

Capital markets and HRM: An ambivalent relationship?

Achim Krausert

New research is looking at how short-term performance pressures from the capital market may affect longer-term HRM investments, and at the mechanisms that may support this influence. In collaboration with the CIPD, we explore what types of HRM activities, if any, are attended to by investors, and with what implications for firm investments in skills, employment security and innovative work practices.

For better or worse, capital markets have been a growing influence on how business is being conducted, also affecting employment relations and HRM practices. Interrelations between HRM and capital market processes have been investigated by IRRU both theoretically and empirically. On a theoretical level, the relationships between capital market processes, short-term performance pressures and suboptimal levels of HRM investment have been explored and problematised. Short-term performance pressures are caused by various factors. Some of them, arguably, justify a short-term orientation of firms. For example, if a firm's survival is at stake due to low firm performance, a temporary focus on near-term performance may be warranted. Investors, in particular short-term investors such as hedge funds,

may also prefer and encourage a focus on near-term performance. At the same time, a focus on near-term performance may be an unintended side effect of a corporate governance system that relies on (more or less) informed trading of company shares. The resulting problem is that longer term investments (including in HRM) may be discouraged, whereas they would be in the interest of sustainable firm performance—and in the interest of (longer term) investors.

What types of HRM practices are most likely to be affected by short-term performance pressures from the capital market? We propose a range of HRM practices which are costly in the short term and beneficial in the long term that are most likely to be undermined.

>> **continued on page 3**

Also in this issue

Work as art as work

A new project experiments an innovative way of sharing and applying the findings of industrial relations' research: a play.

>> **See page 3**

Who participates in European Social Dialogue, and with what results?

In 2016 a new two-year research project, funded by the European Commission's Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion division, was started by IRRU in collaboration with partners at Durham (co-ordinating institution), Cardiff, Pforzheim (Germany) and Gothenburg (Sweden).

>> **See page 4**

New report makes recommendations on halving the disability employment gap

The report highlights that the current disability employment gap of 32 per cent will reduce by just 2.6 percentage points by 2020 and argues that the government's target will only be met if decisive and innovative action is taken.

>> **See page 6**

Editorial: The dynamics of industrial relations research

IRRU Appointments

3 April: IRRU-ACAS Lecture in memory of Sir Pat Lowry: Margaret Beels, Gangmaster and Labour Abuse Authority, 'Tackling Labour Exploitation'

20 April (in collaboration with *Connecting Research on Employment and Work*): public debate to launch the Warwick Brexit Briefings on Employment

25 April (in collaboration with *Connecting Research on Employment and Work*): Meet the Editors Event, with Kim Hoque (*Human Relations*), Paul Marginson (*Industrial and Labor Relations Review*), Mel Simms (*Work, Employment and Society*) and Ida Sabelis (*Gender, Work and Organisation*)

10 May: Workshop on Labour Market Exploitation

15 May: Special seminar with David Allen, IRRU and Rutgers University

9 June: Workshop on European Sectoral Social Dialogue.

Industrial relations research evolves in the same way as the world of work changes. To reflect this, our research centre periodically reframes the streams of its research focus to make them more representative, inclusive and visible. The articles in this IRRU Briefing reflect the variety of IRRU research by exemplifying the three axes as currently redesigned.

First, the opening article on HRM and financial markets represents the stream on employment relations strategy. Financialization has challenged some tenets of employment relations thinking, and suggested the ideas of 'disconnected capitalism' contradicting any HRM commitment (P. Thompson) and of freely circulating money undermining the institutions of social compromise (W. Streeck). Yet if finance markets' conventional short-termism seems to preclude longer-term strategies by HR managers and trade unions, the conceptual and empirical question is how information and feedback between finance and HR actually work and how they can be modified.

Secondly, the article on European sectoral social dialogue corresponds to a long-standing but ever-evolving IRRU interest in comparative issues, now reframed under the stream on 'multi-level governance in a global context'. While the UK is heading towards the EU Exit sign, international multi-level, public-private forms of governance continue to evolve and will remain relevant, if more indirectly, for the UK. The Prime Minister's commitment not to reduce employment rights, combined with the likely inclusion in any future EU-UK trade agreement of the usual EU anti-social dumping clauses, actually call for even more urgent comparative studies of employment relations post-Brexit.

