

# Richard Hyman: Marxism, Trade Unionism and Comparative Employment Relations

*Carola Frege, John Kelly and Patrick McGovern*

## Abstract

*Richard Hyman has been a hugely influential figure in the field of industrial relations for the best part of four decades. At a time when the future of the very subject has been questioned, we highlight three areas of Hyman's work that we believe provide fertile territory for future research. The first concerns the importance of theory and the continuing need to broaden the subject of industrial relations so that it is treated as an area in which we can examine wider questions about 'the political economy of waged labour'. The second area is the changing nature of employee representation which, for much of Hyman's career, was synonymous with the analysis of trade unions under capitalism. The third area is one of the more striking recent successes within the subject, namely the study of comparative industrial relations. Each of these areas reveals Hyman's talent for identifying and clarifying a set of issues around the politics of work that will endure regardless of whether the subject is known as industrial relations, employment relations or human resource management.*

I do not believe that anyone else of Richard's generation can claim, as he can, to have transformed the way most of us actually view the subject area . . . his work has basically set the terms of the theoretical debate in industrial relations over the past three decades. (George Bain, quoted in Terry 2009).

## 1. Introduction

Richard Hyman, as the quote from his former colleague George Bain indicates, has exerted a remarkable influence on the subject of industrial relations ever since he started his academic career as a Research Fellow at the

Carola Frege is at the Department of Management, London School of Economics and Political Science. John Kelly is at the Department of Management, Birkbeck College, University of London. Patrick McGovern is at the Department of Sociology, London School of Economics and Political Science.

University of Warwick in 1967. His early writings, which injected a stream of radical analysis into the subject of industrial relations, led to him being widely recognized as the unofficial founder of the Marxist perspective on industrial relations. Reviews of different theoretical approaches, for instance, invariably take Hyman's work as the starting point when describing the Marxist perspective (see e.g. Blyton and Turnbull 2004: 33–34; Marsden 1982: 243–45; Müller-Jentsch 2004: 6–7). While there were earlier Marxist scholars who wrote on trade unions and industrial relations (e.g. Allen 1971; Blackburn and Cockburn 1967), none have been as prolific or as persistent in developing a Marxist position on these issues (see also Dabscheck 1989: 166; Poole 1984: 103; Strauss and Feuille 1978: 272).

In more recent years, Richard Hyman has become a leading figure in the rapidly expanding field of comparative industrial relations. Starting in the early 1990s, he published two classic comparative textbooks with Anthony Ferner (Ferner and Hyman 1992; Hyman 1994c), as well as numerous articles and a highly regarded study of European trade unionism (Hyman 2001b). Though not widely recognized as an institution builder, he was involved in the creation of the Industrial Relations in Europe Conference (IREC) in 1992, and three years later launched the *European Journal of Industrial Relations*. Hyman was, of course, also a key figure in the famous Industrial Relations Research Unit (IRRU) at the University of Warwick, where in his 'typically understated manner', he played a leading role in forging connections with continental European scholarship as the IRRU moved increasingly towards international and comparative work. One of his initiatives, for instance, led to a visiting professors scheme that attracted some of the most prominent continental European scholars to Warwick (e.g. Sabine Erbes-Seguin, Walther Müller-Jentsch, Silvana Sciarra, Wolfgang Streeck and others).<sup>1</sup>

Finally, Hyman stands out among industrial relations scholars for the sheer range of his interests as well as his extraordinarily prolific output as a writer over a period of more than 40 years. By the time he retired from the London School of Economics in September 2009, he had produced 13 books, 109 book chapters, 57 journal articles plus numerous pamphlets and reports.<sup>2</sup> What is also remarkable is his range of interests, and, indeed, his erudition. References and footnotes, for instance, might include Walter Bagehot on the English constitution, Ernest Gellner on civil society and Antonio Gramsci on workers' councils in Italy (see e.g. Hyman 2001b: 177–90). Partly because of this characteristic, Hyman's writings provided intellectual sustenance, as well as political stimulation for those who came to industrial relations from a background in the social sciences and expected more from the subject than institutional description, discussions of government policy and recommendations for 'good' industrial relations.

While it is no easy task to summarize Hyman's prolific output, our reading of his work identifies at least five major themes: exposing the conservative assumptions of the pluralist theories that dominated industrial relations for much of the postwar period (Hyman 1975, 1978, 1989a); analyzing industrial

relations as antagonistic class relations between labour and capital (Hyman 1975, 1980, 1989a); challenging the way social values and ideologies are used in industrial relations to legitimize social inequality (Hyman 1974; Hyman and Brough 1975); explaining the nature and politics of trade unions under capitalism (Hyman 1971b, 1972, 1989a, 1997, 2001b); and finally, trying to understand cross-national differences in industrial relations (Ferner and Hyman 1992; Hyman 1995, 2001b).

Rather than attempt to summarize this vast *oeuvre*, we concentrate on three areas where we believe his work has had an agenda-setting quality. Significantly, the three areas, industrial relations theory, trade unions and cross-national comparative research, also happen to be those that he repeatedly revisited throughout his career. This focus allows us to map Hyman's evolution from being identified primarily as a Marxist theorist during his early career to his more recent incarnation as one of Europe's leading comparative industrial relations scholars.

The great English mathematician and philosopher Alfred North Whitehead once remarked that 'a science which hesitates to forget its founders is lost' (Whitehead 1929: 108). While we would not wish to claim that Hyman was one of the founders of the subject of industrial relations, we agree with North Whitehead's point about the dangers of forgetting what earlier generations of scholars have contributed to the development of our 'science'. At a time when the very existence of the field is the subject of debate (Darlington 2009), we strongly contest the implication that Richard Hyman should be viewed as a dinosaur in a dying field. Rather, some of Hyman's concerns provide a promising future for industrial relations precisely because they raise important and enduring questions about the world of work. In this respect, our article is intended as a contribution to the questions raised by Edwards in his analysis of the challenges facing the future of the subject (Edwards 2005). To put it simply, our position is that we cannot afford to leave some of the classic or fundamental questions behind as we embrace the future.

