and consultation. In terms of the implications of VPS for collective bargaining, the findings demonstrate a range of outcomes. Variously:

- collective bargaining can embrace VPS alongside established conventions for negotiating increases in basic pay;
- collective bargaining can be reconfigured in the face of the challenges posed by particular forms of VPS for trade unions and their members; and
- management can successfully place some forms of VPS beyond the scope of collective bargaining, thereby loosening its purchase on overall earnings.

These ‘variable implications’ are shaped by the type of VPS scheme and the organisational level at which schemes operate; and product market, technological and labour market characteristics of the two sectors.

The overall picture is mixed. In both sectors, the introduction of variable pay has not undermined collective bargaining in the sense of its core focus on delivering inflation-based increases to basic pay. Yet the proportion of employee earnings that is determined without collective bargaining has grown.

Debating and progressing initial comparative analysis was the focus of an international workshop of the four teams hosted by the Barcelona team in January. This laid the basis for the preparation of three comparative papers, all of which were presented at the IIRA’s 8th European Congress in Manchester in September. Arrowsmith coordinated one of these papers, addressing the management of VPS in the banking sector in comparative perspective. This concluded that, whilst some institutional differences attributable to different bargaining systems were identifiable, these were less sharp than might have been anticipated. A degree of convergence in types of scheme being implemented and managerial rationales for utilising them was evident.

More generally, several key findings emerge from the comparative analysis. First, VPS are more employer-driven under the UK’s single-employer bargaining (SEB) arrangements than under the multi-employer bargaining (MEB) structures which characterise the other three countries. As between the three MEB countries, VPS are more employer driven in Spain, where there is weak articulation between levels, than in the other two. Second, the quantitative significance of variable pay in total earnings is greater in banking under SEB than MEB, and also where there is weak articulation between levels; there are no such cross-country differences in machinery and equipment. Third, diversity of types of VPS is no greater under SEB than MEB; this suggests the operation of isomorphic processes within sectors, irrespective of national bargaining arrangements or sectors’ international exposure. Fourth, actual pay developments arising from VPS are more effectively regulated by local union representatives under the single-channel arrangements found in Norway and the UK.
than under the dual-channel ones of Austria and Spain; this is because of union capacity to locally enforce agreements under single-channel systems. Fifth, concerning MEB systems, dual-channel representation can impede the development of VPS because of union reluctance to cede authority to formally independent works councils; conversely, unilateral management initiatives are more likely than under single-channel systems. Dual-channel systems therefore pose greater challenges for articulation across bargaining levels than do their single-channel counterparts.

Annualised hours

An initial study of annualised hours contracts (AHCs) by Jim Arrowsmith resulted in an article published in the *Industrial Relations Journal*. There was a growth in AHC in the early 1990s but some decline since, and they remain relatively rare in the UK. This is surprising as they offer employers greater control over working-time scheduling at lower cost. They can also share productivity gains to workers. Arrowsmith investigated the use of AHC through a survey of trade unions and analysis of the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey (WERS). The findings are summarised in the box below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annualised Hours Contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the evidence suggested that AHC are retarded by a prevalence of long working hours, which provides an alternative source of flexibility and makes the introduction of AHC more problematic. But there are also inadequate institutional mechanisms in the UK with which to introduce, regulate and maintain more complex working time arrangements effectively. The complexity of AHC depends on specific patterns of labour demand. However, they can be difficult to manage because they generalise and compel a flexibility requirement across the workforce. The redistribution of voluntary overtime (or shift work) across the workforce leads to long-hours workers losing overtime pay, whilst others are effectively conscripted into periodic extra work. There is thus a risk of individual and collective conflict. Hence, it is no coincidence that most cases of AHC are introduced by collective bargaining. Trade union involvement can reassure the workforce by representing their concerns to management and, by taking a collective view, unions can also help employers address any problems of competing earnings and working-time preferences within the workforce. These can also be resolved by negotiating a claim on the financial savings and improved labour productivity arising from the scheme. The trade union survey provided further support for the overall decline in use of AHC and found little evidence of active engagement of trade unions on the part of employers. The WERS data provided a wider picture of the overall patterns of AHC usage and permitted some inferences about the most significant factors involved. The analysis showed that AHC is most commonly found in large organisations in sectors such as education, health, manufacturing, the utilities, transport and communication, and financial services. It is not evidently associated with particular competitive conditions but does seem to form part of a flexibility strategy that involves JIT, shiftworking, multi-skilling and teamwork. Perhaps the strongest finding, however, was that AHC are highly correlated with trade union presence and recognition, and a willingness by management to engage trade unions over workplace change. Given this, there may be two broad explanations as to why AHCs are not more widespread. First, there may be limited need. This essentially refers to a sector effect. In many cases, requirements can be met by different combinations of shiftwork, temporary and part-time work, or overtime. In the retail sector, for example, temporary and part-time work enables operating hours to be extended and regular daily, weekly and seasonal peaks to be covered. In industry, shiftwork and overtime provide extended operating and the flexibility necessary to react quickly to sudden upsurges in demand or to ensure that late or overrunning orders are completed. Just as importantly, overtime working can be cut back to respond to downturn periods without having to lose skilled staff. However, management depends on employees agreeing to work overtime, which it might encourage by lower basic rates of pay. This means that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
overtime can become regularised or ‘institutionalised’ as a self-serving custom and practice that is more expensive and less productive than standard working time.

The second set of possible explanations operates at the level of the firm: i.e. management inertia, risk aversion or a lack of strategic capacity, particularly in the face of potential resistance. Reassuring employees and sustaining a reasonable balance of advantage requires sophisticated industrial relations, and unions themselves have to have sufficient ‘strategic capacity’. Britain’s tradition of antagonistic industrial relations has historically not been suited to a joint problem-solving approach. This has been compounded in three ways. First, the decentralisation of collective bargaining narrows the scope for coordination or the dissemination of ‘best practice’, by employers or by trade unions. One of the most significant AHC initiatives was introduced by sector-level agreement, in the paper and board industry, but such arrangements have now virtually disappeared in the UK. Second is increased competition, organisational change and job insecurity, an instability which can make the maintenance of ‘high-trust’ employment relations more difficult.

Third is, of course, employers’ retreat from collective bargaining itself. Annualisation is much more common in other European countries such as Germany, where it has spread through collective bargaining, or in France where it has been promoted by law. In this sense, the apparent freedoms that UK employers have - weak legal regulation of working time and limited trade union rights - may be somewhat perverse because there is more flexibility, at least in the form of AHC, in those countries where the opposite applies.

Workplace change

The year saw the completion of a series of studies on workplace relationships by Paul Edwards and Prof. Jacques Bélanger (Université Laval). This collaboration began with empirical studies of teamwork in the UK and Canada. More recently, the researchers developed a formal framework mapping workplace conflict and co-operation, which they published in the British Journal of Industrial Relations 2006. This year, that journal published a companion paper that identified the causal mechanisms placing a workplace in a given position in the framework. A forthcoming paper in the Journal of Contemporary Ethnography compares this approach to the results of the Workplace Ethnography project (which works inductively from a coding of 204 ethnographic studies). The paper shows important complementarities between the two approaches, but also argues that the more holistic modelling in the Warwick-Laval method is better able to capture the nature of workplace regimes.

Theme 4: Employee representation and employee voice

Impact of the UK’s employee information and consultation legislation

IRRU’s research on the impact of the UK’s Information and Consultation of Employees (ICE) Regulations straddles this theme and that on legal regulation. Work began in early 2006 on a major government-funded research project investigating organisational responses to the Regulations. The research team comprises Mark Hall, Jane Parker, John Purcell and Michael Terry at IRRU, and Sue Hutchinson at the University of the West of England. The research is co-sponsored by the Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (BERR), the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (Acas) and the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD), and an advisory group of representatives from the three bodies is overseeing the project. The project is due to run to the end of 2009.

Reflecting the phased implementation of the Regulations, the research has involved a first wave of case studies starting in 2006 in organisations with 150+ employees, followed by a second wave in organisations with 100-149 employees starting in April 2007. A third wave of
case studies is due to begin in April 2008 in organisations with 50-99 employees. The research includes in-depth semi-structured interviews with senior management, trade unions (where present) and employee representatives, documentary analysis and an employee survey in each participating organisation.