Thirdly, the article on disability and employment is typical of the stream on equality, diversity and social sustainability. It is also typical of a feature of IRRU

research: policy impact, meant not as search for quick solutions, but as theoretically-informed and empirically grounded contribution to a deeper understanding and awareness of interventions in the world of work. Impact activity of research on diversity is also the topic of the piece by Deborah Dean.

The need for industrial relations research has been recently confirmed by the Review of Modern Employment Practices, which was commissioned by the government to Matthew Taylor, an IRRU alumnus. An industrial relations approach maintains its explanatory potential: rather than being rooted in the past, it has proved its dynamic capacity to analyse change in strategies, environment and values. Phenomena such as the 'gig economy', robotization and new forms of exploitation are sometimes portrayed as the end of work or the end of employment. For researchers, the responsibility is to study these phenomena, while not falling prey of fads. The example of the so-called 'Uberisation' of work is telling. Recent judicial rulings, as well as conflicts across Europe as reported by IRRU in a recent comparative contribution to the EU-wide EurWORK observatory, signal in the Uber case that if the 'gig economy' does present new challenges and opportunities, it is far from preparing an inherently liberating, total and global competition among all workers that would be antithetical to collective employment relations. Issues of surveillance, control, commitment, exploitation, moral economy, socialisation, solidarity and mobilisation re-emerge rather than disappearing. And after all, where did the Uber drivers go when they realised that their 'platform' was inexorably intensifying work, reducing rates and controlling their movements? To the GMB, a trade union whose origins can be traced back to 1888.

Guglielmo Meardi
IRRU Director

IRRU Briefing is published periodically by the Industrial Relations Research Unit. It contains summaries of key findings from current and recent research projects, information on new projects and publications, and analysis of significant industrial relations developments.

IRRU Briefing aims to inform and contribute to the thinking of practitioners in industrial relations and human resource management. Many of our recent papers can be found on our web site. Please go to: www2.warwick.ac.uk/go/irru

For further information on our work, please contact IRRU's Research Coordinator at the address on the final page.

Work as art as work

<< continued from page 1

For example, investments in qualification and skill may take time to impact on performance because qualifications and skills need to be coupled with firm-specific experience for their effects to fully unfold. When a company introduces a new training programme (such as a management trainee or apprenticeship programme), new skills need to be 'rolled out' across the relevant workforce segment for changes in behaviour to emerge. New work practices (e.g., more involving work practices) may temporarily disrupt existing routines and productivity, before higher levels of productivity emerge over time.

The challenge is to develop mechanisms that might mitigate these negative effects of the capital market on longer-term HRM investments. In principle, institutional investors (and securities analysts analysing firms on their behalf) may attribute value to longer term investments if they believe that they have a positive effect on future earnings growth. If managers and investors were able to communicate credibly about investments in skills, employment security and innovative work practices, it might potentially enable managers to support respective HRM investments despite short-term performance pressures. Hence our new empirical project, in collaboration with the CIPD, which is asking if, and under what circumstances, such information-sharing solutions might be effective. The study examines, in particular, to what extent (and what kinds of) signals of HRM practices are currently being attended to by the capital market. First results are expected to be available in autumn 2017.

Further reading

Krausert, A. (forthcoming). The HRM-Capital-Market Link: Effects of Securities Analysts on Strategic Human Capital, *Human Resource Management*.

Krausert, A. (2016). HRM Signals for the Capital Market, *Human Resource Management*, 55(6), 1025-1040.

Krausert, A. (2015). The timing of training effects: A learning curve perspective. In John Humphreys (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Seventy-fifth Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management*. Online ISSN: 2151-6561.

Deborah Dean



Exploring how and why actors get jobs, are paid, and are able to continue working as they age, helps understand advantage and disadvantage in society more widely, and has been the object of my research, including projects funded by the European Commission and the British Academy. To reach a wider audience for the dissemination of the findings, and in collaboration with Dr. Wallace McDowell of Warwick's Department of Theatre and Performance Studies, I will re-work my published research on UK, US and European actors as workers as a play to for industry employers and policymakers. The play will use respondents' own words within a new fictional framework.