## **2. The critique of empiricism and the radicalization of industrial relations theory**

Hyman's early work earned him a reputation as a radical firebrand because he dared to challenge the prevailing orthodoxy of the 'Oxford School' in a subject which, according to one of his contemporaries, was marked by '... a relative lack of interest in theory (especially that of a deductive kind) or in developments outside of Britain, and a preoccupation with governmental policy' (Martin 1998: 84). Hyman himself observed that when viewed alongside the social and political turbulence of the late 1960s and the emerging enthusiasm for radicalism within the social sciences, academic industrial relations appeared to be 'caught in the time-warp of the transatlantic conservatism of the 1950s' (Hyman 1989a: ix). By contrast, the young Hyman

was much influenced by his involvement in the International Socialists (later the Socialist Workers Party), a small Trotskyist political party that sought to create a revolutionary workers' movement through 'rank-and-file' union organization and working class militancy.<sup>3</sup> Having also immersed himself in sociology, partly because he had been asked to teach industrial sociology at Warwick University, Hyman felt compelled to challenge the prevailing wisdom in industrial relations by exposing the limits of empiricism, by calling for a broadening of the subject matter, and, crucially, by offering a radical alternative to the prevailing functionalist theories of order and regulation. These arguments would have a major influence on the subject both because of their cogency, and, also, we suggest, because of their timing, as they coincided with a wave of industrial and student unrest, and with the emergence of the New Left who sought to liberate Marxism from the straitjacket of Soviet Communism.

#### *Against Empiricism and 'Job Regulation'*

In the introduction to the seminal *Industrial Relations: A Marxist Introduction* (1975), Hyman noted that the industrial relations literature provided a vast amount of descriptive detail on issues such as trade unions, employers' organizations and methods of wage determination. For Hyman, the problem with this complex pile of facts was that it left students perplexed and unable to grasp anything approaching an overview of the field (p. 2). Furthermore, the empiricist preoccupation with 'facts' and 'practical problems' was misplaced because '... theoretical assumptions are not excluded, they are merely hidden below the surface' (p. 10).

If one of the problems with the Anglo-American industrial relations literature was the over-riding concern with facts and practical problems, then this tendency was compounded, not resolved, by Dunlop's influential concept of an 'industrial relations system'. In directing research towards processes of rule making, job regulation and collective bargaining, Dunlop downplayed the sources and consequences of industrial conflict in favour of an analytical and normative orientation towards social order. For Hyman, this meant that the subject of industrial relations would always be one-sided and inadequate if it failed to treat instability and stability as being equally significant 'system outcomes' (Hyman 1975: 12). Consequently, Hyman argued that the subject should no longer be defined as the study of job regulation (following Flanders 1965: 10), but rather viewed more broadly as 'processes of control over work relations' (Hyman 1975: 12), or as the political economy of waged labour because 'the phenomena of industrial relations cannot adequately be understood simply in their own terms'. (Hyman 1994c: 171). Indeed, much of Hyman's early work can be considered as an explicit attempt to broaden the field of industrial relations by treating it as an arena in which to apply ideas drawn from Marxism, and, to a lesser extent, from sociology. This desire to broaden the horizons of industrial relations would become a familiar theme in Hyman's work, as he would subsequently venture

into the study of wage bargaining, fairness and social inequality (Hyman and Brough 1975), and, more recently, the study of comparative industrial relations (e.g. Ferner and Hyman 1992; Hyman 2001b). In each case, he would argue that such issues would be most fruitfully analysed through a Marxist perspective.

### *Applying Marxism*

Hyman's great achievement as a Marxist was to set out and elaborate a coherent conceptual framework for a radical perspective on industrial relations. As he has repeatedly acknowledged (Hyman 1975: 4; 1989a: 125; 2006b: 29), this was not an easy task, because it meant applying ideas devised as part of a highly abstract analysis of 19th-century capitalism to one particular sphere of late 20th century capitalism, namely the market for labour. What is striking when we read Hyman's work some 30 years later is that he achieves his task by combining a relatively straightforward, orthodox reading of Marx with an extraordinary knowledge of industrial relations and a talent for applying Marxist concepts in an original fashion. The latter, we will suggest, is particularly evident in his application of the concept of *contradiction*.

For instance, the explicitly theoretical *Industrial Relations: A Marxist Introduction* (1975) offered an orthodox Marxist framework built around the concepts of *totality*, *change*, *contradiction* and *practice*. By totality, Hyman followed the holistic Marxist method, which insists that all social phenomena are inter-related, and no one area, such as the supposedly autonomous 'industrial relations system' of Dunlop's pluralist theory, could be analyzed in isolation. Accordingly, he would consistently argue that it is neither possible, nor desirable, to have a theory of industrial relations because '[I]t forms an area of study with no coherent theoretical or disciplinary rationale, but deriving from a directly *practical* concern with a range of "problems" confronting employers, governments and their academic advisers in the pursuit of labour stability' (Hyman 1980: 37). Nonetheless, Hyman would argue for Marxist theory in 'industrial relations', though this would take the form of a political economy of waged labour, or a 'critical political economy' that would stand in marked contrast to traditional industrial relations empiricism (Hyman 1980, 1994c: 171).

In addition to the concern with totality, Hyman's work has also been characterized by a strong strain of social criticism, combined with calls for the emancipation of labour and the extension of freedom and reason in the world of work (Hyman 1989a: 17). Such calls for *practice* (or praxis) were a standard feature of Marxist literature generally, and were usually accompanied by the acknowledgement that existing social and economic structures limited the opportunities for reformist interventions. It was also conventional for Marxists to claim that such structures were often unstable because capitalism does not consist of stable and harmonious economic processes and institutions. Rather, it is prone to instability and to contradictions between

different parts of the economic system because the system itself is founded on the opposing interests of different social classes. Accordingly, Hyman's analysis of industrial relations was based on two key assumptions: 'The first is that capitalist social relations of production reflect and produce a structured antagonism of interests between capital and labour. The second is that capitalism simultaneously organizes workers collectively (since the capitalist labour process is essentially collective in character), and hence generates the material basis for effective resistance to capital and the priorities of the capitalist mode of production. What is conventionally studied as industrial relations may thus be conceived as a fetishized presentation of the class struggle and the various forms in which it is (at least temporarily) constrained, fragmented and routinised' (Hyman 1980: 42; 1989a: 125).