A key feature of the research is its longitudinal dimension, under which developments in participating companies will be tracked over a two-year period. An initial research visit focuses on the business and employment relations context, the particular arrangements established and the factors shaping management and employee/union approaches to information and consultation. This is followed up the next year by telephone interviews to monitor interim developments, and the year after that by a final full return visit to assess the impacts of information and consultation practices in terms of quality of management decision-making, employee commitment, employment relations climate and organisational effectiveness. The employee survey is also repeated at yearly intervals.

An extensive report by the research team on the first phase of the project (initial interviews and employee surveys in 13 ‘wave 1’ organisations with 150 or more employees) was published in the BERR Employment Relations Research Series in October 2007 (http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file41647.pdf). Key findings are summarised in the box below.

Articles by the research team highlighting the main findings of the report were published in *IRRU Briefing* and *IPA Bulletin*. The research was also the focus of an ‘information update’ written for the *European Industrial Relations Observatory*. The report was also featured in the CIPD publication *Impact* and on the XpertHR website.

The research team presented a written paper analysing trade union approaches to the Regulations at the European Congress of the International Industrial Relations Association in Manchester (September). This is being revised and extended for publication in the *Bulletin of Labour Studies*. Other presentations of initial results from the research were made at the CIPD’s ‘Voice and value’ conference (March), a Symposium Events conference on employee representation, an IRRU seminar and a Unions 21 meeting (all in November). The research team also made a submission to BERR’s review of workplace representatives’ facilities and facility time, drawing on initial findings from the project. This summarised data on time off, training and facilities provided to employee representatives in the information and consultation arrangements covered by the research.

Fieldwork continued during 2007, with interviews taking place in eight ‘wave 2’ case study organisations from a range of sectors and with differing employment relations cultures, recruited mainly via Acas. Draft case reports were completed on six of these organisations and employee surveys carried out in three. In addition, interim update reports were completed in respect of nine of the ‘wave 1’ organisations and repeat employee surveys in two. Completion of the remaining ‘wave 2’ case reports, ‘wave 1’ updates and initial/repeat employee surveys is scheduled for the first quarter of 2008, along with data analysis and the preparation of a draft overview report of key findings from the second phase of the research.

In early December, the research team held an informal workshop with researchers at Cambridge University (Simon Deakin and Aristea Koukiadaki) and doctoral researchers from Bath and Kent universities who are also undertaking research focussing on the ICE Regulations. Notably, the findings to date from this other research were similar to and reinforced those of the BERR/Acas/CIPD-funded project. The informal workshop also provided the springboard for an application for ESRC funding for a series of research seminars on the impact of the ICE Regulations, submitted by Hall and Purcell (IRRU), Deakin (Cambridge) and Hutchinson (UWE) at the end of 2007.
Implementing information and consultation: early experience under the ICE Regulations

Reflecting the 2002 EU Directive, the Information and Consultation of Employees Regulations give employees the right to be informed and consulted by their employers on key business, employment and restructuring issues. The UK legislation has applied since April 2005 to undertakings with at least 150 employees, since April 2007 to those with at least 100 employees and from April 2008 will apply to undertakings with 50 or more employees. The Regulations provide considerable flexibility of response, and enable the adoption of organisation-specific information and consultation (I&C) arrangements.

Initial findings from ongoing case study research in 13 organisations with 150+ employees provide an early assessment of employee consultation bodies introduced or modified in the context of the UK’s new regulatory framework.

Company strategy on I&C

The research suggests that the legislative context was only one of a number of factors shaping company strategy on I&C. Others include:

- ownership and corporate values;
- the experience of major change;
- the impact of newly-appointed managers;
- a wider emphasis on employee involvement; and
- the existence or prospect of union recognition.

Types of I&C arrangement

Most of the case study organisations had recently established an I&C body, though some had revamped existing arrangements. Eight of the 13 organisations’ I&C bodies, including the five which do not recognise unions, are elected by all employees. Six, all of which recognised unions, had ‘hybrid’ I&C bodies involving union representatives and elected representatives of non-union employees. In two of the multi-site organisations there were site-based variations in approach.

Eight organisations’ I&C arrangements were based on voluntary agreements with employee representatives, including some regarded by management as ‘pre-existing agreements’ under the terms of the Regulations. In addition, one organisation’s (draft) agreement was intended to have the status of a ‘negotiated agreement’ which is enforceable via the Regulations’ statutory procedures. In four cases, management had not sought employee representatives’ agreement to the I&C arrangements.

I&C in practice

In many cases, the role of the I&C bodies was largely confined to the discussion of management-provided business information along with the resolution of employee-raised ‘housekeeping’ issues. Typically, senior management sought to use the I&C body to highlight the ‘bigger picture’ in terms of business or organisational performance to contextualise and reinforce the case for new initiatives. Employee representatives often saw the agendas of I&C bodies as predominantly management-led, whereas some management respondents wanted representatives to be more proactive and less concerned with ‘tea and toilets’ issues.

A widespread perception among employee representatives was that the balance of activity was weighted towards information rather than consultation, and often concerned decisions that management had already taken. However, four I&C bodies were reported to have had specific impacts on management decisions by securing modifications to the implementation of major restructuring initiatives and/or changes affecting terms and conditions of employment.
Notwithstanding the widespread management emphasis on ‘strategic’ issues, over half the case study organisations cited examples of agreed solutions to housekeeping issues raised by employee representatives, or reported general satisfaction with management responsiveness to issues raised.

Only three organisations’ agreements/constitutions excluded pay from the remit of the I&C bodies and in practice some aspect of pay systems or the reward package had been discussed by the I&C bodies at all but two of the case study organisations (and at all of them if pensions issues are included).

Despite some initial union concerns, little tension arising from any overlap between the roles of I&C bodies and established collective bargaining arrangements was reported. In two cases where management had sought to integrate union-based and I&C bodies, the provision that I&C representatives could be asked to leave the meeting when ‘negotiating’ issues were dealt with was reportedly little used in practice and union representatives did not feel that their role had been adversely affected.

The surveys suggested that employee awareness of the existence of the I&C bodies and recognition of the role played by employee representatives was relatively low. This might be a reflection of the newness of some of the I&C bodies, as well as variable levels of reporting back to the workforce by employee representatives.

Initial assessment

Most of the I&C bodies examined were still at an early stage of development and any assessment can only be provisional. However, the research to date suggests that in every case management’s approach to I&C was strategic in the sense that it was part of a wider concern with developing employee involvement. Employee representatives were subject to formal election processes and were afforded time off, training and office facilities, though newly elected representatives inevitably need time to grow into their role and in most cases independent networking by employee representatives was limited. The evidence suggests that the I&C bodies were treated seriously by management, who in many cases had put significant issues on the agenda. Reported instances of the consultation process influencing management decisions or their implementation were sparse, but there were indications that consultation practice was evolving. The longitudinal dimension of the research will enable the development – or sustainability – of the I&C bodies to be monitored in the light of subsequent events.

Trade union organisation and mobilisation of contingent workers

As reported last year, Deborah Dean and Melanie Simms are engaged in a project examining two sectors where there is evidence of significant union representation and, to some extent, successful mobilisation of groups of workers where non-standard working predominates. The workforce groups and unions concerned are in higher education and the performing arts. The research identified important barriers to mobilisation which, in many cases, were specific to the nature of the work undertaken. Of particular importance was the attribution of a perception of injustice. Many workers attribute inequity or injustice to the ‘nature of the business’ or the peculiarities of non-standard work. Indeed, many do not even perceive themselves as workers, and their unions can therefore struggle to frame injustices as work-related. Further, there are particularly challenges to these groups in establishing collective identities. This is partly because of the transient and often peripatetic nature of the work itself. In the case of the higher education workers, it also has its roots in exclusion by the union prior to the expansion of academic fixed-term work during the 1980s. It is only relatively recently that there has been an explicit effort by the union to construct a collective response to non-standard work.

Nonetheless, these groups have mobilised and the study identified two key factors that account for this. First, the pre-existence of the institutions and mechanisms for formal collective bargaining in the sectors is extremely important. This establishes collective bargaining and trade unionism as an acceptable norm (although not always actively supported by managers) and gave legitimacy to the mobilisation process. Second, the unions have both worked hard to secure resources (time, money, availability of officers’ expertise etc.) for these
groups. This has been central to the process of building solidarities amongst these workers and overcoming the barriers identified above.