We will work with award-winning media production company Zebra Digital to create a shareable online campaign around the play; and with Equity, the entertainment industry union, using actor members for the piece and mobilising leading actor members as patrons. The piece will draw on respondent data to produce one (filmed) performance of a form of documentary theatre to be staged at a London venue, either a theatre or potentially at the Palace of Westminster. The patrons and my existing contacts through previous research will facilitate engagement with the employers, gatekeepers, funding bodies and campaign groups who will form the play's invited audience.

The play will touch upon currently topical employment equality issues through the use of data and themes from peer-reviewed social science research in an industrially-relevant way. A short 'highlight' film of play segments will be disseminated through the online film campaign and social media strategy developed with Zebra Digital. It will have both accessibility and legitimacy, adding to public and policy discussions on what needs to change and how, in its different understanding of why.

The performance itself will be filmed and copies of the script (with links to the academic research explicit in the text) will be given to the audience, to which policy makers in the field of culture, media and equality will be invited, following on

A new project experiments an innovative way of sharing and applying the findings of industrial relations' research: a play.

previous mentions of my research in the House of Commons. The filmed version and script will also be published online, for example on the websites of Equity and of the International Federation of Actors and Creative Diversity Network (a forum of television employers to promote and drive good practice around the diversity agenda). All of these bodies have equality and diversity dimensions to their work or policies. What this project will add is the rigour of peer-reviewed social scientific research in an entertaining/provocative form, which is mobile, accessible and useable.

Further reading

Dean, D. and Greene, A.: 'How do we understand worker silence despite poor conditions – as the actress said to the bishop', *Human Relations* (2017)

Dean, D.: 'The relevance of ideas in a union's organization of contingent workers: 'Here come the fairy people!', *Work, Employment And Society*, 26, 6, 918-934 (2012)

Dean, D.: 'No human resource is an island: gendered, racialized access to work as a performer', *Gender, Work & Organization*, 15, 2, 161-181 (2008)

Dean, D.: 'Performing industrial relations: the centrality of gender in regulation of work in theatre and television', *Industrial Relations Journal*, 38, 3, 252-268 (2007)

Who participates in European Social Dialogue, and with what results?

Manuela Galetto

The new European Commission-funded project ‘*Social Partner Engagement and Effectiveness in European Dialogue*’ (SPEEED) continues the long-standing stream of IRRU’s comparative European research. European sectoral dialogue committees were established by the EU in 1998. How effective is the participation of social partners in this structure, and under what conditions does it contribute to the joint governance of employment relations in Europe? Are the sectoral social dialogue committees fit for purpose?

In 2016 a new two-year research project, funded by the European Commission’s Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion division, was started by IRRU in collaboration with partners at Durham (coordinating institution), Cardiff, Pforzheim (Germany) and Gothenburg (Sweden). European Social Dialogue was launched by European Commission President Jacques Delors in the 1980s, and since the late 1990s operates not only at the cross-sector, but also at the sectoral level. At a time of turbulence in European institutions and labour markets, its operation is under renewed discussion.

Our recently concluded European-Commission project on Active Inclusion and Industrial Relations from a Multi-level governance Perspective (see *IRRU Briefing* 24, Spring 2015) had shown instances of positive social partners’ involvement in European employment policies, but also their fragmentation. This new project looks at how social partners’ role can be institutionalised in a more systematic way. The SPEEED study aims at mapping mechanisms and outcomes of sectoral social dialogue, and at identifying what makes for an effective engagement of social partners at the European level.

The origins of the European Sectoral Social Dialogue (ESSD) date back to the creation of the European Community itself. The European Coal and Steel Community in 1955 led to the creation of the first two ESSD committees for coal and steel. During the relatively young history of the European Union and its institutions, sectoral social dialogue has gone through waves of support and development. The so-called Val Duchesse process launched in 1985, crucially, involved European social partners

“ At a moment when the whole institutional architecture of the EU is put in question, a study of the operation of social dialogue can contribute to the understanding of inputs for the legitimacy and effectiveness of European policies. ”

in the construction of the internal market. The 1992 Maastricht Social Agreement (then articles 138, 139 of the EC Treaty) gave it a legal basis by formally including social partners in the European policy-making process, including with legislative initiative. In 1998 the Commission systematised the joint committees and informal working parties that had been operating in some sectors into homogenous ‘Sectoral Social Dialogue Committees’ (SSDCs). Today, there are 48 SSDC, ranging from fishing to telecommunications, from hairdressers to construction, from professional football to sugar, and covering an estimate of 75% of Europe’s workforce.