In a now-familiar Hyman manoeuvre, these two assumptions are joined by the notion of contradiction: capitalism creates conflict between employers and workers while simultaneously providing the latter with a basis for challenging and changing capitalism. We would argue that this dialectical imagination, and, in particular, the use of the concept of contradiction, is Hyman's most distinctive contribution to the radical perspective. Of the four concepts that were introduced in *Industrial Relations*, contradiction is the one that recurs most frequently in Hyman's subsequent work. Trade unions, for instance, are torn between accommodation and conflict; they co-operate with employers in order to improve the terms and conditions of their members while also challenging the excesses of capitalism if not capitalism itself (Hyman 1971a, 1975, 1989a). Other contradictions, such as those between democracy and bureaucracy, sectionalism and solidarity will be examined in the next section.

This use of the dialectical concept of contradiction is perhaps best exemplified in a rare foray into territory covered by those working within labour process analysis (e.g. Smith and Thompson 1998). In one of his most influential essays, Hyman reviewed the ever-expanding managerial literature on business strategy and asked whether the concept of strategy was compatible with the idea that capitalism is structurally determined. His conclusion was that the existence of contradictions within the capitalist enterprise would allow opportunities for strategic choice to emerge, but no one strategy would prove entirely successful. To illustrate the point, he made the celebrated argument that contradictions in the labour process mean that '... the function of labour control involves *both* the direction, surveillance and discipline of subordinates whose enthusiastic commitment to corporate objectives cannot be taken for granted; *and* the mobilisation of the discretion, initiative and diligence which coercive supervision, far from guaranteeing, is likely to destroy' (Hyman 1987: 41). Within Labour Process studies, this argument has had a significant influence on the literature that followed in the 1990s (Du Gay, 1996: 51–52; Geary 1992; Noon and Blyton 2007: 250–452). Curiously, Hyman played no public part in the deskilling debate that was triggered by Braverman's *Labor and Monopoly Capital*, the book that revived labour process studies in the UK and elsewhere (Braverman 1974).<sup>4</sup>

In sum, Hyman's early theoretical writing played a crucial role in the radicalization of industrial relations as an academic subject during the 1970s and 1980s (Wood 1976).<sup>5</sup> It injected a much-needed theoretical sophistication into a field that was dominated by pragmatic policy-oriented empirical research, with the result that much of the writing was essentially institutional description (Bain and Clegg 1974; Kelly 1998; Martin 1998; Winchester 1983). Indeed, one of the criticisms of the influential 'Oxford School' was that it focused on the reform of institutional arrangements, such as collective bargaining, at the expense of the social and economic environment (Goldthorpe 1974). By contrast, Hyman emphasized the pre-institutional social roots of industrial relations in explaining, among other things, strikes, wage determination, union organization and union identity. In doing so, he raised the intellectual standing of industrial relations by using it as an area in which to apply ideas from Marxism and sociology. Rather than being merely another 'social problem'-oriented or 'applied' subject, Hyman showed how industrial relations could be of interest to Marxist and non-Marxist sociologists who wished to understand collective action, industrial conflict, union democracy, fairness, social inequality and the role of the state (see for instance Edwards and Wolkowitz 2002: 253). In this respect, it can be said that Hyman focused much of the research and debate in British industrial relations and industrial sociology for the best part of three decades. Indeed, his success in introducing Marxist ideas means that even today, the materialist perspective on which it draws remains the established orthodoxy in British industrial relations theory, at least according to one influential commentator (Ackers 2005: 539).

### *On Theory and Empirical Research*

What is also noteworthy is that Hyman has consistently argued for a Marxist perspective on industrial relations, including in recent years when the enthusiasm for Marxism, both in theory and practice, has dissipated (Hyman 1980, 1994c, 2006b). His influential 1994 article on 'Theory and industrial relations' reveals that this was not simply a matter of unyielding socialist politics, but rather it followed from a position that Hyman took on the nature of theory and its relationship to empirical evidence. According to Hyman the few industrial relations scholars who are interested in theoretical discussions have either adopted a hypothetico-deductive approach to generate hypotheses or relied on middle-range theorizing. Thus, most industrial relations research has been characterized by simple empirical generalizations or middle-range hypotheses (Hyman 1982b). The assumption is that, ultimately, general theory can be constructed through the accumulation of empirically verifiable propositions. Hyman rejects this approach because 'Even in the natural sciences, theory construction rests more on creative imagination than the step-by-step elevation of generalizations; the theorist is architect not brick-layer' (Hyman 1994c: 168).

Furthermore, there exist important theoretical propositions which are relevant for our field but might not, according to Hyman, be available for

falsification or empirical proof simply because they are too complex and cannot easily be quantified. One example is French *régulation* theories, which argue that the decline of central collective bargaining is due to the crisis of Fordist production systems, which in turn is a major cause of the trade union decline in advanced industrialized economies. As Hyman points out, it is very difficult to test the adequacy of such a theoretical argument since ‘the level of abstraction involved in concepts such as ‘Fordism’ is such that their test cannot be reduced to a simple question whether they fit the facts’ (Hyman 1994c: 170). In fact, he asserts that to discover some statistical association between variables does not entail either the development or testing of theory, and by implication, he suggests that qualitative research focused on processes and meanings would prove more illuminating (Hyman 1994c: 169). Societal phenomena must be analysed in terms of actually existing structures and causal mechanisms that are not necessarily directly observable (and hence quantifiable) — a conviction which is, of course, a major challenge to the principles of empiricism and quantification (Hyman 1994c: 171).<sup>6</sup>

