

NEW DIRECTIONS IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS RESEARCH?

Jennifer Sappey

Charles Sturt University, Bathurst

Richard Sappey

Charles Sturt University, Bathurst

John Burgess

Curtin University, Perth

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally employment (or industrial) relations, has been associated with the management of either collective or individual conflict in the workplace. In recent years, the focus has opened out to consider the benefits of high performance working on productivity, but also the wider social implications for individuals and their dependents. The workplace provides not only the money that we need to support ourselves and our families but it can also provide purpose, status, and friendship, allowing people to develop new skills, both technical and social. The ability of line managers to manage employment relations on a day-to-day basis and to get the best from their staff has implications for innovation, productivity, quality and reliability, and ultimately levels of growth at a national level and our ability to compete on the global stage. With so much invested in work by managers and employees individually, employment relations has never been so important. (Podro, 2011)

For most of the life of industrial relations (IR) as an academic discipline or field of study, the principal institutions have provided the foundation for the study of the discipline (Dunlop, 1958). They existed before the discipline was established and seem destined to continue even if it ceases. In recent years, changes in the international order have raised questions as to the role and efficacy of IR, particularly but not exclusively, to the systems that operationalise theory in institutional forms. In short, IR in all its forms: as a body of theory, practice, education, source of policy analysis and advice, and a cluster of occupations which have grown to constitute an industry in its own right, are being probed in some way, or critically examined, in terms of its right to exist (Edwards, 2005; Phelan, 2007; Foster, Murrie & Laird, 2009; Thelen, 2009; Piore, 2011; Dibben & Williams, 2012; Kaufman, 2011). Stimulus for

examining the efficacy of the institutional framework (Purcell, 1993) has tended to come from the decline in membership of unions in many developed economies (with some exceptions) and, to a lesser extent, the slow growth of membership in developing economies, particularly those with relatively high economic growth in the first decade of the twenty-first century (ILO Dialogue Data, Unions 2011: Trade Union Statistics Database). Of the group of established developed and major developing economies in GDP terms, the overall evidence of density rate decline continues. For the OECD between 1999 and 2011, this decline was from 20.8% to 17.5% (OECD StatExtracts 2013, Trade Union Density). In one particular case which is of interest, that of Australia, the evidence of trade union membership between 1990 and 2006 indicated that young workers were not joining unions. In fact, there was an absolute decline in union membership between the ages of 15 and 44, before the decline ceased at 45 years and over (ABS 2013 Cat.63100TS001).

Other factors conventionally associated with institutional IR (IIR), particularly industrial conflict (mainly strikes, lockouts and bans) and the process of collective bargaining at national, industry and workplace levels have also been in decline or threatened by government policy and managerial prerogative. Industrial conflict was the *raison d'être* for IR but while the causes may still exist, they are not perceived in such a way as to generate collective conflict. As with union membership, the evidence to date is variable but also suggestive of relatively low rates of strike activity (ILO Laborstat, 2013). However, there is some case study 'evidence of the persistence of the strike...' (van der Velden, et al 2007, p. 14). If there is a trend of longevity, it is at present the low levels of union membership and strike activity within the old world. Regardless of the debates as to the future of IIR, research and theorising have established a broader view of IR beyond the established institutional approach. This gives rise to questions as to how IIR and this broader view can be developed and modernised. In short, the history of IR has been dominated by its institutions because these have become the most prominent sources of theory building, analysis and practice, including practical solutions to problems such as forms of conflict and wider political change. As IR became 'segmented' in disciplinary terms and moved away from just linking single disciplines to theory and practice, particularly labour economics and industrial law, the more there was a search for methods of integrating the relevant disciplines, or making use of them to build theory in the forms of multidisciplinary building blocks. In addition, the application of political science, history and sociology appeared promising perspectives from which to explore the context of IR.

Within workplaces, this broader view encompasses the power of management, the ideas of labour process theory, the links between IR and life and the community beyond, and psychological contracts between employer and

employee. In the wider society there are symptoms of an intimidating context for IIR: the continuing power of international capital and attendant economic crises; the restructuring of the workforce and the decline of the stable ongoing job; political restructuring at regional levels; insecurity from networked terrorism and climate change; emphasis on the individual and the consumer; and, the general malaise in addressing problems within the gulf between markets and the regulation of them.

The history of IR thought has been mainly institutional and debated and differentiated perspectives — as opposed to one theoretical perspective. This has meant that the boundaries have been porous and impermanent. It is not the purpose of this paper to ‘pick a winner’ in the terms of the theoretical contests. However, the issues that have arisen and are discussed in this paper seek to further the discussion, and argue for a debate in order to explore further afield rather than debating a predetermined position of where to dig the new postholes.

The literature, both IR in general and that which may be reasonably related or tangential to it, is presently reflective of theoretical and empirical directions that are fragmenting IR. There is work on new occupations and their identities, forms of employment and near-employment, new types of work (eg knowledge work), new types of labour (eg emotional and aesthetic labour), forms of control and resistance, new actors, neo-pluralism, revitalised unionism and varieties of or variegated capitalism. The world beyond IIR is interesting in its own right and for its own sake, regardless of its attachment to other disciplines, but it is more interesting, revealing and useful when it is connected to IR. In short, the emergence and spread of forms of IR (organisations and processes) partially or largely outside the established institutional mainstream (unions, employer associations, courts, tribunals and government departments) could be addressed in a more strongly theoretical and empirical way. One significant shift that puts the institutional focus into perspective is that the UK Donovan Report (1968) identified two forms of IR: the formal and the informal. The informal could still be legitimately confined to IR because of characteristics such as union workplace delegates, wage drift, work groups and unofficial strikes, stoppages and bans. The framework remained institutional. By contrast, there is an informal form of IR at the present time but it is largely generated by management and lies largely outside the traditional institutional IR framework or has weakened its efficacy at workplace level. These internal systems of regulation can be seen through such processes as performance management, teams and bonus systems. To some extent, such change challenges or threatens to compromise the established institutions and the theoretical foundations of IR.