In May 2015, 30 years after Val Duchesse, a High Conference for a ‘New Start for Social Dialogue’ was held in Brussels, on the initiative of ‘the President of European Social Dialogue’, as Jean-Claude Juncker would like to be known for. The Commissioner

for Employment, Social Affairs, Skills and Labour Mobility, Marianne Thyssen, stated at the conference that:

‘strengthening social dialogue is a common endeavour between social partners and public authorities. Capacity-building activities as envisaged by the social partners can play a major contribution to reinforce their dialogue and its outcomes. Social partners have also a key role to play in addressing the key challenges our societies and labour markets are facing. This is why the Commission has been giving a prominent role to social partners in the discussions on the European pillar of social rights and the recently adopted skills agenda.’

Despite this formal official endorsement by EU authorities, the assessment of European sectoral social dialogue is very mixed. The joint work programmes that the Sectoral Social Dialogue committees have been working on over the years produced mainly non-binding agreements, joint opinions and procedural documents (more than 500 joint texts until 2010). Only in a minority of cases the sectoral committees’ efforts have led to new binding EU regulations (for example in sea-fishing, hairdressing and central administrations). The extent to which the renewed interest is reflecting a genuine political will of the European Union to embrace tripartite dialogue at sectoral level as a *modus operandi* or, by contrast, an attempt of re-balancing the *economic* Union with a *social* Union, is not straightforward. The institutional structures are in place but, in brief, do they work? Is Sectoral Social Dialogue an effective forum of discussion and participation for national social partners representing the collective interests of their

industry? Is there a shared view on what 'effective' should mean in this context?

The industrial relations studies of Sectoral Social Dialogue in Europe have raised the issue of social partners' representativeness, something systematically investigated by the Representativeness Studies conducted by Eurofound with the contribution, with regard to UK sectoral organisations, of IRRU. But other problems have emerged over time: the disadvantage of countries characterised by weak institutional settings; the exclusion of key themes, such as wages, from the agenda; the limits of the 'soft law' approach in producing effective outcomes. Other observers, however, have emphasised the new role of a potential forum for European coordination in the multi-level governance of industrial relations. A comprehensive and up-to-date assessment is missing. Moving from the extant literature and taking stock of the activities and experiences of all SSDCs so far, our research project has therefore committed to (1) map and analyse the settings of ESSD, (2) develop an 'effective engagement indicator', (3) identify barriers to effective engagement in SSDCs, and (4) analyse social partners engagement procedures.

The research will be based on both quantitative and qualitative analysis, methods rarely used in combination in the research on ESSD. The quantitative analysis will be based on secondary data including all 43 representativeness studies by Eurofound, the social dialogue texts database, and Eurostat data. This will provide the material to build a dataset of all agreements, joint declarations and, in general, outputs of all sector committees and the mapping of all relevant social partners of all 28 member states. This body of information will be matched by accounts of specific characteristics of each sector in terms of their relative weight in the economy, trends in employment and productivity, as well as for example the presence of specific groups of workers. This will help providing a contextualised picture of the various industries, their respective needs and the capacity of social actors to represent them at different levels.

To account for differences in the capacity and engagement of social partners in specific industries, the study compares two sectors in five countries in detail: metalworking and hospitals in Germany, Italy, Poland,

Sweden and the United Kingdom. Interviews at national and European levels and participation in Sectoral Social Dialogue Committee meetings in Brussels will provide an in-depth picture of social dialogue processes.