### 3. Too much class conflict?

Hyman’s theoretical work is not beyond criticism. Although now well rehearsed, our first criticism concerns the privileged status given to class conflict as an explanatory mechanism. Certainly, conflict is an important feature of the employment relationship, but it is not always the result of class struggle. For instance, it was not uncommon for industrial disputes in the 1970s to revolve around pay differentials with one group of workers insisting on being paid a certain percentage more than another group of workers who were deemed to be lesser status. Hyman has argued that such disputes were really struggles between capital and labour (Hyman 1975: 17–23). The problem with this argument, as Crouch has shown, is the assumption that the abolition of private property would somehow end the division of labour and thereby eliminate intra-class disputes over pay differentials (Crouch 1982: 37). Moreover, the preoccupation with social class means that other kinds of social divisions with the labour market, notably those based on ethnicity and gender, cannot easily be explained through a Marxist framework (Parkin 1979). In this respect, it is interesting to note that Hyman has begun to recognize that while Marx may be necessary, his work is no longer sufficient, especially when addressing such issues (Hyman 2004: 269–71, 2006b: 52). This evolution in Hyman’s thinking is particularly evident in his work on comparative industrial relations which we discuss later.

A second problem with the radical perspective is the insistence that conflict is endemic within capitalism. Writing in *Strikes*, Hyman argued that industrial conflict was not irrational, irresponsible or illegitimate, but rather the product of irreconcilable contradictions within capitalism. Much of the book’s theoretical focus is devoted to the ‘powerful underlying causes’ (p. 87) or ‘mainsprings’ of conflict. These include the persistence of class-based



inequalities, notably in income and wealth, insecurity of employment, the lack of influence over decisions made at work and the very fact that workers are sentient human beings whose capacity for creativity and innovation are rarely fulfilled by prevailing forms of work organization (Hyman 1984a: 87–106).

If conflict is inevitable, given the structured antagonism built into the capitalist employment relationship, then how can the Marxist perspective account for the extraordinary decline in the number of strikes over the past 30 years? At the time when Hyman was writing in the early 1970s, the British public had ‘become accustomed to consuming strikes with its cornflakes’ (Lane and Roberts 1971: 232–33). By the late 1990s, however, the incidence of strikes in Britain had reached an all-time low (Waddington 2003: 225). To be fair, Hyman acknowledges the collapse in strike activity in the Afterword to later editions of *Strikes* (e.g. Hyman 1984a: 179–235), and, indeed, examines why this had occurred (see also Godard 2011). Furthermore, Hyman cannot actually be accused of claiming that strikes would continue to rise as a result of ever-escalating class conflict. Instead, his analysis of this relationship is so nuanced by reference to the general dynamics of capitalist production, how these are mediated through patterns of relations in particular work situations, and, almost inevitably, by contradictory social forces, that Hyman’s position is difficult to pin down (Hyman 1984a: 182, 185–86). This, indeed, has been an occasional criticism of some of Hyman’s writing by scholars who prefer to work with testable theoretical propositions (e.g. Poole 1984: 105; Wood 1976: 56).

A key issue in the analysis of strikes is the nature and role of trade unions, not least because it could be argued that the decline in strike activity may be caused in large part by the parallel decline in trade unionism. Trade unions have been the major focus of Hyman’s career dating from his early research in labour history through to his most recent comparative work on European trade unions (Hyman 1971b, 2001b). It is also in the area of trade union research that Hyman’s evolution as a scholar has been most evident because, like other Marxists, he was initially preoccupied by a topic that is no longer on political or research agendas: the search for revolutionary class consciousness among the working class (see Elliott 2008).

#### **4. The contradictions of British trade unionism**

Hyman’s writings in the 1970s were suffused by an optimistic appraisal of the political potential of trade union militancy to generate heightened levels of class consciousness. This is not to say he was unaware of the weaknesses and limitations of British trade unionism because he did, after all, write perceptively and critically about sectional divisions amongst the workforce and about the pressures towards accommodation between labour and capital. For instance, in a widely cited essay from 1979, he noted that workplace union organization was becoming increasingly centralized and

hierarchical, a process he depicted as the 'bureaucratization of the rank and file' (Hyman 1979). Although noting the workplace research by his Warwick colleague Eric Batstone on shop steward organization, he was rather dismissive of its lack of attention to the rhythms of capitalist production, complaining about its 'idealist problematic' (Batstone *et al.* 1977; Hyman 1979: 60). He was perhaps even more critical of those Marxist organizations, principally the Communist Party and the International Socialists, which aspired to play a leading role within the labour movement. His 1975 essay on the strategic errors of the early British Communist Party was written at about the same time that he was withdrawing from the International Socialists as they succumbed to similar illusions of power and influence (Hinton and Hyman 1975). Labour's election defeat in 1979 at the hands of a Conservative party openly hostile to trade unions inaugurated a long period of decline in trade union membership and militancy that was periodically reinforced by major strike defeats, most notably the coal miners in 1985. The strike waves of the 1970s were succeeded in the 1980s by what Shalev ironically described as 'the resurgence of labour quiescence' (Shalev 1992). Mass unemployment played a big part in curbing union power, but so too did new legal restrictions on strike activity. Legal measures that had been successfully resisted by trade unions in the late 1960s and early 1970s, such as mandatory pre-strike ballots, were successfully enacted by governments in the 1980s.

In response to these dramatic changes in the fortunes of the trade union movement, Hyman's work displayed both continuity and change. Continuity was most evident in his regular deployment of the concept of contradiction as a key analytical tool (see above), and three examples will illustrate the overarching significance of this theme. In a 1981 essay, he argued against the idea that job controls over effort and staffing levels, often organized by shop stewards, expressed an enduring if rudimentary anti-capitalist logic; they could just as readily express a narrow sectional consciousness of craft or small group interests (Hyman and Elger 1981). In a 1982 essay on industrial conflict, he noted that the 'hierarchical representative structures' of the trade union movement played a contradictory role, sometimes facilitating the expression of conflict but at other times hindering it (Hyman 1982a). His appraisal of the 1984–1985 miners' strike explored *inter alia* the contradiction between coercion and consent in the widespread use of mass flying pickets sent across the country from the most militant coalfields into areas where strike support was weak. And in a more general essay, also written in the aftermath of the strike, he continued to insist on the value of analyzing the contradictions inherent in trade unionism, between bureaucracy and democracy, compromise and struggle, class action and sectionalism (Hyman 1985). For Hyman, the analysis of trade unionism involved seeking out opposing tendencies, charting their origins, development and consequences and indicating their respective strengths. Predictions were not possible within this mode of analysis if only because the tensions between contradictory logics, of compromise and struggle, for example, would ultimately be decided by

human agents whose actions cannot be subjected to the hypothetico-deductive methods of natural science (Voskeritsian 2010).