In addition to the question of moving beyond IR institutions without abandoning them, there has been an important move to address a wider view of the employment relationship which itself can be cast beyond institutions. Industrial relations has as parts of its foundations the common law contract of employment and managerial prerogative, conceptualised as individual in nature in the first instance. The challenges historically became collective, assisted by mass employment for standardised production; institutions enveloped in statute law became a necessary focus of attention in theory and practice. Where IR institutional arrangements are shifted onto a more individual basis (eg individual contracts under statute law), and work is organised to reflect the value placed on individual performance and differentiated rewards (eg work teams) it may be assumed that such shifts are back within the province of organisational and management theorising. However, such a conceptualisation would negate the value of theorising from a different and wider perspective to explore the changes over time. To construct theory which excludes collective or individual from within the fences of any prevailing orthodoxy is to limit the scope of theory. Prevailing orthodoxy should always be subjected to challenge.

What appears to be warranted is an exploration of current theory, research, pedagogy and practice with a view to a more extensive scrutiny of the implications for future IR. This is a reflective paper that poses some of the challenges without providing substantive answers. It is selective and not comprehensive in terms of the issues that are covered. The angst, reflection and the challenges over these issues can be found in Ackers (2011) in terms of theoretical underpinnings, Kaufman (2011) in terms of research challenges and Bailey (2013) in terms of teaching and practice. Theoretical development in IR has shifted towards a wider range of perspectives, which have been useful in both moving theoretical debate and identifying changes in the IR landscape. As important as this is, it would be useful, at least to some extent, to separate the search to improve IR theory and practice from attempts to discover the one perfect perspective. If history is any guide, for good practical reasons and the history of debate, more would appear to be gained from the imperfection of building than the discovery of something akin to Taylor's one best way.

Just as IR issues remain pertinent in public policy discussion on a daily basis it is relevant to explore the marginalisation of the discipline in many universities and ask whether this is linked to a substantive deficiency in the framework and methodology surrounding the discipline or does it say more about what is happening in universities?

THE IR CORE AND ITS SURROUNDING ELEMENTS

If the main indicators are, or at least approximate, an accurate picture of IIR, there continues to be a shift and probably a decline in the level and spread of activities and institutions linked to IR. These include a decline in: collective conflict (strikes, bans, lockouts); collective bargaining; the efficacy of government institutions as regulators of labour markets; union membership (as a percentage of employees); the demonstrated effectiveness in improving wages and conditions through collective bargaining; union access to and effectiveness of policy through attachment to political parties, particularly when in government (industrial regulation, industry policy and the social wage) (Waring et al, 2010). What we have witnessed is dissolution of traditional IR institutions and an inability of “Labour” governments to proceed with progressive agendas (Waring et al, 2010). Overall there is a gradual replacement of institutions by markets as the principal determinants of wages and working conditions. Industrial relations has tended to be viewed in theoretical terms as a set of options that are based on ‘perspectives’, particularly unitarism and pluralism (Fox, 1966). There has been a general expansion of these over the years to include radicalism, corporatism and strategic choice; however it is more like a set of phases of change where the dominance of ‘perspective’ shifts. At present, unitarism has resurfaced and pluralism declined. Institutions and processes within them have shifted, particularly Hyman’s (1978) procedural rules, and what is meant by interests — more individual than collective, career instead of job — not brought to an end but changed form. Also, there is more emphasis on employees moving on, rather than having to stay and put up a fight, because the expectation of remaining with the one employer for a long time is no longer the norm. The internal labour market in both the private and public sector is being dismantled through contracting out, contingent labour arrangements and offshoring (Marchington et al, 2005). Not only are more jobs part time, insecure or contingent, but they also tend to be of shorter duration, especially in Australia as compared to other countries (van Wanrooy et al, 2009). Staying put and developing a career path within the one organisation is no longer an option for the majority of employees (Mumford & Smith, 2003).

While there has been a search for an underlying theory of industrial relations (Dabscheck, 1995) the literature is diverse and draws on many different approaches and traditions (Kaufman, 2011). This reflects the changes to the practice and context of industrial relations (laws, politics, disputes, new technology and production processes, international trade and investment) and to the ability of industrial relations research and practice to draw upon other disciplines and incorporate new approaches and ideas such as corporate social responsibility and varieties of capitalism research (Kaufman, 2011). It has not

been possible to accommodate the diversity of theoretical development in IR but it seems reasonable to make use of this rich history to explore the extent to which and the forms of these perspectives, including the fundamental elements of pluralism, particularly in analysing IR institutions. But it has become a strength of IR over the years that it has not limited itself to one perspective over others, particularly when confronted by a pointless search for universality in time and space.

Industrial relations has become more technically orientated and narrower in its scope, thereby avoiding the theoretical debates of the past and the uncomfortable issues linked to income distribution, human rights and political voice (Kaufman, 2011). The context is less challenged with acceptance of the existing IR system with suggestions for policy towards minor amendment and incremental change. This is manifested by the growing emphasis on quantitative methods in many of the leading IR journals, with surveys and statistics dominating research (Ackers, 2011). As Ackers (2011) states this confines analysis towards incremental issues and acceptance of the status quo. What remains is a more general framework of IIR that provides minimum levels of wages and conditions as in the Fair Work Australia legislative framework, leaving anything above to be negotiated between employers and employees. Legislated IR systems continue to provide for bargaining mechanisms and enforcement of legislation around minimum conditions. However, the low levels of traditional IR activity such as strikes, which have become very proscribed and regulated, and the breadth of the framework do not allow for workplace, sub-workplace and job-specific protection from problems associated with managerial systems, job design and addressing changes when balancing work and non-work time. Such features of contemporary work were reasonably assumed in the past to be protected by union delegates who were the monitors and guardians of prevailing agreements and applied industrial legislation. Recent research in Australia casts doubt on the efficacy of government inspection systems. This places emphasis on approaches to rules: away from enforcement and penalties and towards educative approaches within agreements and legislation (Maconachie & Goodwin, 2010).

The most important debate is the extent to which and how unions respond to institutional decline and external change (Kelly, 1998; Peetz, 1998). This is because unionism in its broad political sense has been the most important institution within IR and the greatest stimulus to the evolution of other institutions and their principal roles, particularly state regulation and collective bargaining. Unionism is the cornerstone of the institutional centre of IIR and IR theory and is more likely than any of the other institutions to build bridges to IR beyond the institutional centre and to link IR with theory, policy and

community activities (especially around human rights issues). This is a question of IR practice but it will influence the direction of IR theory and any shift in the boundaries and definition of IR.