Metalworking has traditionally represented a key, driving industry in setting patterns of collective bargaining in most countries. Yet at European level the Sectoral Social Dialogue committee was set up relatively recently, in 2003 – despite some informal European sub-sector social dialogue in the 1980s in automotive and machine tool production. The SSDC for the health sector was created in 2005. The themes discussed by the committees are varied and include the implication of ageing populations and workforces, manufacturing competitiveness, training and qualifications. By tracking the trajectories of such themes in the social dialogue agenda (how does a theme become a shared priority?), the SPEED project will be shedding light on the mechanisms of communication (vertical and horizontal) and engagement of social partners, as well as the preferences for different outputs (guidelines, directives, codes of practice, recommendations, joint declarations).

At a moment when the whole institutional architecture of the EU is put in question, a study of the operation of social dialogue can contribute to the understanding of inputs for the legitimacy and effectiveness of European policies.

Call for papers

Special Issue of *Economic and Industrial Democracy*

"Trade Unions and Democracy: In Memory of Giulio Regeni, 15.1.1988-n.d.2016"

Editors: Guglielmo Meardi (IRRU), Lucio Baccaro (Université de Genève), Chiara Benassi (King's College London)

Manuscript submission deadline: 15 September 2017

Further resources

www.speeded.uk SPEED project's website, which will contain fieldwork reports and a newsletter.

P. Marginson and K. Sisson: *European Integration and Industrial Relations*. London: Palgrave (2004)

B. Bechter, B. Brandl and G. Meardi: 'Sectors or countries? Typologies and levels of analysis in comparative industrial relations', *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 18, 3, 185-202 (2012)

New report makes recommendations on halving the disability employment gap

Kim Hoque

At current rates of progress, it will take until 2065 for the government's manifesto commitment to halve the disability employment gap by 2020 to be met. This is one of the conclusions of the report 'Ahead of the Arc: A Contribution to Halving the Disability Employment Gap', launched by the All Party Parliamentary Group for Disability in December last year.

The report, authored by Philip Connolly (Disability Rights UK), Vicki Wass and Melanie Jones (Cardiff Business School), Nick Bacon (Cass Business School) and myself, highlights that the current disability employment gap of 32 per cent will reduce by just 2.6 percentage points by 2020 and argues that the government's target will only be met if decisive and innovative action is taken.

In terms of what this action might comprise, the report – which draws heavily on research Nick Bacon, Melanie Jones, Vicki Wass and I have conducted in the area of disability in recent years as well as on verbal and written evidence from disability charities, campaign groups and disabled people – outlines several new interventions. First, it argues that disabled people have difficulty in accessing mainstream business networks and the government agencies that administer research and innovation grants (e.g. Innovate UK and the Business Bank). The government is keen to explore self-employment and entrepreneurship as a route to narrowing the disability employment gap, but this is currently undermined by disabled people's lack of access to (and support from) the necessary networks and funding agencies. The report recommends that Innovate UK and the Business Bank should be required to: monitor whether their services are being accessed by disabled people; develop plans to ensure that disabled people's access to their services is proportionate; and actively promote their services to disabled people.

Second, the report points to the role of public sector procurement in improving disabled people's job prospects and labour market outcomes. Public sector procurement was worth £242 billion in 2015. The report argues that the government should leverage this by stipulating that public sector contracts will only be granted to firms that adopt an inclusive approach to

“ The report... highlights that the current disability employment gap of 32 per cent will reduce by just 2.6 percentage points by 2020 and argues that the government's target will only be met if decisive and innovative action is taken. ”

the recruitment and retention of disabled people in order to improve disabled people's employment prospects.

Third, the report highlights a lack of reliable data on the scale and distribution of disability employment gaps. As such, it recommends that all organisations, and especially those funded by and contracting with the public sector, should be required to collect and record the disability status of their employees, users and applicants, and that this information should then be used to develop plans and monitor progress towards hiring and retaining more disabled people, or providing better services to them. Firms may regard measuring the disability status of employees, applicants and users to be an unnecessary bureaucratic exercise. It is, however, an essential pre-requisite to identifying disability gaps, and developing plans to address those gaps.

Fourth, the report highlights that disabled people continue to encounter inaccessible and inflexible workplace environments, and it argues that measures such as tax

incentives for employing disabled people, reducing tribunal fees for disabled people and providing greater support for specialised union equality representatives would go some distance in helping to address these problems. The report also argues that both public and private organisations need to set targets to help increase and retain the number of disabled people in work, and that the government must hold organisations to account in meeting these targets. Equality legislation has a central role to play in establishing such targets, given that the disproportionate access to new jobs disabled people will need to halve the disability employment gap will require preferential treatment and the sort of positive action that legislation makes possible.