**Evaluating ten years of training trade union organisers**

As reported last year, this Nuffield Foundation-funded study by Melanie Simms and Jane Holgate (London Metropolitan), is reviewing the experience and impact of graduates of the TUC’s Organising Academy (OA) ten years after it was established. The research involved surveying all 191 contactable graduates, conducting in-depth interviews with 32 graduates, interviewing a further 21 policy makers, and observing sessions of both the TUC training and union-specific training. Four main questions have been addressed. How do OA graduates evaluate their experiences of the training? What are OA graduates doing now and to what extent do they use the training they received? How do they relate this to organising within their current union? Is there evidence of any wider impact of the OA on the UK trade union movement? The study is the first concerted effort to gather the views of graduates on these issues. Findings are summarised in the box below.

---

**The experience and impact of graduates of the TUC's Organising Academy**

Ten years ago, senior TUC officials intended that the Academy would target groups of workers that were under-represented within the trade union movement. The aims were to encourage unions to invest more heavily in recruitment and organising activity, and to attract new people to work in the trade union movement as organisers, policy makers and officials. Further objectives were to encourage unions to expand into workplaces and sectors that were un-unionised, to adopt an approach to organising activity that emphasised member involvement and participation, and to develop a cadre of specialist organisers who could take a more strategic view of organising and renewal activity.

*The training experience*

In terms of the training experience, it is clear from the interviews that the OA has delivered mixed outcomes. Academy graduates do come from a much more diverse background of skills, gender and age than their officer counterparts. The OA has also largely been successful in training a cadre of graduates in basic organising skills, a high proportion of whom have remained employed in the union movement. On other measures of success, however, the evidence is far more mixed. Training in some of the more strategic skills such as planning organising strategies and planning for the transition between the organising and representation phases of a campaign seem to have been less successful. Evidence from individual campaigns shows that where unions fail to manage these more strategic aspects, it is extremely difficult to sustain short-term organising gains.

*What are OA graduates doing now?*

The continued influence of graduates on the unions in which they work is clear, with around half employed as specialist organisers and half in more generalist positions. Of those who remain in organising roles, frustrations were expressed about the generally low status of organising and the relative lack of opportunity for promotion and career development. Indeed, it is precisely these pressures that have pushed many of those who have taken on a different role to do so. Despite this, a high proportion of both specialists and generalists report that they use their organising skills in their current roles and this reflects a perception that people who have been trained as organisers continue to have an ‘organising perspective’. In this regard, many of the OA graduates see a clear role for themselves in promoting an organising culture within their unions and beyond. They are overwhelmingly optimistic about the potential for union renewal despite the lack of clear evidence in this direction.

*Tensions between organising and servicing*

As well as commenting on the Academy training specifically, the research examined the impact of the graduates on the wider union movement. Here, tensions arising from the organising focus of the training can be seen. Organisers frequently report fundamental tensions between the organising and servicing functions, and register disappointment at what many of them perceive to be a lack of broader cultural
change within their unions. There is a widespread perception of a lack of progress in unions’ efforts to renew themselves.

This has implications for broader questions about union renewal. First, the creation of specialist functions appears to have entrenched the divide between organising and servicing activity. As a result many specialist organisers perceive resistance from other officials to the cultural change they are trying to promote. Second, the perception of organising being of a lower status limits the potential for career progression paths open to many Academy-trained organisers. There are relatively few senior organising roles available across the UK union movement. This means that organisers often have to move beyond their specialism in order to move up the career ladder. Whilst this is not inherently problematic, they are likely to lose an organising focus as they move into generalist roles. Given the long-term and intensive nature of greenfield organising work, if these specialists are unable to deploy their specialist skills as they become more senior, realisation of the vision of union renewal becomes harder to achieve.

Social movement unionism

As reported last year, Jane Parker has been undertaking a study examining why and how the TUC engages in alliance building with civil movements and groups. Drawing on interviews with senior TUC officials and documentation, the study has investigated the rationale for such activity; the nature of the alliances; and the extent to which they inform TUC efforts towards union revival. Parker presented a paper based on the findings at the IIRA’s 8th European Congress in September, and a further version will be presented at the 22nd AIRAANZ conference in Melbourne in February 2008. Main conclusions included:

- most of the TUC’s recent, and indeed earlier, civil alliances have been interpreted as a ‘tool’ for other union revival strategies, notably recruiting, organising and political engagement. Some have also shown elements of the labour movement’s capacity to act as a ‘sword of justice’.

- little is known about the relative significance of particular revival strategies or their interactive effects. It is thus difficult to calculate the utility of civil alliances involving the TUC for other revival strategies or their relative contribution to union revival;

- notwithstanding this, and though not its main focus or activity, TUC interest in civil alliance-building is gathering momentum due to an array of internal and external factors (detailed in the research outputs). The TUC’s role as an alliance partner continues to unfurl, particularly in respect of ‘big issues’ such as international development and environmentalism, and lower profile but essential matters such as the availability of learning services to all. The varied ways in which the TUC reaches out to external civil groups reflects its multiple roles as well as the diversity of its alliance partners;

- a number of possible ‘ideal’ conditions for developing high calibre civil alliances emerge, including: a general need to develop long-term strategy, commitment and resources; the existence of mutually beneficial aims for the alliance partners; balanced, consensus-based policy which can be flexibly applied; the means to manage tensions over often complex alliance interests and how they are to be pursued in practice; and partner organisations’ capacity to coordinate their departments and sections’ alliance activities.

- while certain features of alliances (e.g. loci of control and activities) will always test the TUC’s authority, it is thus currently well-placed to offer a coordinating and advisory role, and potentially, more.

- while much of the TUC’s involvement in civil alliances has been emphasised in terms of labour movement revitalisation, some of the evidence gathered suggests that recent
and potential activity has greater potential to broaden the purpose of the labour movement than might have been initially thought. The diversity of many TUC and labour movement activists and officials, identity-based groups, constituents and their links to other social movements and organisations suggest that the nature and scope of overall alliance activity has been underreported. Conceptualisations of the primary purpose of British unions may thus need to emphasise more that broader purpose unionism can help unions to respond to work-based issues in a more informed manner.

**Theme 5: Legal regulation of the employment relationship**

**Public sector contracting processes and the impact of new employment protections**

Early findings from a study by Trevor Colling of the newly introduced employment protections for workforces affected by contracting out of public sector activities to the private sector, show two things. First, the scale and pace of contracting activity is about to increase dramatically as a result of greater emphasis being placed by government on competition and the role of the private sector to improve service delivery. Second, they suggest that the new employment protections are unlikely to prevent changes to terms and conditions or ruptures to structures of employee representation. The study is funded under WBS’s research development fund. In the past, contracting activity has undermined the coherence of public sector employment systems, in that services subject to competition and tendering have experienced *ad hoc* local adjustments to pay, benefits and to systems of collective representation. Labour governments since 1997 have invested heavily in public services and reinforced public sector employment systems, through wide ranging pay reforms such as *Agenda for Change* in the National Health Service. Contracting procedures have also been amended and employment protections introduced for those workforces affected. The Transfer of Undertakings [Protection of Employment] Regulations (TUPE) were revised and their application to public sector transfers clarified. Additional protections were provided by *Retention of Employment model* (RoE) for National Health Service staff and the *Code of Practice on Workforce Matters*, introduced initially for local authority staff and extended across the public sector in 2005.

These various measures appear to offer protections to public sector employees that go significantly beyond those applicable to earlier rounds of contracting. TUPE protects existing contracts of employment, the terms and conditions therein and the bargaining arrangements that have secured them. The RoE model enables some occupational groups to retain their NHS employment contracts whilst working in privately operated facilities. The Code of Practice on workforce matters prohibits the ‘two tier workforce’, whereby ‘new’ workers are employed alongside transferred staff on inferior terms and conditions of employment.

Fieldwork has focused so far on reviews of documentary and statistical sources and on interviews with key trade union officials and branch representatives in one English region (the West Midlands) and at national level. Two objectives have been served by this work. First to establish the extent and dynamics of contracting activity and, second, to identify the use made of new employment protections by employees and their representatives. On the first, although employers enjoy much more discretion over the organisation of tendering exercises than was the case under previous mandatory regimes, the range of services potentially affected has increased dramatically and cost-reduction dynamic applied previously is once again very much to the fore. Significant numbers of public sector employees are likely to be faced with the prospect of transferring to other public or private
sector employers and the force of the employment protections available to them then becomes an important issue.