As an academic discipline in its own right, IR developed in Australia from the 1950s, as reflected in expanding training and university courses, research, scholarly and other publications and as a collection of occupations within government regulatory organisation and the judiciary, unions, employer organisations and individual workplaces. That it is in decline is evident but a continuation of this is not inevitable. This is because the core remains and does so because key questions continue: the distribution of income, working time, safety, effort, power, participation, rights, recruitment, turnover, status and convenience which continue to reveal problems of efficiency and fairness within workplaces, IR systems and wider political, economic and social contexts. These lead to conflict and bargaining, albeit in new and different forms within the employment relationship.

The discipline moved from an approach which emphasised the integration of established disciplines to a multi or interdisciplinary approach which would become a standalone discipline in its own right by utilising economics, law, politics, psychology and sociology. Initially, this was from fragmentation to integration, but this process has been reversed to one of re-fragmentation where the traditional concerns of workplace conflict, bargaining outcomes and bargaining processes have been incorporated into these disciplines or included as a branch of human resource management. Industrial relations is retreating to the established disciplines which are adopting more technical approaches through the use of quantitative methods and hypotheses testing, and here there is a strong intrusion by behavioural research from psychology (Ackers, 2011). This permits more operationalisation within the institutions but particularly in workplaces. This is particularly the case with law and psychology. Practice has replaced theory and theory is accepted only when it produces narrow reformulation of building bridges between theory and practice (Ackers, 2011).

Critical evaluation has been truncated as ideology and theory have been removed from the debate. Grand processes of engagement between social partners associated with incomes policy (the Australian Labor Party (ALP) Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) Accord 1983) and industry policy (ACTU/TDC's Australia Reconstructed 1977) are not compatible with a policy program that is market driven and unitarist based (Bramble, 2008). Increasingly, debate as to institutional systems narrows towards a trivialisation of issues that can be solved through quantification of research results and technical adjustments or behaviour modification (Ackers, 2011). New ideas are

similarly constructed. This allows for management-centred and controlled approaches (eg coaching, high performance work systems, teams and autonomous responsibility). Human resource management systems are similarly technical in orientation and are derived from broader managerial perspectives and decision-making (eg within strategic planning and business models) (Bailey, 2013). This is consistent with the economics approach of taking product markets as the starting point and labour market policy and development as deriving from them (eg the demand for labour is a demand derived from product) (Whitfield & Ross, 1998). In this way, human resource management (HRM) has to be geared to wider managerial models and IR is one component of managerial decision making and control.

In building a wider IR, changes taking place in the context and which have been absorbed into workplaces (eg Ackroyd et al, 2005) reflect the need to ask and pursue a series of questions about how IR is influenced. The key question is: how can current IR as a discipline become more relevant to these changes in terms of theory, policy and practice? In particular, what are the relationships between the changes and IR? How can the changes be included in IR in ways that strengthen it as a discipline? As a starting point only, the following list of changes, which we call surrounding elements, include: work, management and HRM, new actors, psychological contracts and identity. It is possible to identify surrounding elements of IR beyond the core. These are not, of course new and have been the subject of analysis in the past but neither have they been demonstrated to be critical to IR, primarily because they have tended to have been viewed as peripheral to the institutional core. The list is not exclusive but merely used here to indicate some current directions in the IR and related literature, and which also suggest the potential of IR to contribute to other disciplines from which it has become peripheral (Bailey, 2013).

IR has not been able to define itself throughout its history. Far from being a deficiency, the diversity has permitted openness to new ideas, theoretical approaches and the invention and construction of useful concepts. While it would be helpful to establish more precision on all fronts, not only is this unlikely given the history of IR, it is likely to be counterproductive to any future approaches because it would confine thinking. We are suggesting here that the problem with saving IR is the last 50 years of IR thinking. More than identifying what seem to have become useful areas for exploration, we are aware that there may be others, and that these may well change, expand, fade away. The point made is one of a need for contemporary exploration rather than staking out new ground that will remain relevant forever. It won't.

Understandably IR has often addressed IR as a set of problems. However, while there are new problems that arise involving injustice, unfairness and

exploitation, as they manifest themselves in ways that are imposed on working people, the point in this paper is that a wider theoretical view should aim to explore the changing nature of IR and all its relevant wider workplace and societal contexts as phenomena in the widest sense.

EMPLOYMENT, WORKPLACES, EMPLOYERS AND WORKERS

The spread of labour process theory (LPT) in particular has tended to stand beside IR, occasionally experimenting with cooperation and merger, but often not wishing to get too involved. Despite the inclusion of sociology (industrial and more general) in the development of IR theory since Dunlop (1958), the rapid and extensive expansion of sociology as it relates to work constitutes one of the main sources of influence on IR. The LPT literature itself and derivatives of it have cast light on new or largely under-researched types of labour (eg emotional), work (eg knowledge) and occupations (eg call centres). At the core of labour process are traditional IR issues: control, appropriation, ownership, identity and conflict (Braverman, 1974).

A number of challenges and new areas of inquiry are emerging. First, work at or near the point of production, in particular how it is designed, controlled, resisted and changed, is important to working people and their employers on a day-to-day basis. Much of each working day for most of us is taken up with what we have to do and how we have to do it; what we can and can't do and change; how we are supported and 'treated' by others including managers, workers doing the same, similar and different work, suppliers and customers. All this goes on within an IR framework that is largely dominated by institutions and the decisions coming from them. In other words, this is the institutional context for work and sets the scene for influencing it, particularly the 'when', the 'where', the rewards for working, how safe it is and what benefits and costs we bear when work ends. But the two are different: the work itself and the IR context for it. To connect the IR centre to this world of work on the edge is a test which undertaken, even if it fails, will change IR. Earlier work by Behrend (1957) and Baldamus (1961) on the wage-effort bargain, a relationship with potential to explore the relationship between the employment relationship and the organisation of work, could usefully be rekindled.