The report also highlights, however, that even if disabled people take all of the jobs that the Office of Budgetary Responsibility estimates will be created within the British economy between now and 2020, this will still not be enough for the government to meet its manifesto target. It is perhaps concerning that Penny Mordaunt, Minister of State at the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP), has recently sought to distance the government from its manifesto target rather than commit to the types of action required to meet it.

The report's recommendations have received direct endorsement from 15 Members of Parliament across seven parties, and seven Peers. At the launch event (which was chaired by Dr Lisa Cameron MP), Members of Parliament and Peers including Heidi Allen MP, Neil Coyle MP, Jonny Mercer MP, Kate Green MP, Neil Gray MP and Lords Addington and Low all spoke at length about the importance of the report's recommendations. Commenting before the launch of the report, Dr Lisa Cameron MP and Chair of the APPG on Disability said

“This report looks at factors that the DWP green paper on employment and disability largely overlooks – are there enough future vacancies and how can government ensure that disabled people are able to either create jobs or take opportunities in major areas of the economy? It argues for a new relationship with disabled people in which government spending also has a social dividend that helps them gain work; and government funded bodies such as Innovate UK and the Business Bank target a proportion of their funding at supporting disabled people. That funding could be used to help disabled people become self-employed where appropriate, start businesses, invent products or services that overcome their barriers to the labour market or even create new markets that benefit everyone.” At the launch event, Jonny Mercer MP commented: “under this Prime Minister I think we have a real chance of change. This is part of her agenda. She gets this problem, she is entirely driven by the evidence and the data on it and I think we have a real opportunity”, while Lord Colin Low added “this report is certainly a valuable contribution to halving the disability employment gap, and I am sure if either half the recommendations in the report are taken on board by the government it will make a real difference to achieving the target of halving the gap”.

Both Lisa Cameron’s office and Disability Rights UK are now seeking to ensure the report has the maximum possible impact on government policy. They are approaching all government departments to ask how they intend to respond to the reports’ recommendations, and are working with groups of MPs to seek ways in which its recommendations can be taken forward. Lisa Cameron raised the report in Prime Minister’s Questions in January, asking whether the Prime Minister will ensure that ministers engage with the APPG and its recommendations. The Prime Minister responded by saying that she is sure the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions will see the requests she has made in relation to the APPG. Further to this, Lisa Cameron, Philip Connolly and I had a meeting with the Secretary of State, Damian Green, in March, during which he emphasised the report’s potential contribution to the government’s disability green paper. If ministers can indeed be encouraged to act on the report’s recommendations, this will

lead to a shift in government policy from a focus on cutting disabled people’s benefits to improving the support they receive to gain and retain jobs. Should this provide disabled people with new and additional job prospects, this will make back-to-work support more effective, and also, where their health condition makes this appropriate, provide a real incentive for disabled people to move off benefits into work.

Further resources

APPG report:

www.disabilityrightsuk.org/sites/default/files/pdf/AheadoftheArc9Dec2016.pdf

Disability@work: website of Kim Hoque, Victoria Wass, Melanie Jones and Nick Bacon presenting research and debates on disability and work: www.disabilityatwork.co.uk

Hoque, K., Wass, V., Bacon, N. and Jones, M. ‘Are High Performance Work Practices (HPWPs) enabling or disabling? Exploring the relationship between selected HPWPs and work-related disability disadvantage’, *Human Resource Management* (forthcoming).