However, alongside the continuity marked by the notion of contradiction, there are two important intellectual shifts that can be detected in his 1980s writings. First, and in the domain of theory, he began to construct a rather more critical appraisal of Marxism, and, second, he began to write far more critically about the contemporary trade union movement. According to Hyman, the main categories of Marxist theory were constructed at a high level of abstraction, and intended to throw light on the capitalist mode of production as a whole, not to illuminate the relations between unions and employers or the internal structures of unions. Not surprisingly, therefore, many of the terms frequently used by Marxists in the analysis of industrial relations were originated by non-Marxist writers, including terms such as trade union bureaucracy (Michels) and business unionism (Hoxie and Perlman). Equally, there were no methods of research that differentiated Marxist from non-Marxist social science. It was 'in the questions asked . . . and what is regarded as problematic' that Marxists could make their most telling contributions to the field of industrial relations (Hyman 1980: 128).

One such contribution was Hyman's increasingly critical appraisal of contemporary British trade unionism, epitomized most clearly in the starkly titled essay, 'The sickness of British trade unionism: is there a cure?' (Hyman 1989b). In this and other publications of the 1980s, he re-appraised the spectacular membership growth of the 1970s, arguing that what unions had often created through the compulsion of the closed shop were 'paper members', workers with only a weak attachment to the trade union movement. In the field of union policy, he expressed scepticism about the widespread union support for 'free collective bargaining', a 'complex and contradictory' slogan that expressed militant opposition to state intervention but which simultaneously reinforced a 'sectional' and 'economistic' outlook among workers. Indeed, the Conservative election victory in 1983 was built partly on that party's success in appealing to the narrow economic self-interest of manual workers who had traditionally voted Labour. Hyman's response to Labour's worst election result since 1918 was to intensify his criticisms of both wings of the labour movement, unions and party alike. In a phrase used a number of times throughout the 1980s he complained that British socialism was 'modest and banal in its long-term vision even when superficially radical in its short-term programme.' (Hyman 1989c: 234–35). Moving from analytical into prescriptive mode, and maintaining his stance as social critic, he declared that the labour movement required a 'vision of an alternative order', a 'credible conception of humanistic socialism' if it was to recover its vitality and challenge the growing hegemony of neo-liberal ideas (Hyman 1984b). In order to construct and implement such a vision, unions would have to connect with other social movements, a theme he first broached in the late 1980s, but one which anticipated the more recent interest in 'social movement unionism' by over a decade (e.g. Hyman 1989c).

## 5. The European labour movement and comparative industrial relations

Structural changes, such as the crisis of the British labour movement, the gradual opening up of the TUC to Europe and the increasing Europeanization of British employment regulations during the 1990s as well as the increasing power of global capital forces were all associated with an intellectual shift in Hyman's work. During the 1990s he moved from a focus on the British labour problem and trade union movement to a broader comparative analysis of employment systems and labour movements across Europe. In particular, he reached out to study the trade union movements in France, Germany and Italy (Hyman is also fluent in the three languages).

This move was accompanied by his renewed interest in the nature of industrial relations research. As we discussed above Hyman's original Marxist writings provided him with a strong conviction of the necessity of theoretical engagement in industrial relations (Hyman 1994c), and one long-standing feature of his work has been to challenge the dominant empiricism of employment research (see also Marsden 1982). Although a Marxist analysis remains indispensable for Hyman for a true understanding of industrial relations — in particular, because it emphasizes the nature of work itself rather than the rules and regulations of work which occupy most industrial relations students — he now emphasizes that a classic Marxist approach is not sufficient in understanding advanced capitalist societies (Hyman 2004: 269–71; 2006b: 52). While his Marxist approach identified capitalist production systems generally as the root of many industrial relations problems, Hyman's evolution as a scholar led him to analyse different forms and functions of capitalism and of trade unionism from a broader economic and political perspective. Thus, his focus shifted towards an appraisal of the varieties of capitalism and the consequent variety of employment regulations and of labour movements within Europe. Rather than assuming a universalist approach to class conflict and class struggle, he began to explore the contextual and structural constraints and facilitators of labour movements in different countries. Moreover, Hyman returned to a theme in his earlier work by emphasizing the importance, as well as the diversity of 'ideological dynamics', the role of social norms, ideas, beliefs and language in shaping industrial relations.<sup>7</sup> Although much contemporary industrial relations research tends to ignore ideational factors such as attitudes, values and ideologies, Hyman has been able to use his comparative work to identify an important and somewhat neglected area for further research. This marked an increasing willingness on Hyman's part to work with categories beyond those found in classic Marxist theory. Moreover, it could be claimed that his increasing comparative perspective and his move from a focus on the workplace to the state embodied the broader institutionalist turn in the social sciences during the 1980s and 1990s (e.g. Brinton and Nee 1998). However, he combines this recognition of the importance of the nation-state and employment institutions with an emphasis on their underlying identities, norms and values.

In sum, Hyman increasingly acknowledged that industrial relations vary cross-nationally, and that the varieties of institutions in the labour market, including trade unions with their differing identities and ideologies, need to be taken into account (Hyman 1994a: 272).