As to the second theoretical question, it could reasonably be argued that the act of work derives from and influences IR decisions either by the institutions or by management. In other words, institutional IR has tended to enshrine managerial prerogative rather than significantly dilute it when it is used to decide where, when and how work is to be conducted, and by whom. Thus, how work is constructed, particularly controlled, is sanctioned by the

legitimacy entrenched in IR systems. It is possible for control of workplace aspects of managerial prerogative and conditions of employment derived from bargaining to be changed. Change may come from institutional activity or workplace activity, importantly including resistance to control (Frenkel et al, 1995). Theoretically, these are different conceptually and different in terms of how change occurs (or doesn't) but the line between them is a fine one in both theory and practice and the connections and 'blurriness' would seem to be in need of further exploration.

Third, recent empirical work reflects a change in the economic and social context in which IR has operated. Disparate though the contextual forms may be, they include changing attitudes to work and authority by young generations of workers, the takeover of the notion of job by the notion of career, the extension of mobility and diversity of occupations and employment within labour markets, the notions of work and occupational identity, the more general adoption of individualism as the prime source of identity (Giddens, 1991), the replacement of production by consumption as a source of social differentiation (Burrows & Marsh, 1992) and the segmentation of societies in lateral, overlapping hierarchical terms. It is a matter of debate to what extent and in what forms such changes infiltrate IR but together such changes would seem to be at odds with the usual assumptions of IR. In particular, the framework of institutional IR systems houses pluralist, and to a lesser extent unitarist elements which assume a continuity, efficiency, equity, efficacy, rule orientation, authority and collectivism which is being ignored or damned with faint praise (Ackers, 2011). The world of work has changed at a pace with which IR has found it difficult to match.

Fourth, the identity and relationships are being challenged. Ambiguous and new employment arrangements (eg contracting, agency work) (Rubery et al, 2010); multiple employer arrangements; the cloaking of employers (eg sub-contracting) (Marchington et al, 2005), the ambiguity of the workplace (eg. telework); the emergence of new skills and training requirements (Felstead & Dowling, 2011) and the relationship between workplace and community (eg fly in fly out work) question the very foundations on which IIR was developed (Rubery, et al, 2003). This is also being supported by technological change where ITC has created new forms of work; has removed workers from the workplace, supported new service delivery and new service work, and introduced ambiguity into the employment relationship (Castells, 2000). These developments create challenges around the identity of the employer and the workplace, and also raises challenges for trade union recruitment and membership, as well as the activating collective action (Heery, 2010).

Finally, the full time male breadwinner model of work and social welfare has been supplanted by the growing feminisation and diversity of the workforce; the continued growth in contingent employment arrangements; the expansion in working time and the growth in dual income earning families (ACIRRT, 1999; Pocock, 2003). In turn the relationship between work, family and community has become a key focal point, especially given associated demographic shifts in workforce participation patterns by age, gender and family status (Pocock, 2003).

While the above changes are important and do impact on industrial relations systems, it is also important to have an historical perspective of the ongoing changes to employment and production systems. Underlying issues over the labour process and systems of control and regulation persist, however as Quinlan (2012) reminds us many of the changes that are observed around the security and precariousness of many employment arrangements are not new and have been always been a challenge to employment regulatory systems.

MANAGEMENT AND HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (HRM)

Management has always been a necessary actor in IR, either because of its strategic role in bargaining (Thurley & Wood, 1983) or setting the agenda in the workplace (Winkler, 1974). This role was elevated through the application of strategic choice in IR by Kochan, et al (1986). However, the role was largely played within the paradigm of the other IR actors, including when employers operated through their institutionalised employer organisations. There is overall compliance by managers as the agents of employing organisations, voluntary and involuntary, with legislated regulatory IR frameworks but the intrusion of those frameworks into strategic, operational and cultural decision-making is not significantly inhibiting. The fluidity of asset ownership that makes company (and some public sector) ownership more transient and dispersed through share-trading and organisational identity ambiguity through takeover and merger activity, means that employees (including managers) and unions cannot always be sure who the enemy is. Research has raised the prospect of developing the management factor and IR more generally in different contexts (eg Rubery, et al 2003) and in relation to corporate governance (Goergen, et al 2009).

Provis' (1996) argument that there is a shift from pluralism with its emphasis on interests to unitarism with its emphasis on values pointed to a theoretical problem for IR. Pluralist assumptions, particularly procedural rules, were white-anted in the name of an extended focus on culture as strategy. This appeared to open the door to an expanded role for HRM (Lundy & Cowling, 1996) and an extension of the strategic choice argument of Kochan et al (1986)

that reactive management had been replaced by proactive deliberate strategy to consolidate moves towards an unfettered basis for IR and production decisions. While management focus had shifted from group to individual (in a job design and satisfaction sense) to whole-of-organisation culture, the use of strategy was compatible with a culture emphasis but also made the assumption that unitarism was becoming the underlying IR perspective. However, at least to some degree, this relied upon managers choosing Legge's (1995) 'soft' HRM over 'hard' HRM. To the extent that more participative managerial styles came to spread this perspective through workplace supervision and near-point of production HRM systems such as training, it could not cater for increased market competition which placed strain on costs, particularly in times of economic recession. In addition, and interestingly in line with a more technical approach to IR, some scholars have noted a similar trend in Australian HRM with implications for IR. Kramar (2012, p. 133) notes research that identifies '...strong trends of HRM policies becoming more calculative and individual, a reduction in the role of collective organisations ...'. Over time, the market imperative was extended from production to market share through quality (of goods and services), sometimes as a point of product differentiation with competitors. The consequence was a shift to performance, cascading from business objectives (eg return on investment, market share, productivity growth) to business units and workers. HRM systems and techniques were developed and applied which would measure team and /or individual manager and worker performance. In part, these were used to align with rewards and work systems. The implication of Harley et al's (2007) study of high performance work systems in an aged care industry being applicable to high and low skill levels was that performance measurement could increase output, quality and job satisfaction through performance. More generally, alignment of organisational and individual objectives was developed, rewarded through remuneration packages and buttressed by status rewards (eg awards for performance) and monetary bonuses and prizes (eg movie tickets, shopping vouchers and holidays) which differentiated organisational IR systems from those emanating from the IR system. This extended to games, fun, and developing organisations with a family oriented culture so that the workplace becomes a happy family group (Kinnie et al, 2000).