Bacon, N. and Hoque, K. (2015) ‘The influence of trade union disability champions on employer disability policy and practice’, *Human Resource Management Journal*, 25, 2, 233-249

Hoque, K., Bacon, N. and Parr, D. (2014) ‘Employer disability practice in Britain : assessing the impact of the positive about disabled people ‘two ticks’ symbol’, *Work, Employment & Society*, 28, 3, 430-451

IRRU research and the government U-turn on facility time

In the Spring 2016 IRRU Briefing, we had reported the research by Kim Hoque with Nick Bacon on ‘facility time’ for union representatives, which the government had proposed to limit with Clause 13 of the Trade Union Bill. That research (see Warwick Industrial Relations Paper nr 101), together with subsequent research Professors Hoque and Bacon conducted with the Royal College of Nursing, highlighted the hidden benefits of facility time and was repeatedly mentioned in both Houses as the Trade Union Bill went through Parliament, including by Lord John Monks and Jo Stephens MP. That empirical contribution to the debate made an impact. The House of Lords voted to remove the clause of the Bill, and the House of Commons reinstated it in a significantly watered down version in the final Trade Union Act of the 4th May 2016, with the government committing not to take any action on facility time for at least three years, until further evidence on costs and benefits is gathered.

About IRRU

IRRU embraces the research activities of the industrial relations community in Warwick University's Business School (WBS). There are currently 19 academic and research staff in membership, plus a number of associate fellows.

Our work combines long-term fundamental research and short-term commissioned projects. In both instances, we maintain the independence and integrity which have been the hallmark of IRRU since its establishment in 1970. We aim thereby to improve the quality of data and analysis available to industrial relations policy-making by government, employers and trade unions.

IRRU's advisory committee includes senior representatives of the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service, the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, the Confederation of British Industry, the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, and the Trades Union Congress.

IRRU's research projects are clustered around three main themes:

- Employment relations strategy;
- equality, diversity and social sustainability;
- multi-level governance in a global context

IRRU staff have produced a number of textbooks, including:

Trevor Colling and Michael Terry (eds) *Industrial Relations: Theory and Practice* (3rd edn), Wiley, 2010

IRRU also publishes its own series of research papers – *the Warwick Papers in Industrial Relations*. The most recent are:

No 103 Paul Marginson: Trade Unions and Multinational Companies: A multi-level challenge

No 104 John Cridland: Reflections on Employee Relations

No 105 Keith Sisson: Shaping the world of work – time for a UK jobs strategy

No 106 Paul Marginson: European Industrial Relations: An increasingly fractured landscape?

These are available on-line at:
www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/wbs/research/irru/wpir/

IRRU, together with the Institute for Employment Research, is the UK national centre for the network of EU-wide 'Observatories' operated by the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, EurWork, which is accessible on-line at:
<https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/default/observatories/eurwork>

In collaboration with CREW (Connecting Research on Employment and Work) IRRU is co-editing a series of *#WarwickBrexitee Briefings on Employment*, which will be published and presented at public events in Warwick and London in the Spring/Summer 2017.

IRRU staff

Academic and research staff

David Allen	Kim Hoque
Deborah Dean	Ian Kirkpatrick
Linda Dickens*	Achim Krausert
Jimmy Donaghey	Paul Marginson*
Claire Evans	Jude McNabb
Dulini Fernando	Guglielmo Meardi
Shainaz Firfiray	Juliane Reinecke
Manuela Galetto	Keith Sisson*
Stefano Gasparri	Michael Terry*
James Hayton	

* Emeritus Professor

Support staff

Val Jephcott
(IRRU Research Co-ordinator)

IRRU doctoral students

Duncan Adam	Mary Ann le Lean
Anne Antoni	Joyce Mamode
Rina Binte	Jessica Parrott
Muhammad Musta	Jieun Ryu
Martin Brock	Joey Soehardjo
Meryl Bushell	Arianna Tassinari
Martin James	Hendrik Tiesinga
Victoria Jelacic	Fuk Ying Tse
Ide Humantito	Yiluyi Zeng
Seon Hwang	

Associate Fellows

James Arrowsmith	Mark Hall
Jacques Bélanger	Richard Hyman
Mark Carley	Jane Parker
Paul Edwards	Valeria Pulignano
Tony Edwards	Helen Rainbird
Mark Gilman	Monder Ram

Further information

Information on our current research programme and projects, and on recent papers and publications, is available from IRRU's website: www2.warwick.ac.uk/go/irru/

Alternatively, please contact Val Jephcott, IRRU Research Coordinator, Warwick Business School, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL; email: irruoffice@wbs.ac.uk; phone: +44 (0)24 7652 4268

IRRU Briefing is designed by Morse-Brown Design morsebrowndesign.co.uk Printed on 50% recycled paper.