On the second, evidence so far has indicated very real barriers to the effective implementation of recent new protections. Government and employers have acted reactively and reluctantly. The legal framework falls short of the universal ‘fair employment clause’ that unions would like to see applied to public sector contracts, providing instead an uneven and complex patchwork of regulations and agreements. Workforces and their representatives are experiencing some difficulty enforcing these protections and the threat of litigation in these areas is relatively low. Mobilising workforces through industrial action has proved a relatively attractive and successful tactic, but unions simply do not have the capacity to engage comprehensively and constantly in campaigns of this type.

**Regulating for equality**

In ‘The Road is Long. Thirty years of anti-discrimination legislation in Britain’ published in the *British Journal of Industrial Relations* in late 2007 (see last year’s annual report), Linda Dickens suggested that, with the establishment of a single body—the Equality and Human Rights Commission—and a proposed Single Equality Act, there is now an ideal opportunity for legislators to address the limitations of British equality law and enforcement mechanisms which she identified and explored in the article. The extent to which this opportunity is taken up forms part of her ongoing research which is concerned more broadly with identifying the prospects, potential and limitations of regulating for equality. A discussion paper and contribution to an edited collection are in preparation.

**Employment relations legislation over quarter of a century**

Linda Dickens and Mark Hall accepted an invitation to participate in a project analysing employment change in Britain over the period from 1980, using the unique data of the five Workplace Employment Relations Surveys (WERS) undertaken during that time. They are currently working on a chapter provisionally entitled ‘Legal regulation and the changing workplace’ for a book - The Evolution of the Modern Workplace - edited by William Brown, Alex Bryson, John Forth, and Keith Whitfield, to be published by CUP. The chapter develops their earlier joint work (see previous annual reports) to provide an account and assessment of legislative change over the 25 year period and its interaction with changes at the workplace which are the subject of detailed analysis in other chapters of the book.

**Other research**

*European Working Conditions Survey – follow-up qualitative study*

As reported last year, Jane Parker coordinated a small team of IRRU-based researchers on a contract from the European Foundation to undertake in-depth interviews with around 20 individuals from amongst respondents in the UK to the Foundation’s 2005 European Working Conditions Survey. As the UK partner, Parker met in March with project co-partners and Foundation managers to discuss national and comparative findings, research outputs and activity. Her UK national report, based on the field interviews, was published on the European Foundation’s website in early 2007, and the comparative report by the overall project coordinators was subsequently published later in the year (http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2007/671/en/1/ef07671en.pdf). Key substantive themes considered in the reports included job development and employability. On this, UK interviewees stressed the complexity of training and development activity and the link to employability, and the array of factors that contribute to the former’s provision, utility and
take-up. Drawing on the interview findings, and documentation and commentary from the social partners, the UK report made a number of suggestions for good practice, including:

- reform of the qualifications system, which the CBI describes as ‘the key proxy measure for skill levels’;
- active consultation of employees in respect of possible ways of developing their jobs and flexible, tailored training and development provision to suit their work-life-balance arrangements, work commitments and preferred modes of development, including indirectly via trade unions were appropriate;
- placing further emphasis on lifelong learning initiatives by the state and employers;
- encouraging employee skills auditing, particularly among lower status/skilled employees, and in assessing employees under-used or ‘latent’ work-related skills;
- dissemination, tailored to sector, of good practice concerning ‘high performance work practices’ such as teamwork, employee involvement and job enrichment.

Re-regulation of work

We reported last year on the visit to IRRU of Laurent Taskin (Université catholique de Louvain). He identified shared interests with Paul Edwards which led to the co-authorship of a paper published this year. These interests turn on the ideas of the ‘disciplined worker’ and the ‘re-regulation of work’ developed in earlier work by Edwards. The paper’s empirical base is part of Taskin’s PhD. It addresses telework in two public sector organisations in Belgium, showing that the reception of telework varied according to the type of work being undertaken and the precise bureaucratic context. As Taskin argues more generally in his PhD, telework in many ways reproduces and reinforces, rather than transcends, bureaucratic control systems – as the re-regulation approach would predict.

Doctoral research

IRRU staff supervised a number of doctoral students researching topics in industrial relations through 2007. Students are formally registered under Warwick Business School’s doctoral programme. The eleven students concerned, and the topics they are researching, are listed in Appendix B. At the end of the year, two students were undertaking revisions to their thesis following examination and prior to resubmission, and a third had submitted and was awaiting examination.

In May, three of IRRU’s doctoral students – Sophie Gamwell, Annette Hayden and Aristea Koukiadaki – participated in and presented papers at an inaugural Cornell-Warwick doctoral research workshop, generously hosted by Cornell University’s School of Industrial and Labor Relations (ILR). ILR students also presented papers. The papers were commented on by ILR faculty and IRRU’s Ardha Danieli, who also participated in the workshop, as well as by their doctoral student peers.

Since 1998, IRRU has sought to encourage applications for doctoral research in industrial relations through the Hugh Clegg Research Studentship scheme, funded by income generated through Warwick Industrial Relations Limited (see Appendix E). Typically, awards make a contribution to the living expenses and/or fees of students during their first 3 years of registration. Three of the students listed in Appendix B have received support under the scheme.
European Observatory Network

During 2007, IRRU continued as the UK national centre for the network of EU-wide ‘observatories’ operated by the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. The network embraces the European Industrial Relations Observatory (EIRO), the European Working Conditions Observatory (EWCO) and the European Restructuring Monitor (ERM). IRRU’s role is to provide up-to-date information on key employment and industrial relations developments, restructuring data, research findings and policy analysis, aimed primarily at practitioners and policymakers at national and EU levels and published on-line. A consortium consisting of IRRU and the Institute of Employment Studies is also one of four European research institutes responsible for coordinating a range of EU-wide comparative analytical reports for the three observatories.

IRRU has been the UK national centre for EIRO since the latter’s establishment in 1996. This involves providing a range of inputs including information updates on key UK developments and debates, and national contributions to comparative analytical reports which focus on a particular topical issue and its treatment across Europe and to sectoral representativeness studies which assess the representative capacity of employers’ organisations and trade unions. These various inputs appear as records on EIRO’s online database, which is publicly accessible at http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro. During 2007, the UK’s input to EIRO continued to be co-ordinated and edited by Mark Hall and Jim Arrowsmith, who were also responsible for writing a proportion of the required material. Other IRRU members and UK researchers also provided information updates and contributions to comparative analytical reports and representativeness studies.

EWCO (http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/ewco/index.htm) was established more recently than EIRO and IRRU became its UK correspondent in 2005. It covers career and employment security, the health and well-being of workers, skills and work-life balance, with a particular focus on survey-based material. Again, IRRU provides a range of inputs including information updates, survey data reports, covering key national surveys in the working conditions field, and national contributions to comparative analytical reports. The UK’s input to EWCO is co-ordinated and edited by Jane Parker, who also contributed several information updates herself.

IRRU has been the UK contributor to the ERM (http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/emcc/erm/index.php) since 2006. This involves reviewing daily newspapers and the business press for cases of restructuring that: entail an announced or actual reduction of at least 100 jobs; involve sites employing more than 250 people and affect at least 10% of workforce; or create at least 100 jobs. Brief details of all such cases are recorded in standardised fact sheets, which allows for the compilation of EU-wide statistics comparing countries, sectors, types of restructuring and employment effects. This work is undertaken by Sophie Gamwell and Thomas Prosser, both doctoral researchers within IRRU. National contributions to comparative analytical reports are also required.


A comprehensive listing of IRRU’s inputs to the three observatories during 2007 is contained in Appendix C. At the end of the year, IRRU received a very positive assessment of its input to the observatories from the network’s management team at the European Foundation. Under each criterion, IRRU’s input was rated as ‘meets requirements’ or ‘exceptional’.
Reviewer’s comments included ‘continuing excellent work’ (EIRO), ‘overall, an excellent contractor’ (EWCO) and ‘excellent quality . . . The UK continues to provide a very satisfactory performance’ (ERM).