Managers in such an environment appear to be less constrained by IR systems and yet more managed themselves by higher order systems (eg budgetary). They are more removed from IR in general where this is located in strategic managerial arenas. Their importance lies in the shift from initiating, interpreting and enforcing IR policy to operationalising HRM policies and systems, particularly where these have to contribute to the performance of work systems. The IR role of managers is increasingly narrow and specialised but it is crucial in terms of managing the organisation of work. Moreover, there

has been a shift towards a particular disciplinary view of IR by HRM (Boxall & Dowling, 1990). It is reasonable for this to be reversed, such that an IR view of HRM and its counterpoint in terms of focus and the labour process is expanded. That is to say that it is legitimate to approach HRM from an IR perspective in which a multiplicity of disciplines may be adopted. The key here is the use of critical analysis (Clarke, et al 2011) in more robust forms that may open the way for non-unitarist and non-institutional theoretical and practical questions.

NEW ACTORS AND VOICE

Following Bellemare's (2000) identification of one source of new actors and his construction of a framework for identifying others, there has been a growing interest in different types of new actors (eg Michelson et al, 2008). Legault and Bellemare (2008) argue two important points in relation to further conceptualisation of new actors. First, the context is important for their role in IR and this may be direct or indirect. Second, new actors reinforce the notion that IR is dynamic which implies that established structures and processes, particularly those housed in existing institutions, can no longer be assumed.

In part, new actors fill the gap that emerges in the context of falling trade union densities and the shift towards individual bargaining (Podro, 2012). These new actors can range from NGOs that are linked to supporting employee rights in global supply chains through to local community and regulatory organisations that support the rights of women workers, young workers, the elderly and migrants. The range of actors can include the Human Rights Commission, the Women's Electoral Lobby and Amnesty International (Michelson, 2008).

The work on new actors to date is clear that they are different from, but have similarities with, the established IR institutions because of their intrinsic characteristics (eg customers, paid agents, community organisations). They are on the edge of IR in both theory and practice at present but their roles may well expand and diversify if IIR is perceived to be less relevant and unable to be identified with people who are presently on the edge of IR systems themselves. A number of key questions remain to be addressed. First, to what extent and how can new actors perform a representative function in relation to workers, particularly a continuous function as part of an IR system? Second, to what extent do they act as substitutes for existing actors, particularly unions and those agencies of the state that perform advice and protection roles (eg for small business and monitoring and prosecuting organisations which have breached legislation)? Third, what does the emergence of identified new actors do to the boundaries of IR and the disciplinary nature of IR itself?

In the future, new actors may play a more extensive role in IR where existing actors, particularly unions, lose membership and bargaining and/or regulatory power. There are forms of legislative voice developing around such issues as occupational health and safety (OH&S) and equality of employment opportunity (EEO) that require employee representation and participation (Strachan et al, 2010). At the workplace level it is also apparent that while formal voice and communication mechanisms are present, the role of indirect mechanisms through trade unions has diminished. However, while HRM departments promote direct and formal mechanisms of communication, it is apparent that informal mechanisms are widespread and play an important role in both communication and voice (Townsend et al, 2011). In addition, extended forms of governance and recognition of a wider stakeholder interest in economic activities have opened discourses around corporate social responsibility (CSR) (Gospel & Pendleton, 2005; Waring, et al 2008).

It is clear that the decline in union density rates in the Anglo Saxon economies does not mean the end of industrial conflict, workplace disputation, or the underlying sources generating conflict. To the extent that this situation persists, a power vacuum will widen and be filled. Where external labour markets are less influenced by institutional processes and internal labour markets are eroded, it is more likely that market factors will influence wage levels, conditions, the labour process and employment outcomes. However, new forms of voice and participation are emerging, as are new actors that provide advocacy, surveillance and enforcement roles at the workplace.

IR AND THE HUMAN CONDITION

The rise of globalisation as a focal point for economic and sociological debate and analysis points to another problem for IR. Beyond problems of conflict and inequality that IR was designed to address was an underpinning of the use of western politics and political institutions to address problems of injustice, poverty and degradation within developing countries, particularly where autocratic, incompetent and corrupt regimes exploited their own populations for the continuous entrenchment of power and the rewards that flowed from it. This was, and remains, a difficult expansion, in large part because it necessitated international IR institutions, particularly international unions and a strong role for bodies such as, and particularly, the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The connections to the wider world outside nation state borders and national IR institutions reflected a perspective more representative than one's own narrow interests and a moral humanitarian foundation. National unions and employer associations could and did become incorporated under the umbrella of the NGO patchwork. Government aid, bilateral and through international institutions, particularly the ILO, was

directed at more effective functioning of IR institutional processes such as inspection systems to address unjust and inhumane problems such as child labour, migrant workers, working conditions which lead to terminal illness and the human costs when working time and non-working time lack sufficient balance for social cohesion. Increasingly labour is mobile, not fixed, production is integrated and global, not local, and as such this challenges local labour conditions and standards, and the reach of labour institutions and regulation (Dicken, 2000).

While IR has become a collection of mainstream disciplines, the various attempts to integrate these in some form to create a new discipline in its own right have always struggled to make theoretical distinctions between it and other disciplines. That said, a key to understanding IR has always been its potential to influence these disciplines, in theory and practice to use IR as a stimulus for economic and social change primarily through political change. The battle over ideas continues to have the potential to move from the journal article to the political meeting and the streets. The political and street protests across Europe against the established order and ideas in 2012 and 2013 demonstrate that core issues around rights, representation and participation remain relevant.

The wider, albeit competing political goals of IR having a role in political change, economic development and social justice have been gradually established. In turn this is being legitimised and supported by social reporting codes and corporate social responsibility (Anonymous, 2012a). This is now also in decline and the link to anything beyond representing individual career as a belief system has weakened the role of IR. IR is now increasingly a collection of prescriptive technical functions within concentric circles of strategic market operations spreading from work team to national economic policy.

BUSINESS DEGREES, BUSINESS SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC POLICY

Finally, IR is increasingly marginalised in universities. It is clear that dealing with such issues as conflict, collectivism, distribution and equity sit uncomfortably with individualism, managerialism and efficiency. The US business school model emphasises managerial and unitarist views of the organisation, more critical, pluralist and views that engage with institutions are generally dismissed. As Janice Bailey (2013) stated:

... hegemonic paradigms in business schools may tend to foreground neoliberal imperatives and minimise the human factor which ... is not only morally bankrupt but also fails to prepare students adequately for professional jobs in IR/HR.