These insights led Hyman to emphasize a new research agenda for industrial relations. In essence, he reworked his early critique of the Dunlop-Flanders focus on job regulation and gave it a comparative inflection, arguing that *Anglo-Saxon* research had become too preoccupied with the study of job regulation and collective bargaining arrangements to the exclusion of the state (Kahn-Freund 1954; Kerr 1964; Kerr *et al.* 1960). In practice, this meant that, for example, corporatist arrangements were studied by political scientists, and not by employment scholars in Britain or the USA (contrary to continental Europe, where employment and work were always seen as subject and object of the broader political economy (Frege 2007). Hyman's proposal for industrial relations research was to broaden or 'Europeanize' its relevance by interpreting industrial relations as a political economic set of phenomena and thus re-emphasizing the sociological and political science interest in industrial relations (rather than a narrow labour economic focus):

Industrial relations emerged historically as a field of study with a primarily meso focus (institutions at sectoral or company level). Today it is evident that the issues of industrial relations are embedded in national and transnational structural dynamics; and that they are likewise conditioned by the complex evolution of procedures and relations at the point of production. Analysis has to link the macro, meso and micro dimensions of a changing world of work and employment. An integrated perspective which encompasses structures, actors and practices is essential. (Hyman 1995: 43).

Finally, what can help foster the study of the interrelations between structures, actors and practices in a subject area that is notoriously under-theorized is the use of cross-national comparisons, which force the observer to address critically what is normally accepted as unproblematic within the individual national context (Hyman 1994b: 2). Thus, 'the process of comparison — unless exclusively descriptive — contributes to the development and refinement of theory by provoking generalization and causal explanation' (Hyman 1994b: 2).

### *Comparative Industrial Relations Research and Europe*

While Hyman was not the first to use comparative methods in the field of industrial relations (Clegg 1976; Kahn-Freund 1954; Kerr *et al.* 1960), he surely contributed to making comparative methods mainstream in British, if not European industrial relations research. Hyman has also reflected on the nature of comparative research itself. According to Hyman 'most work has either focused on industrial relations within a single context or as an undifferentiated decontextualized field of study' (Hyman 2001b: 1). He supports

Adams' (1983: 509, 526) observation that 'Industrial relations is not an internally self-consistent field of study. It is instead a confederacy of competing paradigms . . . when viewing the empirical world members of different schools [in industrial relations] neither look at nor see precisely the same things'. Hyman believes that part of this phenomenon can be explained by national and linguistic differences, which also shape the ways in which industrial relations are understood and analysed. Consequently, the popularity of different paradigms varies with time and place, and different countries have different disciplinary approaches and theories of industrial or employment relations (e.g. French *régulation* theory has not become popular in Britain). National intellectual traditions and academic structures have long path dependencies going back to medieval times, while patterns of industrial relations are shaped by pre-capitalist 'state traditions' by legitimating ideologies associated with the construction of the modern nation-state and by subsequent class compromises (Hyman 2004: 273). These national patterns influence and are being influenced by different forms of class compromise in the labour market, as well as by different strategies of employment actors and their underlying rationales and discourses. They also shape the ways in which scholars conceptualize employment research and select research topics, methodologies and theories (Frege 2007). Thus, Hyman concludes that different forms of capitalism, such as Anglo-Saxon liberal market economies, compared with co-ordinated market economies, will favour distinctive models of conceptualizing social relations. In conjunction with nationally specific theoretical and disciplinary traditions, they shape the way in which industrial relations are perceived and interpreted (Hyman 2004: 274).

A major difference Hyman highlights is the heuristic dichotomy between Anglo-Saxon individualism and the collectivist presuppositions of the 'European social model', which he explores in various articles (e.g. Hyman 2003, 2006a, 2010). Hyman defines Anglo-Saxon individualism in industrial relations as an emphasis on the freedom of contract, on voluntarism, a narrow focus on company or workplace relations, and a lack of concern with the tensions and contradictions between market dynamics and larger social policy issues, such as social protection and citizenship. He also claims that Anglo-Saxon employment research is often characterized by parochialism and ethnocentrism (Hyman 2004: 276). In contrast, the European social model treats markets as social constructs, individuals as social beings, collective action as a normal phenomenon, and takes it for granted that the state is deeply implicated in employment relationships (Hyman 2004: 279). Conflict is regarded as embedded in the employment relationship, but can be managed by stable collective organizations, thus social partners.

These significant variations make it essential to develop a cross-national comparative perspective for the study of industrial relations (Hyman 2001a). Most recently, Hyman highlighted the existence of the different identities of trade unions in European countries. The concept of trade union identity (which arguably parallels recent work on corporate identities) is crucial in that it incorporates a notion of strategic choice. Hyman pointed

to three major ideal types of European trade unions, each of which reflects a distinctive ideological orientation: market, society and class.<sup>8</sup> In the first, union are primarily seen as labour market institutions engaged in collective bargaining; in the second, unions focus on improving workers conditions and status in society more generally and advance social justice and equality; in the third type, they are ‘schools of class conflict’ in the struggle between capital and labour (Hyman 1994a, 1995, 2001b). Hyman then broadly associates Britain with market-oriented unionism (being located on the axis between market and class), Germany with civil society unionism (being located on the axis between society and market), and Italy with a class-oriented unionism (being located on the axis between class and society). The eternal triangle provides another example of Hyman’s longstanding emphasis on contradictions within the capitalist system. All unions inevitably face in three directions. As associations of employees, they have a central role in regulating the wage labour relationship; as associations of workers, they embody a conception of collective interests and identities which divides workers from employers. Yet unions also exist and function within a societal context that they may aspire to change, but which also constrains their current choices (Hyman 2001b: 4). Unions in different countries are facing different forms of dynamic interplays and stable balances between the three identities. Thus, despite common convergence pressures in all countries (such as the declining importance of traditional union strongholds in manufacturing), the weakening of the ties between work and other social identities, or less supportive political conditions (Hyman 2001b: 169), there still exist distinctive features of the national labour movements. Moreover, even when facing similar pressures, unions still have strategic choices, and their responses differ in part because of their different historic identities and their associated path dependencies.