3 PUBLICATIONS AND PRACTITIONER ENGAGEMENT

IRRU addresses its research findings both to academics and to practitioners and policy makers. As well as publishing books, reports and articles in academic journals and presenting papers at academic conferences, IRRU staff aim to disseminate research findings, and highlight their implications, in practitioner-oriented publications and in presentations to high-level policy and practitioner audiences, nationally and internationally. IRRU is also involved in organising well-regarded national and regional events.

Academic publications and dissemination

A full list of the publications and papers presented at conferences by IRRU staff during 2007 is provided in Appendix C. The year’s publications include ten books and reports, 17 articles in eleven different refereed journals and eight chapters in edited books. The conferences at which IRRU staff presented papers during 2007 included international conferences in the fields of international business, economic sociology, sociology of work and migration studies, as well as industrial relations. Twelve IRRU members (co-)presented ten papers at the International Industrial Relations Association’s (IIRA’s) 8th European Congress, held in Manchester in September (see also section 5 below).

Four papers were published during 2007 in IRRU’s refereed Warwick Papers in Industrial Relations series, which Trevor Colling has edited since late 2006. Publication of Warwick Papers is on-line through IRRU’s web-site, where conference and research papers by IRRU staff are also made available. The web-site is located at: http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/wbs/research/irru/

IRRU’s research seminar series provides a forum for the presentation of findings and provisional conclusions from ongoing research projects. Speakers include colleagues from other institutions and also IRRU staff. During 2007 the series was coordinated by Deborah Dean, and involved nine seminars.

As reported in previous years, as part of his ESRC/EPSRC AIM fellowship Paul Edwards organised a series of events aimed at capacity building. During 2007 he gave two further ‘capacity-building’ presentations at workshops at Strathclyde and the British Academy of Management, respectively.

Practitioner engagement and dissemination

The fourteenth and fifteenth issues of IRRU Briefing were published in early and mid 2007, respectively, and circulated widely amongst the practitioner and academic communities. Issue no. 14 carried features on employee commitment in small firms by Paul Edwards, Sukanya Sen Gupta and Chin-Ju Tsai, findings from Anne-marie Greene and Deborah Dean’s study of stakeholder involvement in diversity management programmes and on Jim Arrowsmith’s review of the incidence and regulation of temporary agency work in Europe, which was commissioned by the European Foundation. Issue no. 15, which was also distributed to delegates at the IIRA’s 8th European Congress, contained features on threats to relocate by multinational companies operating in central eastern Europe – and union responses – by Guglielmo Meardi and Paul Marginson, on initial findings from the study of the impact of the UK’s information and consultation of employees legislation being undertaken by the IRRU-
based research team and on the comparative study on gender and careers prepared by former IRRU member Helen Newell for the European Industrial Relations Observatory.

The sixth annual Warwick-Acas public lecture in honour of Sir Pat Lowry was given by Sir Bill Callaghan, then Chair of the Health and Safety Commission. Held in March, and kindly hosted by the EEF in London, the lecture was delivered to an invited audience of leading employment relations practitioners and academics. In the lecture, Bill Callaghan argued that health and safety and industrial relations are inextricably linked, but noted with concern that key issues at the workplace, such as employee involvement or working time, are addressed ‘in two separate silos by the HR and safety communities’. He called for a reintegration of policy responsibility at national and organisational levels. He also reaffirmed the principle of self-regulation at the workplace which has underpinned Britain’s Health and Safety legislation in the modern era. The practice of self-regulation faced new challenges, however. Amongst these, Bill Callaghan drew attention to the threat to the capacity for effective self-regulation arising from the decline in trade union organisation in a growing number of workplaces.

The West Midlands Employment Relations Forum is jointly organised by IRRU and Acas Midlands, with the support of the regional organisations of the CBI, EEF and TUC. The Forum aims to provide authoritative briefings and promote informed debate on key employment relations issues; enable exchanges of information and experience; encourage research and analysis of regional employment relations developments; and raise the profile of employment relations in policy formation in the West Midlands. Forum membership includes companies, public sector organisations, trade unions and specialist industrial relations organisations (e.g. law firms). Three main half-day events were held during the year on: ‘flexible working arrangements’ (in the context of the 2006 Work and Families Act); the challenge of ‘becoming an employer of choice’; and ‘promoting good equality and diversity practice’ (jointly organised with the West Midlands Equality and Diversity Network). IRRU took particular responsibility for organising the second of event, at which Paul Marginson and Duncan Adam presented key findings from their report profiling workplace employment relations in the West Midlands. Commissioned by the Forum, the report was compiled from regional tabulations of the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey. It found differences in employment relations practice between the West Midlands and Britain as a whole on three dimensions. First, the characteristics of workplaces and the workforces they employ. Second, the presence of HR specialists and trade unions, and employment relations institutions such as collective bargaining and joint consultation. Third, various aspects of employment practice, including training, team working, performance appraisal, payments systems, equal opportunities and flexible working. The regional tabulations did not allow possible relationships between these three dimensions to be investigated. The report formed a central part of the Forum’s submission to the Regional Development Agency’s consultation towards revising the region’s economic strategy.

Jim Arrowsmith made an invited presentation on ‘variable payment systems’ to the CIPD’s ‘Research into Practice’ conference in July. He was also interviewed as an expert on temporary agency working for a publication, ‘Europe at Work’, which is widely distributed to EU and national policy makers and HR directors in large companies.

Linda Dickens and Mark Hall's 2006 Human Resource Management Journal article 'Fairness - up to a point' was posted on the official 10 Downing Street website in March 2007 on the occasion of a major lecture by the outgoing prime minister Tony Blair concerning the role of work in the 21st century. The article was one of six 'expert papers' described as having 'helped inform' the prime minister in the preparation of his speech.
In addition to the forum on small firms noted above, Paul Edwards was invited to discuss his work on small firms with the Acas small firms group.

Mark Hall, Jane Parker, John Purcell and Michael Terry made presentations of the findings of their research on employee information and consultation at a number of practitioner events, including the CIPD’s annual ‘Voice and value’ conference in March and a Unions 21 seminar in November. As noted in section 2, the research team also made a submission to the government’s review of workplace representatives’ facilities and time off work to carry out their duties. Mark Hall was an invited speaker at the ‘Employee representation 2007’ conference organised by Symposium Events.

Paul Marginson was invited to make a presentation reviewing the state of play in European industrial relations research to the inaugural meeting of the European Governments Industrial Relations Research Forum, organised by the Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (BERR) in London in September. In February, he presented on ‘Regulating for workforce consultation’ at a WBS Dean’s Lunch for alumni in London. At the invitation of the European Public Service Union federation (EPSU), Marginson was a panel speaker on ‘The future of European industrial relations’ at its collective bargaining conference in Brussels in December.

Guglielmo Meardi featured as a key speaker at the International Fair of Rights and Equal Opportunities for All, organised under the EU’s Year of Equal Opportunities for All in Turin in October. In co-operation with Simon Clarke (Sociology Department), Meardi participated in the presentation of findings from research on post-communist trade unions at a conference in Moscow in April, at which union leaders from various Russian and Kyrgyz trade unions participated.

Melanie Simms has regularly briefed the TUC’s National Organiser and other trade union officials on emerging findings from her research with Jane Holgate on the TUC’s Organising Academy (see section 2).

John Purcell was invited to make presentations to the CIPD’s Reward and HRD conferences, on rewards and the role of the line manager (February) and learning and the line manager (April), respectively. He was a plenary speaker at Ireland’s CIPD National conference on the role of line managers in HR in May, and rapporteur for a stream on HRM and performance at the Dutch HRM Network annual conference in November.

4 RESEARCH FUNDING

IRRU’s research projects are funded from a range of national and European sources, including research councils and governmental and non-governmental organisations. The sources of funding for ongoing projects and those which were completed during 2007 are listed in Appendix D.

In addition, Paul Edwards and Paul Marginson were named applicants on a successful bid to Canada’s SSHRC by the Inter-University Research Centre on Globalisation and Work and Employment (CRIMT), based in Montréal, for a second research programme (2008-13). The bid was led by Professors Gregor Murray, Jacques Bélanger (an IRRU Associate Fellow) and Christian Lévesque.