In turn the push for accreditation of programs tends to be dominated by US business school models, even though these models have been heavily criticised as being irrelevant and removed from reality (Mintzberg, 2004). There is also the pressure from Australian business schools that see Australian institutions, laws and policy as not being suitable for “international” business programs. In this context IR becomes marginalised to an optional subject or is subsumed into International HRM programs. The disconnection between these views and the almost daily discussion of IR as a national priority for “reform” in the media is astounding. However, there does remain a strong push for business programs to encompass sustainability, CSR, workplace diversity and business ethics (Anonymous, 2012b); surely there is an opportunity for IR to embrace these issues?

The HRM programs are individual based, linked to organisational goals, are largely de-contextualised and management centred (Bailey, 2013). Industrial relations can be subsumed into HRM as an appendix of special issues such as bargaining, occupational health and safety, and managing diversity. While HR is represented as being strategic, the link between strategic HRM practices and organisational performance is far from proven while the positioning of HRM in organisations is also far from strategic with HR directors not being included on strategy committees and many of the HR functions being outsourced (Rasmussen et al, 2009).

Industrial relations jobs are no longer as plentiful as they were before the 1990s (eg the occupation of ‘industrial officer’ for a company), so the decline in qualifications and training and university education involving significant study in IR has followed. There would also appear to be a segmentation of IR occupations with more opportunities for lawyers, OH&S specialists, management consultants, employment services specialists (including those managing apprenticeship schemes), sociology-based researchers and labour economists within government and ‘think tanks’. There may still be a useful role for general IR prior to becoming employed in these fields but the technical specialisation has become more important in labour markets than the generalist IR degree. This has implications for IR teaching, in particular an increased demand for more technical subjects in courses that have flow-on effects for the types of teaching, content and staff employed. However, as Bailey (2013) argues there are a range of issues and practices that can be used to generate student interest and enthusiasm, and IR has the advantage of being a discipline where the issues, theories and debates are lived out on a daily basis in the media and in various industrial tribunals. Pick up a newspaper or visit a news link, and relevance and application is there for all to see as is the participation by IR academics in the major debates around work, workplaces and employment conditions. The WorkChoices system saw

legislation being used to marginalise unions, erode employment conditions and strengthen managerial prerogatives; IR academics were active in their evaluations of the rationale, impact and consequences of the system (Peetz, 2006; Teicher et al, 2006). The subsequent 2007 federal election saw IR at the centre stage of the policy debate and a critical factor in the election of a Labor government (Bramble, 2008). The IR academic cohort have been active participants in public policy issues linked to industrial relations legislation (David Peetz), parental leave (Marion Baird), casual employment (Iain Campbell), training and skill development (John Buchanan), productivity (Keith Hancock, Roy Green), work and family (Barbara Pocock, Sarah Charlesworth) and occupational health and safety (Michael Quinlan). There is a clear link between theory, practice and public policy debate and development. How many academics in business schools are active in public policy development and evaluation?

CONCLUSION

There is a sound basis for reconsidering IR. First, as Budd and Bhavé (2008) have identified in developing a new perspective, the world has shifted away from the collective and towards the individual. Second, the most fundamental of questions is now being asked: on what basis does IR, and should IR, have a future (Clarke, et al 2011)? There has been a long tradition within IR education that there is a set of perspectives which have built into a theoretical framework. In other words, there were options: pluralist, radical, unitarist. However, these may also now be viewed as dominant phases in the changing history of IR, albeit that they overlap with varying degrees of power within IR systems. While it may be argued that institutional IR and pluralism have declined, they have not disappeared. To predict the rise and fall of anything in IR is dangerous, as the history of the waves of industrial conflict and attempts to explain them bear testimony. What is clear is that the pattern and focal point of interest of IR is presently shifting away from the older industrialised nation states on Europe, North America and English-speaking parts of the world. While the powerful and emerging nation states of Asia, South America and Africa tend to display signs of developing IR (eg perceptions of conflict as reflected in strikes and demonstrations, industrial legislation based on ILO Conventions, union membership growth) the pattern of IR which is emerging is open for the development of explanation. Clearly, IR has been significantly founded and influenced by northern hemisphere history. The emergence of southern hemisphere nation states in the post-1945 expanding world economy has thrown up questions of differing approaches to IR. Comparative IR approaches reveal a wider diversity than previously considered. It is early days but research that further reveals the basis of similarity and difference is undoubtedly a reason for considering a new positioning of the fences.

There is now sufficient evidence and theorising to alert IR to the dangers inherent in changes taking place on the edge of, and beyond its current boundaries, particularly on the roles of its institutions and the theoretical platform which has served IR so well in the past. It is reasonable to conclude that unless the edge becomes moribund or the centre itself changes, IR as a field of study will continue to shrink to a point of marginal relevance, not only to the theoretical and conceptual capacity within social science but in terms of policy and practice. The institutional decline may not significantly affect the academic IR sphere in terms of research and publication but the decline of job opportunities for specialist IR practitioners and the associated implication for IR courses and student numbers will ultimately find its way into pushing all aspects of IR to the point where it simply gets old, with all the costs and few of the benefits which that entails. In his review of the future of IR, Paul Edwards (2003) suggested that its strength was its theoretical resilience and grand theorising. However, he saw the challenges as the shift away from theory towards empirical (quantitative) analysis to attract grants and the engagement with HRM for purposes of attracting students and funding, again at the cost of theoretical insight.

Alternatively, there is an optimistic scenario that involves extending the boundaries of IR research, incorporating different contexts and institutions, addressing different issues (eg CSR, social reporting) and considering different career domains for IR graduates. The strength of IR, regardless of the perspectives within it, remains its emphasis on critical evaluation, connections to wider contexts, the emphasis on different forms of interests, differences (particularly ingrained in stratification, institutions and cultures) and the preparedness of IR teachers and researchers to pursue public policy and application in all its shapes and sizes. The title of this paper comes with a question mark. It continues to be the case that IR is a haven for contested perspectives but what is unclear is that it can or should move the fences of its past and present domain. Presumably both the 'can' and the 'should' will become the source of further exploration and debate.