Furthermore, Hyman interprets unions’ current crisis as being shaped in part by the competing demands of the ‘political economy’ and the ‘moral economy’, those social norms and values which transcend a pure market logic (Hyman 2001b: 13). The traditional axes of union policy — free collective bargaining, the historic social compromise, the social market economy — have become unstable, and the agendas of market, class and societal unionism have become more complex and difficult to combine (Hyman 2001b: 173). Trade unions seem condemned to act as mediators of transnational economic forces, negotiating the erosion of previous achievements in the fields of social welfare and employment regulation (Mahnkopf and Altvater 1995). This brings Hyman to the idea of ‘social Europe’ as a potential means for the survival and revival of the labour movements in Europe. However, if the EU or nation-states continue to refrain from imposing social controls over market forces and global capital flows, then the future for European industrial relations as an interplay between capital, labour and state and the future of European trade unions remain bleak (Hyman 1994b: 13; 2010: 74–7). Still, as a Marxist Hyman perhaps hopes that a certain amount of strategic choice for labour will remain simply because the

structural conditions imposed by the EU, as well as by the increasingly powerful capitalist actors will always be to a certain degree contradictory.

Hyman's particular concern is the lack of a moral economy at European level, which goes beyond the abstract concept of a 'European social market' (Hyman 2001b). A stronger civil society at European level, where trade unions would be a major driving force, could initiate, in his mind, the creation of a meaningful European moral economy and stronger resistance to the dehumanizing advance of market forces in the European Union. Yet the current weakness of a realistic civil society at European level is for Hyman the main obstacle to the creation of a genuine European system of industrial relations (Hyman 2001b: 175).

Finally, Hyman points to the continuing erosion of credible ideologies and values within the European labour movements as a reason to spell out visions of a better future, which are needed to build and maintain collective solidarities. This is a theme he first began to broach in the early 1980s in the British context, but which has now been broadened to embrace the European trade union movement as a whole (Hyman 2001b: 173). To remain significant, social actors capable of engaging in social and political mobilization unions need new utopias that cannot solely be confined to the national level (Hyman 2001b: 173). They need to include transnational solidarity at the European level, as well as allow co-ordinated diversity rather than traditional organizational conformity (Heckscher 1988: 177). This approach would require stronger centralized structures, as well as stronger grassroots participation (as exemplified in Barack Obama's 2008 presidential campaign), which Hyman refers to as the 'internal social dialogue'. His earlier, 1980s notion of social movement unionism finally became European.

## 6. Conclusions

Our primary aim in this article has been to review Richard Hyman's work with a view to identifying areas where a more broadly defined and retitled subject of employment relations has a promising future. The first point we would make is that one of Hyman's great achievements was to use industrial relations as an arena in which to explore and refine both general social theory, in the form of Marxism, as well as sociological theories of conflict, fairness, and union democracy to name but a few. Although he did not participate in debates about Marxism *per se* (analytical, structural, etc.), he has both maintained and developed his longstanding interest in the independent role of social values in industrial relations, and enriched this understanding with the concept of organizational identities. He has also continued to deploy the Marxist idea of contradictions within trade union organizations, or to explore what non-Marxist scholars might refer to as tensions between rival organizational logics.

Contemporary industrial relations scholars have continued to show interest in theoretical developments pioneered in these and related fields, such as



theories of institutionalism (Thelen 2009), new social movements (Kelly 1998) and varieties of capitalism (Hall and Soskice 2001). The benefit of such theorizing is that it provides the kinds of intellectual problems and puzzles and sets of ideas, that are needed to refresh and sustain a subject area (see also Edwards 2005: 277). For a subject that has been heavily influenced by policy concerns relying on purported 'social' or policy problems such as strikes or inflation will not be sufficient to sustain an intellectual base when these phenomena have disappeared (temporarily or otherwise). In other words, we would do well to remind ourselves of Hyman's desire to broaden the subject matter of industrial relations while moving it away from policy concerns with order and regulation.

Second, Hyman has mapped out and explored over many years an intellectual agenda that is of continuing relevance and importance. The issues of social justice, class inequality and effective employee voice are at least as salient today as they were in the 1970s because of economic globalization, the growth of income inequality and the decline of trade unionism. Differences in the distribution of job rewards, notably across the 'status divide' between manual and non-manual workers, were a prominent feature of the literature in the 1970s (Hyman 1974). However, the topic more or less disappeared from industrial relations and industrial sociology in subsequent decades. Given that a recent national survey has found that class-based forms of inequality in job rewards actually hardened with the arrival of the twenty-first century (McGovern *et al.* 2007: 80–95), it may be time for industrial relations (and industrial sociology) researchers to revisit the subject.

Although Hyman has not contributed directly to the debates about economic performance or about the impact of HRM practices, his radical and distinctive intellectual stance continues to raise important theoretical and empirical questions about the costs and benefits of contemporary forms of employment. At a time when the politics of work suffers from a near-pathological neglect in the ever-expanding fields of organizational behaviour and HRM, Hyman's work asks a the simple but revealing question of new management practices: who benefits? Moreover, his belief in the capacity of trade unions to correct the imbalance of power in the employment relationship stands as a critical point of reference in contemporary debates about alternative forms of 'employee voice'.

Finally, his firm and longstanding insistence on the need for cross-national comparative research is increasingly accepted as conventional wisdom among industrial relations scholars. Moreover, at a time when quantitative research has become increasingly fashionable, Hyman has positioned himself as an articulate and influential proponent of qualitative research and of what some researchers describe as 'contextualized comparisons'. Allied to this methodological focus, he has also underlined the importance of the 'European dimension' in contemporary industrial relations, not least in his critical appraisal of the different facets of the 'European model'. To conclude, we believe that industrial relations has a promising future if it learns some lessons from Richard Hyman's work. Rather than worrying whether the

decline in trade union membership and collective bargaining marks the end of the subject, we should instead be much more intellectually ambitious, much more willing to treat industrial or employment relations as an arena in which to test claims of economic and social transformation, and much more willing to do all of this from a comparative perspective. Only by doing this will we be able, as Hyman would have it, to both know the causes of things and use knowledge as an instrument for human emancipation (Hyman 2009: 7).

Final version accepted on 14 June 2010.

### **Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank Peter Ackers, Paul Edwards, John Godard and Ed Heery for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of this article. The usual disclaimer applies.