IRRU’s own income generating activities, particularly publication of European Works Councils Bulletin until this ceased at the end of 2006 (see last year’s Annual Report), resulted in a £20,000 Gift Aid donation from Warwick Industrial Relations Ltd (see Appendix E) at the end of the 2006-7 financial year. In part, this funding was allocated to augment Mark
Hall’s time for research on the implementation and impact of the UK’s legislation on employee information and consultation. It also supported a three-year Hugh Clegg doctoral studentship which commenced in October 2006.

5 PUBLIC AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES AND DISTINCTIONS

IRRU played a central role in the organisation and academic programme of the International Industrial Relations Association’s (IIA’s) 8th European Congress. Held in Manchester in September around the theme of the ‘Dynamics of European employment relations’, this was the first time in over 30 years that the UK had hosted an IIRA Congress. The Congress attracted almost 400 delegates, more than one half from outside the UK. As reported last year, Linda Dickens chaired the organising committee which comprised members from seven UK universities and the British Universities Industrial Relations Association (BUIRA). Also a member of the organising committee, Paul Marginson co-ordinated one of the Congress’s four main thematic streams – ‘Regulating employment: towards multi-level governance’. Keith Sisson and IRRU Advisory Committee member David Yeandle (EEF Deputy Director, Employment Policy), along with Rita Donaghy (Acas Chair) and Heather Wakefield (Head of Local Government, Unison), were expert participants in the plenary roundtable on contemporary British employment relations which opened the Congress. Guglielmo Meardi convened a special symposium on the impact of EU enlargement on labour markets and industrial relations. Professor Colin Crouch, of WBS’s Public Management and Policy group, chaired the expert plenary roundtable, which included John Monks (General Secretary, ETUC) and Mária Ladó (Social Policy Director, Hungarian Ministry of Economic Affairs), on future directions for European employment relations with which proceedings closed. Anne-marie Greene jointly convened the meeting of the IIRA study group on gender and industrial relations. Twelve IRRU staff and doctoral students presented papers at the Congress (listed in Appendix C). Linda Dickens accepted an invitation to edit the Bulletin of Comparative Labour Relations (Kluwer) in 2008 based on a selection of papers given at the Congress. Paul Marginson is collaborating with editor Richard Hyman on the selection of papers for a 2008 issue of European Journal of Industrial Relations.

IRRU is grateful to WBS for providing sponsorship awards to enable attendance by doctoral students and new researchers. The thirteen award holders, who were successful in open competition, came from eight countries - France, Austria, Australia, Germany, USA, Estonia, Sweden and Spain. Their presence ensured a higher than usual participation by doctoral students and new researchers. Mike Terry, in his then capacity as WBS Deputy Dean, hosted a lunchtime reception at the Congress for recipients of the WBS awards.

Paul Marginson was invited to give the 2007 Shirley Lerner lecture in Manchester in May. His topic was ‘Europeanisation of industrial relations: formal and autonomous processes’.

Linda Dickens and John Purcell are both Deputy Chairs of the Central Arbitration Committee. Dickens has also been appointed to the Two-tier Workforce dispute panel, and she continues her role as an Acas disputes arbitrator and mediator. Purcell is Strategy Adviser to Acas.

Paul Edwards is Chair of the Social Science Group of the British Academy. In addition to chairing the group, the position makes him an ex officio member of the Academy’s Council and Policy Advisory Committee. Edwards continued his work on the business and management sub-panel for the 2008 Research Assessment Exercise. He is also a member of the EPSRC’s College of Assessors for research grants. Edwards, and also Paul Marginson, continue to serve on BERR’s Advisory Forum on the Impact of Employment Policy.
Melanie Simms is a member of the Executive Committee of the British Universities Industrial Relations Association. During 2007 she became a member of the ESRC Virtual College that assesses small grants.

Jim Arrowsmith has been appointed Reviews Editor for *Industrial Relations Journal*. Ardha Danieli, Anne-marie Greene and Sonia Liff are Associate Editors of *Gender, Work and Organization*. Danieli and Greene are also members of the Editorial Board of *Equal Opportunities International* and Danieli of the Editorial Board of *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*. Linda Dickens is an Associate Editor of the *Journal of Industrial Relations*, and a member of the Editorial Boards for the *Industrial Law Journal*, *Employee Relations* and *Journal of Interdisciplinary Gender Studies*. Paul Edwards is an Associate Editor of *Human Relations*, and serves on the Editorial Boards for *Relations Industrielles, Work and Stress* and *Work and Occupations* and the International Advisory Board of *British Journal of Industrial Relations*. Paul Marginson is a member of the International Advisory Board of *European Journal of Industrial Relations*. John Purcell is a member of the Editorial Boards of *Human Resource Management Journal* and *Journal of Industrial Relations*. Guglielmo Meardi has joined the Editorial Boards of *Work, Employment and Society* and *Industrielle Beziehungen*.
Appendix A

IRRU Staff during 2007

Academic and Research Staff

Jim Arrowsmith
Andy Charlwood
Trevor Colling
Ardha Danieli
Deborah Dean
Linda Dickens
Paul Edwards
Anne-marie Greene
Mark Hall
Sonia Liff
Paul Marginson
Guglielmo Meardi
Gillian Morris*
Jane Parker
Sylvia Rohlfèr [until June]
Sukanya Sen Gupta [until May]
Melanie Simms
Keith Sisson**
Mike Terry
Chin-Ju Tsai [until May]

* Honorary Professor
** Emeritus Professor

Clerical and Support Staff

Duncan Adam Survey Research Assistant
Val Jephcott IRRU Research Co-ordinator

Associate and Visiting Fellows

Jacques Bélanger (Université Laval, Québec)
Mark Carley
Tony Edwards (King’s College, London)
Anthony Ferner (De Montfort University)
Mark Gilman (University of Kent)
Richard Hyman (LSE)
Valeria Pulignano (Catholic University, Leuven)
Helen Rainbird (University of Birmingham)
Monder Ram (De Montfort University)
Sylvia Rohlfèr
Sukanya Sen Gupta (Cardiff University)
Chin-Ju Tsai (Royal Holloway, University of London)
Judy Wajcman (Australian National University)
David Winchester
Appendix B

Doctoral Researchers and Topics

Domenico Bevilacqua^  Labour management, business development, and social and economic actors: A study of manufacturing SMEs in the Marche region, Italy

Heather Connolly†  Constructing union organisation and collective action: An ethnographic study of an autonomous French union

Chris Edger  Innovative HRM and M&A: 'Before, during and after' the event

Michael Frize†  Union revitalisation and the law: The use of information and consultation regulations in organising strategies in Britain

Sophie Gamwell†  Temporary Agency Workers: Issues of unionisation and representation in a triangular employment relationship

Annette Hayden*†  Regional integration and the effects on labour management strategy and practice in multinational companies

Benjamin Hopkins*†  The use of short term labour in low-skilled manufacturing jobs

Aristea Koukiadaki*†  Information and Consultation Rights of Employees: A Policy Cycle Approach

Christina Niforou  The regulation of teleworking: A study based on the impact of the EU Autonomous Framework agreement on telework

Thomas Prosser†  'Europeanisation’ through ‘soft law’? The implementation of the framework agreements on telework and work-related stress and other ‘new phase’ texts.

Emma Stringfellow†  Trade union responses to employer ‘Managing Diversity’ policies in Europe

* Hugh Clegg Research Studentship
† ESRC award
^ University studentship linked to IRRU’s ESRC/EPSRC AIM Research project
Appendix C
IRRU Publications during 2007

Note: This list covers work done within the IRRU programme. Names in square brackets are people who are not members of IRRU.