REFERENCES

- Ackers, P. (2011) 'Finding the future in the past: the social philosophy of Oxford industrial relations pluralism' in K. Townsend and A. Wilkinson (eds) *Research Handbook on the Future of Work and Industrial Relations*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 45-68.
- Ackroyd, S., Batt, R., Thompson, P. & Tolbert, P. S. (eds) (2005) *The Oxford Handbook of Work and Organisation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- ACTU/TDC Mission to Western Europe (1977) *Australia Reconstructed*, Australian Government Printing Service, Canberra.

- Anonymous (2012a) New Report Highlights Challenges for Business Schools World Wide, *Chronicles of Higher Education*, September 9.
- Anonymous (2012b), Business Ethics: Split the Myth from the Hard Reality', *Business Report*, September 10.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) (2013), 631000TS001, *Employee Earnings, Benefits and Trade Union Membership, Australia – Trade Union Membership 1990-2012*, www.ausstats.abs.gov.au [accessed 12 August 2013].
- Australian Centre for Industrial Relations Research and Teaching (1999) *Australia at Work: Just Working?* Prentice Hall, Sydney.
- Australian Labor Party (ALP)/Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) (1983) *Statement of Accord by the Australian Labor Party and the Australian Council of Trade Unions regarding Economic Policy*.
- Bailey, J. (2013) 'Maybe Because I'm Green: Transition Pedagogies for IR and HR Students'. *AIRAANZ Presidential Address*, Perth, February.
- Baldamus, W. (1961) *Efficiency and Effort: An Analysis of Industrial Administration*. Tavistock, London.
- Behrend, H. (1957) 'The effort bargain', *Industrial & Labour Relations Review*, 10(4), pp. 503-15.
- Bellemare, G. (2000) 'End users: actors in the industrial relations system?', *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 38(1), pp. 383-405.
- Black, B. (2005) 'Comparative industrial relations theory: the role of national culture', *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 16(7), pp. 1137-58.
- Boxall, P. & Dowling, P. (1990) 'Human resource management and the industrial relations tradition', *Labour and Industry* 3(2&3), pp. 195-214.
- Braverman, H. (1974) 'Labour and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century', *Monthly Review Press*, New York
- Bramble, T. (2008) *Trade Unionism in Australia: A History from Flood to Ebb Tide*. Cambridge University Press, Melbourne.
- Budd, J. W. & Bhavé, D. (2008) 'Values, ideologies, and frames of reference in industrial relations', in P. Blyton, E. Heery, N. Bacon and J. Fiorito (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Industrial Relations*, Sage Publications, London.
- Burrows, R. & Marsh, C. (eds) (1992) 'Consumption and Class: Divisions and Change', *Explorations in Sociology*, 40, British Sociological Association, Macmillan, London.
- Castells, M. (2000) 'The Global Economy' in D. Held and A. McGrew (eds) *The Global Transformation Reader*, Polity Press, Cambridge, pp. 259-273.
- Clarke, L., Moore, S., Donnelly, E., Hyman, R., Kelly, J. & McKay, S. (2011) 'What's the point of industrial relations?' *The International Journal of Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations*, 27(3), pp. 239-53.
- Dabscheck, B. (1995) *The Struggle for Australian Industrial Relations*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne.

- Dibben, P. & Williams, C. C. (2012) 'Varieties of capitalism and employment relations: informally dominated market economies', *Industrial Relations* 51(S1), pp. 563-582.
- Dicken, P. (2000) 'A New Geo Global Political Economy' in D. Held and A. McGrew (eds) *The Global Transformation Reader*, Polity Press, Cambridge, pp. 251-258.
- Donovan, The Right Hon. Lord, (1968) *Royal Commission on Trade Unions and Employers' Associations 1965-1968*, HMSO, London,
- Dunlop, J. T. (1958) *Industrial Relations Systems*, Henry Holt, New York.
- Edwards, P. (2003), 'The Future of Industrial Relations. In Ackers P. and Wilkinson, A. eds. *Understanding Work and Employment*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 337-358.
- Felstead, A. & Dowling, M. (2011) 'Skills in the twenty first century organization: the career of a nation' in K. Townsend and A. Wilkinson (eds) *Research Handbook on the Future of Work and Industrial Relations*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp.169-187.
- Foster, B., Murrie, J. & Laird, I. (2009) 'It takes two to tango: evidence of a decline in institutional industrial relations in New Zealand', *Employee Relations*, 31(5), pp. 503-514.
- Fox, A. (1966) *Industrial Sociology and Industrial Relations*, HMSO, London.
- Frenkel, S, Korczynski, M., Donoghue, L. & Shire, K. (1995) 'Re-constituting work: trends towards knowledge work and info-normative control', *Work, Employment and Society* 9(4), pp. 773-96.
- Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Givan, R. K. (2007) 'Side by side we battle onward? Representing workers in contemporary America', *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 45(4), pp. 829-55.
- Goergen, M., Brewster, C. & Wood, G. (2009) 'Corporate governance regimes and employment relations in Europe', *Relations Industrielles/Industrial Relations* 64(4), pp. 620-40.
- Gospel, H. & Pendleton, A. (2005) *Corporate Governance and Labour Management: An International Comparison*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Green, F. (2006) *Demanding Work: The Paradox of Job Quality in the Affluent Economy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Hall, P. A. & Soskice, D. (2001) 'An introduction to varieties of capitalism' in P. A. Hall and D. Soskice (eds), *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 1-68.
- Hall, P. A. & Thelen, K. (2009) 'Institutional change in varieties of capitalism', *Socio-Economic Review* 7(1), pp. 7-34.