Books and Reports

D Adam and P Marginson, *Workplace Employment Relations in the West Midlands*, West Midlands Employment Relations Forum, Acas Midlands/IRRU, 29pp


P Edwards, [T Edwards, A Ferner], P Marginson, [O Tregaskis], D Adam and [M Meyer], ‘Employment Practices of MNCs in Organisational Context’, De Montfort University, Leicester; Kings College, London; Warwick Business School, 110pp

M Hall, [S Hutchinson], J Parker, J Purcell and M Terry, *Implementing information and consultation: early experience under the ICE Regulations*, Employment Relations Research Series No. 88, Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform, 98pp

[E Léonard, R Erne], P Marginson and [S Smismans], ‘New structures, forms and processes of governance in European industrial relations’, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, Dublin, 88pp


J Purcell and [S Hutchinson], *Learning and the line: the role of line managers in training, learning and development*. London: CIPD http://cipd.co.uk/onlineinfodocuments

J Purcell and [S Hutchinson], *Line Managers in Reward, Learning and Development*. Research into Practice. London CIPD, 40pp

J Purcell and [S Hutchinson], *Rewarding work: the vital role of line managers*. London: CIPD http://cipd.co.uk/onlineinfodocuments

Journal Articles and Book Chapters

J Arrowsmith, ‘Increase in temporary work is likely to continue’, in Jacques Brousse (ed), *Europe at Work*, Brussels: Arca

J Arrowsmith, ‘Why is there not more ‘annualized-hours’ working in Britain?’, *Industrial Relations Journal*, 38, 423-38


D Dean, ‘Performing industrial relations: the centrality of gender in regulation of work in theatre and television’, Industrial Relations Journal, 38, 252-268

L Dickens, ‘The Road is Long. Thirty years of equality legislation in Britain’, British Journal of Industrial Relations, 45, 463-494


G Meardi, ‘Multinationals in the new EU member states and the revitalisation of trade unions’, Debate. Journal for Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe, 15, 177-193

G Meardi, ‘Restructuring in an enlarged Europe: challenges and experiences’, Transfer, 13, 253-266


J Purcell and [S Hutchinson], ‘Front-line managers as agents in the HRM-performance causal chain: theory, analysis and evidence’, Human Resource Management Journal, 17, 1. 3-20


[S Sayce, P Ackers] and AM Greene, ‘Work Restructuring and Changing Craft Identity: The Tale of the Disaffected Weavers (or what happens when the rug is pulled from under your feet)’ Work, Employment and Society, 21, 85-101


M Simms, ‘Managed activism: two union organising campaigns in the not-for-profit sector’ Industrial Relations Journal, 38, 2, 119-135

C- J Tsai, S Sen Gupta and P Edwards, ‘When and why is small beautiful?’ Human Relations, 60, 1779-1808.

Conference Papers and presentations


J Arrowsmith, [H Nicholaisen, B Bechter and R Nonell], ‘The management of variable pay in banking: forms and rationale in four European countries’ 8th IIRA European Congress, Manchester, September


[A Ferner], P Edwards, [T Edwards], P Marginson and [O Tregaskis], ‘The determinants of central control and subsidiary discretion in HRM and employment relations policies’, 8th IIRA European Congress, Manchester, September

M Hall, [S Hutchinson], J Parker, J Purcell and M Terry, ‘UK trade unions and the Information and Consultation of Employees Regulations’, 8th IIRA European Congress, Manchester, September


P Marginson, ‘European industrial relations research: an increasingly textured but uneven terrain’, European Industrial Relations Research Forum, London, September

P Marginson, ‘Europeanisation of industrial relations: formal and autonomous process’, Shirley Lerner Lecture, Manchester, May


P Marginson, J Arrowsmith and M Gray, ‘Undermining or reframing collective bargaining? Variable pay in two sectors compared’, 4th Pay and Reward Conference, Manchester, March

P Marginson, P Edwards, [T Edwards, A Ferner and O Tregaskis], ‘Channels and coverage of employee voice in multinational companies operating in Britain’, 8th IIRA European Congress, Manchester, September

G Meardi, ‘The Polish Plumber in the West Midlands’, European Migration Conference, Vienna, September
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[K Nergaard, J Dølvik], P Marginson and [F Traxler], ‘Engaging with variable pay: union responses in comparative perspective’, 8th IIRA European Congress, Manchester, September.


M Simms, ‘“What are we organising for?” Outcomes of five union organising campaigns’ 8th IIRA European Congress, Manchester, September.

M Simms and D Dean, ‘Mobilisation of non-standard workers: evidence from two campaigns’ 8th IIRA European Congress, Manchester, September.

M Simms, and [J Holgate], ‘10 years of the TUC Organising Academy’ Paper presented to the Work, Employment and Society conference, Aberdeen, September.

M Simms ‘The Organising Academy: 10 years on’ presentation at Bristol Business School, University of West of England, December.

K Sisson, ‘Weathering the storm: the maturing of British industrial relations’, Plenary paper, 8th IIRA European Congress, Manchester, September.


**Research/ practitioner seminar presentations**

D Adam and P Marginson ‘West Midlands employment relations profiled’, West Midlands Employment Relations Forum Briefing, September.


P Edwards, ‘Masterclass: Writing Research Grants’ and ‘Good and Bad Jobs in SMEs: Beyond the Stereotypes’, University of Strathclyde, March.


J Purcell, ‘Rewards and the role of line managers’, CIPD Reward conference, February.

J Purcell, ‘Learning and line managers’. CIPD HRD conference, April.

J Purcell, ‘Absence management’, EEF Western, April.

J Purcell, ‘The vital role of line managers in HRM’, CIPD Ireland, National conference plenary, May.

J Purcell, workshop on HRM and performance, British Academy of Management, Warwick, September.

J Purcell, ‘Reconsidering the role of line managers in reward’, CIPD Reward workshop, October.
J Purcell, Rapporteur for stream on HRM and Performance, Dutch HRM Network annual conference, November

J Purcell and J Parker, ‘Information and Consultation Research: a MNC case study in comparative perspective’ Warwickshire, September

M Terry and J. Parker, ‘UK trade unions and the Information and Consultation of Employees Regulations’, Unions 21 meeting, London, November

**Shorter publications**

J Arrowsmith, ‘Temporary agency work in Europe’, *IRRU Briefing* 14, Spring

P Edwards, S Sen Gupta, C-J Tsai, ‘Small, satisfying but not all that beautiful: Employee commitment and the small firm’, *IRRU Briefing* 14, Spring

A M Greene, [G Kirton] and D Dean, ‘Exploring the involvement of stakeholders in diversity management’, *IRRU Briefing* 14, Spring

M Hall, [S Hutchinson], J Parker, J Purcell and M Terry *Submission to DTI review of workplace representatives’ facilities and facility time*, 8pp (http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/wbs/research/irru/publications/recresrep/dti ee reps submission_march_2007.pdf)

M Hall, [S Hutchinson], J Parker, J Purcell and M Terry, ‘Impact of consultation legislation examined’, *IRRU Briefing* 15, Autumn

M Hall, [S Hutchinson], J Parker, J Purcell and M Terry, ‘What impact have the information and consultation regulations had?’ *IPA Bulletin* 69, October, 1-4

G Meardi and P Marginson, ‘Relocation: Incidence, threats and union responses’, *IRRU Briefing* 15, Autumn

**Warwick Papers in Industrial Relations and other working papers series**


[T Edwards, O Tregaskis], PK Edwards, [A Ferner], P Marginson, J Parker, D Adam, [M Meyer and A Budjanovcanin], ‘Charting the Contours of Multinationals in Britain’, *Warwick Papers in Industrial Relations*, No. 86, Warwick Business School, 32pp

[T Edwards], P Marginson, PK Edwards, [A Ferner and O Tregaskis], ‘Corporate social responsibility in multinational companies’, *IILS Discussion Paper No. 185*, No. 185, ILO, 16pp


K Sisson, ‘Revitalising industrial relations: making the most of the “institutional turn”’, *Warwick Papers in Industrial Relations*, No 85, Warwick Business School, 76pp
IRRU/UK contributions to the European Industrial Relations Observatory (EIRO), European Working Conditions Observatory (EWCO) and European Restructuring Monitor (ERM) submitted during 2007

EIRO information updates

January 2007
Women still seriously under-represented in senior posts (H Newell)
Lack of access to paid time off is biggest barrier to training (M Carley)
Government simplification plan targets employment regulation (M Hall)

February 2007
Right to request flexible working extended to carers (M Hall)
Government evaluates facilities and time off of workplace representatives (M Carley)

March 2007
New public sector equality provisions take effect (L Dickens)
Unions target private equity companies in campaign against asset stripping (H Newell)
Burberry offers factory to local community after protests over closure (H Newell)
Steel union seeks assurances in Corus takeover (T Edwards)
Government announces small rise in national minimum wage (D Adam)

April 2007
Government to compensate workers for loss of pension following High Court ruling (H Newell)

May 2007
TUC promotes business benefits of unions to employers (J Arrowsmith)
Ford announces plan to close UK foundry (M Hall)
Trade union concern over government department’s regional pay proposals (P Marginson)

June 2007
Unions call for more protection for workers in redundancy announcements (H Newell)
First steps in creation of transatlantic ‘super-union’ (J Arrowsmith)
Union wins equal pay victimisation case (H Newell)
Leading publisher in breach of information and consultation procedures (M Hall)
Proposed new equality framework triggers mixed reaction (G Kirton)

July 2007
Trades Union Congress launches commission to monitor vulnerable workers (D Adam)
Fall in trade union membership reported (M Carley)
Mixed reaction to ‘opt-out’ from Charter of Fundamental Rights (M Hall)
Minimum holiday entitlement to be increased (M Carley)
Royal mail hit by first national strikes in a decade (J Arrowsmith)
Increase in work days lost due to strikes in 2006 (D Winchester)

August 2007
First fine imposed on defaulting company under consultation regulations (M Hall)
Gender equality still ‘generations away’ (M Carley)
Partnership deal agreed in papermaking industry (M Carley)

September 2007 Unions criticise opposition party’s deregulation proposals (M Hall)

October 2007 Employers worried about threats to flexibility (M Hall)
Trade unions call for vote on EU reform treaty (M Hall)

November 2007 Report assesses companies’ responses to information and consultation legislation (M Hall, S Hutchinson, J Parker, J Purcell and M Terry)
Towards ‘representative actions’ in resolving workplace disputes?: (T Colling)
Telework in the UK (J Parker)

December 2007 Debate on temporary agency work intensifies (M Carley)
Government sets out legislative plans in the employment and social arena (M Carley)

EWCO information updates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2007</td>
<td>Unfair treatment and discrimination at work (J Parker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2007</td>
<td>Stress at work on the increase (M Frize)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical role of managers in information and consultation (D Adam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2007</td>
<td>Union calls for equal rights for temporary agency workers (D Adam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2007</td>
<td>Changing work organisation results in mixed effects (J Parker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2007</td>
<td>TUC calls for equal access to workplace training (J Parker)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ERM fact sheets

205 fact sheets on cases of restructuring in UK undertakings (S Gamwell/T Prosser)

UK contributions to comparative analytical reports

EIRO – 2006 annual review (M Hall)
EIRO – Industrial relations in the postal sector (J Arrowsmith)
EIRO – Pay developments 2006 (J Arrowsmith)
EIRO – Impact of the working time Directive on collective bargaining in the road transport sector (A Broughton)
EIRO – Working time developments 2006 (J Arrowsmith)
Representativeness study – Sea and coastal water transport (H Newell)
ERM – National evidence of employment impacts of relocation (T Prosser)
Representativeness study – Sugar manufacturing (H Newell)
ERM – Perceptions of employment impact of globalisation (T Edwards)
EWCO/EIRO – Social dialogue and working conditions (A Broughton)
EIRO – The impact of the information and consultation Directive (M Hall)
Representativeness study – Railway infrastructure (J Arrowsmith)
Representativeness study – Post and courier activities (H Newell)
EWCO/EIRO – Self employed (H Newell)
Representativeness study – Hospitals (H Newell)
EWCO – Employment and working conditions of younger workers (H Newell)

Comparative analytical reports
EIRO – Annual review 2006 (M Carley)
EIRO – Pay developments 2006 (M Carley)
EIRO – Working time developments 2006 (M Carley)
EIRO – The impact of the information and consultation Directive (M Carley and M Hall)

Forthcoming publications

J Arrowsmith, [H Nicholaisen, B Bechter and R Nonell], ‘The management of variable pay in banking: forms and rationale in four European countries’, Bulletin of Comparative Labour Relations


[L Bordogna] and L Dickens ‘Public Sector Dispute Management: Pertinence of Comparative study’, Journal of Industrial Relations

D Dean, ‘No human resource is an island: gendered, racialized access to performing work’, Gender, Work and Organization


L Dickens, (Guest Editor), Challenges in European Employment Relations. Bulletin of Comparative Industrial Relations, No 66, Kluwer

L Dickens and [L Bordogna], (Guest Editors), ‘Regulating and Resolving Collective Disputes in Public Services’ Journal of Industrial Relations

P Edwards and [J Bélanger], ‘Generalizing from Workplace Ethnographies: From Induction to Theory’, Journal of Contemporary Ethnography.


M Hall, [S Hutchinson], J Parker, J Purcell and M Terry, ‘UK trade unions and the Information and Consultation of Employees Regulations’, Bulletin of Comparative Labour Relations

[E Heery] and M Simms, ‘Constraints on union organising in the United Kingdom’ Industrial Relations Journal

[I Kessler] and L Dickens, ‘Dispute Resolution and the Modernisation of the Public Services in Britain: The case of the Local Government Pay Commission’, Journal of Industrial Relations


P Marginson, G Meardi, [A Toth, M. Stanojevic, M. Frybes and M Fichter], ‘The Complexity of Relocation and the Diversity of Union Responses’, *European Journal of Industrial Relations*

J Parker, ‘The Trades Union Congress and alliance-building with social movements’, *Employee Relations*, 30, 5

M Terry, ‘Not too much to ask’, *People Management*
Appendix D:

Research Funding

New, ongoing and completed grants during 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Provider</th>
<th>Project Details</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Mark Hall)</td>
<td>Network of European Observatories: information reporting services</td>
<td>€98,266</td>
<td>01/03/06 – 28/02/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Mark Hall and [Andrea Broughton])</td>
<td>Network of European Observatories: analytical services</td>
<td>€118,704</td>
<td>01/03/06 – 28/02/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Mark Hall)</td>
<td>Network of European Observatories: information reporting services</td>
<td>€94,165</td>
<td>01/03/07 – 29/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Mark Hall and [Andrea Broughton])</td>
<td>Network of European Observatories: analytical services</td>
<td>€112,322</td>
<td>01/03/07 – 28/02/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Trade and Industry (Mark Hall, Jane Parker, John Purcell and Mike Terry)</td>
<td>Information and consultation of employees – longitudinal employer case studies</td>
<td>£189,910</td>
<td>01/03/06 – 31/12/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuffield Foundation (Melanie Simms and [Jane Holgate])</td>
<td>‘An evaluation of recent developments in trade union organiser training’</td>
<td>£11,756</td>
<td>01/07/06 – 31/01/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Vienna / Austrian Ministry of Labour (Guglielmo Meardi)</td>
<td>‘Market Efficiency and Employee Participation Practice’</td>
<td>€18,300</td>
<td>01/09/06 – 28/02/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRC/EPSRC Advanced Institute of Management Research (Paul Edwards)</td>
<td>‘Organisational Roots of Productivity’</td>
<td>£389,636</td>
<td>01/02/04 – 30/09/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Science Foundation / ESRC (Paul Marginson and Jim Arrowsmith)</td>
<td>‘Variable Pay and Collective Bargaining’</td>
<td>£146,775</td>
<td>01/07/04 – 30/06/07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Economic and Social Research Council ([Anthony Ferner], Paul Marginson, Paul Edwards, [Tony Edwards] and [Olga Tregaskis])

‘Employment Practice of MNCs: a large-scale survey’

Gift Aid donation from Warwick Industrial Relations Ltd (see Appendix E)
Appendix E

Warwick Industrial Relations Ltd

IRRU established Warwick Industrial Relations Ltd (WIRL) in 1994. The company is recognised and approved by the university authorities. Under its memorandum of association, WIRL’s objects are:

- to enable the members of the company to become involved in legally-contracted joint ventures which promote the reputation and research activities of IRRU;
- to provide a framework for organising and developing the contract research undertaken by members of the company; and
- to generate resources to help finance the research activities of IRRU, while providing members of the company with opportunities to improve their earnings.

WIRL owns a 50% share of *European Works Councils Bulletin* (which ceased publication at the end of 2006) and a 25% share of *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, and receives royalties from these sources. Where appropriate, the financial arrangements for IRRU members’ participation in contract research projects are handled via the company.

Each financial year WIRL’s end-of-year surplus is donated under the Gift Aid scheme to the University of Warwick Foundation to support research within IRRU. To date, this support has taken two forms. The Hugh Clegg Memorial Fund is earmarked for supporting the Hugh Clegg PhD studentships periodically advertised by IRRU. The IRRU Research Fund supports IRRU’s research activities more generally. At the end of March 2007, WIRL’s annual Gift Aid donation amounted to £20,000.