- Harley, B., Allen, B. C. & Sargent, L. D. (2007) 'High performance work systems and employee experience of work in the service sector: the case of aged care', *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 45(3), pp. 607-33.
- Hartel, C. E. J. & Fujimoto, Y. (2010), *Human Resource Management* 2nd ed., Pearson, Frenchs Forest, Sydney.
- Heery, E. (2010) 'Worker Representation in a Multiform System: A Framework for Evaluation'. *Journal of Industrial Relations*. 52(6), pp. 543-559.
- Hyman, R. (1978) 'Pluralism, procedural consensus and collective bargaining', *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 16(1), pp. 16-40.
- International Labour Organisation (ILO), ILO Dialogue Data, Unions 2011: Trade Unions Statistic Database, available at <http://www.ilo.org/ifpdial/information-resources/dialogue>. [accessed 4 June 2013].
- International Labour Organisation (ILO), ILO laborstat, available at <http://www.laborsta.ilo.org/applv8/data/c9e.html>. [accessed 4 June 2013].
- Kaufman, B. E. (2012) 'History of industrial relations field reconsidered: getting from the Webbs to the new employment relations paradigm', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8543.2012.00907.x.
- Kelly, J. (1998) *Rethinking Industrial Relations: Mobilization, Collectivism and Long Waves*, Routledge, London.
- Kinnie, N., Hutchinson, S. & Purcell, J. (2000) 'Fun and surveillance: The paradox of high commitment management in call centres', *International Journal of Human Resources Management* 11(5), pp. 967-985.
- Kochan, T., Katz, H. & McKersie, R. (1986) *The Transformation of American Industrial Relations*, Basic Books, New York.
- Kramar, R. (2012) 'Trends in Australian human resource management: what next?' *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources* 50, pp. 133-150.
- Legault, Marie-Josée & Bellemare, Guy (2008) 'Theoretical issues with new actors and emergent modes of labour regulation', *Relations Industrielles/Industrial Relations* 63(4), pp. 742-768.
- Legge, K. (1995) *Human Resource Management – Rhetorics and Realities*, Macmillan, Houndmills, Basingstoke.
- Lundy, O. & Cowling, A. (eds) (1996) *Strategic Human Resource Management*, International Thomson Business Press, London.
- Maconachie, G. & Goodwin, M. (2010) 'Employer evasion of workers' entitlements 1986-1995: why, what and whose?' *Journal of Industrial Relations* 52(4), pp. 419-438.
- Marchington, M., Grimshaw, Rubery, J. & Willmott, H. (2005), *Fragmenting Work: Blurring Organizational Boundaries and Disordering Hierarchies*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Michelson, G., Jamieson, S. & Burgess, J. (eds) (2008) *New Employment Actors: Developments from Australia*, Peter Lang, Bern.

- Mintzberg, H. (2004) *Managers Not MBAs: A Hard Look at the Soft Practice of Managing and Management Development*, Berrett-Hoehler Publishers, San Francisco.
- Mumford, K. & Smith, P. (2003) 'Determinants of current job tenure: A cross country comparison', *Australian Journal of Labour Economics*, 6(3), pp. 435-451.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), StatExtracts, Trade Union Density, available at http://stats.oecd.org/index.aspx?DataSetCode=UN_DEN [accessed 4 June 2013].
- Peetz, D. (1998) *Unions in a Contrary World: The Future of the Australian Trade Union Movement*, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne.
- Peetz, D. (2006) *Brave New Workplace: How Individual Contracts are Changing our Jobs*. Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
- Phelan, P. (ed) (2007) *Trade Union Revitalisation: Trends and Prospects in 34 Countries*. Peter Lang, Bern.
- Piore, M. J. (2011) 'Whither industrial relations: does it have a future in post-industrial society?' *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 49(4), pp. 792-801.
- Pocock, B. (2003) *The Work/Life Collision*, The Federation Press, Annandale.
- Podro, S. (2011), 'The future of workplace relations – An Acas view'. *ACAS Discussion Paper*, London, January.
- Provis, C. (1996) 'Unitarism, pluralism, interests and values', *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 34(4), pp. 473-95.
- Purcell, J. (1993) 'Ideology and the end of institutional industrial relations: Evidence from the UK', *Labour and Industry* 5(3), pp. 57-74.
- Quinlan, M. (2012) 'The pre invention of precarious employment: the changing world of work in context'. *Economic and Labour Relations Review*, 23(4) pp. 3-24.
- Rasmussen, E. Andersen, T. & Haworth, N. (2009) 'Has the status seeking quest of Human Resources Management been fulfilled?' *Conference of the Association of Industrial Relations Academics in Australia and New Zealand*, The University of Newcastle, 4th - 6th February.
- Rubery, J., Lee, F., Earnshaw, J. & Marchington, M. (2003) 'Inter-organizational relations and employment in a multi-employer environment', *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 41(2), pp. 265-89.
- Rubery, J., Grimshaw, D. & Marchington, M. (2010) 'Blurring Boundaries and Disordering Hierarchies: Challenges for employment and skills in networking organizations', *Praxis*, No 2, June 2010, UKCES.
- Strachan, G., French, E. & Burgess, J. (2010), 'Equity and Diversity within Organisations'. In Strachan, G, French, E. and Burgess, J. *Managing Diversity in Australia*. McGraw Hill, Sydney, 57-74.
- Teicher, J., Lambert, R. & O'Rourke, A. (2006), *Work Choices: The New Industrial Relations Agenda*, Pearson Education, Sydney.

- Thelen, K. (2009) 'Institutional change in advanced political economies', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 47(3), pp. 471-98.
- Thompson, P. (2011) 'The Trouble with HRM', *Human Resource Management Journal* 21(4), pp. 355-367.
- Townsend, K. & Wilkinson, A. (2011) (eds) *Research Handbook on the Future of Work and Industrial Relations*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham,
- Thurley, K. & Wood, S. (eds) (1983) *Industrial Relations and Management Strategy*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Waring, P., Lewer, J. & Burgess, J. (2008) 'The Corporate Social Responsibility Movement: A New Actor in Employment Relations?' In G. Michelson, S. Jamieson and J. Burgess (eds), *New Employment Actors: Developments from Australia*, Peter Lang, Bern, pp. 195-222.
- Waring, P., Lewer, J. & Burgess, J. (2010) 'Rompre avec les politiques neoliberales dans le domaine des relations industrielles. Le experience de la Grande Bretagne, de l'Australie et de la Nouvelle Zelande'. *Travail et Emploi*, 124, pp. 9-19.
- Van der Valden, S., Dribbusch, H., Lyddon, D. & Vandaele, K. (eds) (2007) *Strikes Around the World 1968-2005*, Aksant, Amsterdam.
- Van Wanrooy, B., Wright, S., Buchanan, J., Baldwin, S. & Wilson, S. (2009) *Australia at Work in a Changing World*, Workplace Research Centre. Sydney.
- Whitfield, K. & Ross, R. (1998) *The Australian Labour Market*. 2nd edition. Harper, Sydney.
- Winkler, J. (1974) 'The ghost at the bargaining table: directors and industrial relations', *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 12(2), pp. 191-212.