### **Notes**

1. Private communication with Professor Paul Edwards, University of Warwick, September 2008.
2. At the time of writing, Hyman (2010) is undertaking a major study of European trade union responses to economic crisis with Rebecca Gumbrell-McCormack (Hyman and Gumbrell-McCormack 2010).
3. Private communication with Richard Hyman, 1 May 2010. Hyman left the International Socialists in the mid-1970s.
4. Hyman had read chapters of Braverman's book some time before it was published while part of a Marxist discussion group at the University of Warwick. Although he considered the early debate around Braverman to be very important, the annual Labour Process conference did not start until 1983, by which point Hyman was examining the challenges that trade unions faced under Thatcherism. Private communication with Richard Hyman, 1 May 2010.
5. One of the ways Hyman challenged the prevailing orthodoxy was through critiques of other writers and approaches of which the most notable was the debate on pluralism with Hugh Clegg. In a subject that rarely has full-blown academic debates, this debate stands as a symbolic marker in the passing of the generations as Hyman was, in the formidable figure of Clegg, challenging someone who had been his former teacher and doctoral supervisor.
6. Hyman has occasionally expressed some disdain for empiricists preoccupied with measurement and quantitative techniques. One of the most striking examples can be found in his withering critique of Kochan's (1980) *Collective Bargaining and Industrial Relations*, where he asserts 'that not everything which can be fed into a regression analysis is for that reason alone of analytical importance' (Hyman 1982b: 101).
7. Drawing on economic, sociological and psychological perspectives on reference groups, effort bargaining and the negotiation of order, *Social Values and Industrial*

*Relations* argued that norms of fairness are of critical importance in fixing wages and maintaining differentials within organizational and occupational hierarchies (see also Hyman 1974; Hyman and Brough 1975).

8. He originally started with slightly different types of union identities: 'friendly society' (focusing on services), 'company union' (productivity coalition), 'social partner' (political exchange), 'social movement' (campaigning) (Hyman 1994a).

## References

- Ackers, P. (2005). 'Theorizing the employment relationships: materialists and institutionalists'. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 43: 537–43.
- Adams, R. J. (1983). 'Competing paradigms in industrial relations'. *Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations*, 38: 508–31.
- Allen, V. L. (1971). *The Sociology of Industrial Relations: Studies in Method*. Harlow: Longman.
- Bain, G. S. and Clegg, H. (1974). 'A strategy for industrial relations research in Great Britain'. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 12: 91–113.
- Batstone, E., Boraston, I. and Frenkel, S. (1977). *Shop Stewards in Action*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Blackburn, R. and Cockburn, A. (1967). *The Incompatibles: Trade Union Militancy and the Consensus*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Blyton, P. and Turnbull, P. (2004). *The Dynamics of Employee Relations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Braverman, H. (1974). *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Brinton, M. C. and Nee, V. (eds) (1998). *The New Institutionalism in Sociology*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Clegg, H. (1976). *Trade Unionism under Collective Bargaining*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Crouch, C. (1982). *Trade Unions: The Logic of Collective Action*. Glasgow: Fontana.
- Dabscheck, B. (1989). 'A survey of theories of industrial relations'. In J. Barbash and K. Barbash (eds), *Theories and Concepts in Industrial Relations*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, pp. 155–83.
- Darlington, R. (2009). *What's the Point of Industrial Relations? In Defence of Critical Social Science*. Manchester: British Universities Industrial Relations Association.
- Du Gay, P. (1996). *Consumption and Identity at Work*. London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Edwards, P. (2005). 'The challenging but promising future of industrial relations: developing theory and method in context-sensitive research'. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 36: 264–82.
- Edwards, P. K. and Wolkowitz, C. (2002). 'Great Britain'. In D. B. Cornfield and R. Hodson (eds), *Worlds of Work: Building an International Sociology of Work*. New York: Kluwer Academic / Plenum Publishers, pp. 253–74.
- Elliott, G. (2008). *Ends in Sight: Marx/Fukuyama/Hobsbawm/Anderson*. London: Pluto Press, p. 157.
- Ferner, A. and Hyman, R. (1992). *Industrial Relations in the New Europe*. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Flanders, A. (1965). *Industrial Relations: What Is Wrong with the System?* London: Faber.

- Frege, C. (2007). *Employment Research and State Traditions: A Comparative Historical Analysis in the United States, Great Britain and Germany*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Geary, J. (1992). 'Employment flexibility and human resource management'. *Work, Employment and Society*, 6: 251–70.
- Godard, J. (2011). 'What has happened to strikes?' *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, this issue.
- Goldthorpe, J. (1974). 'Industrial relations in Great Britain: a critique of reformism'. *Politics and Society*, 4: 419–52.
- Hall, P. A. and Soskice, D. W. (2001). *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heckscher, C. (1988). *The New Unionism: Employee Involvement in the Changing Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hinton, J. and Hyman, R. (1975). *Trade Unions and Revolution: The Industrial Politics of the Early British Communist Party*. London: Pluto Press.
- Hyman, R. (1971a). *Marxism and the Sociology of Trade Unionism*. London: Pluto Press.
- (1971b). *The Workers' Union*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- (1972). *Strikes*. London: Fontana-Collins.
- (1974). 'Inequality, ideology and industrial relations'. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 12: 171–90.
- (1975). *Industrial Relations: A Marxist Introduction*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- (1978). 'Pluralism, procedural consensus and collective bargaining'. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 16: 16–40.
- (1979). 'The politics of workplace trade unionism: recent tendencies and some problems for theory'. *Capital and Class*, 8: 54–67.
- (1980). 'Theory in industrial relations: towards a materialist analysis'. In P. Boreham and G. Dow (eds), *Work and Inequality*. Melbourne: Macmillan, pp. 38–59.
- (1982a). 'Pressure, protest and struggle: some problems in the concept and theory of industrial conflict'. In G. B. J. Bomers and R. B. Peterson (eds), *Conflict Management and Industrial Relations*. Boston, MA: Kluwer-Nijhoff. Reprinted in Hyman (1989a), pp. 96–119.
- (1982b). 'Symposium on Thomas Kochan's (1980) *Collective Bargaining and Industrial Relations*'. *Industrial Relations*, 21: 100–14.
- (1984a). *Strikes*. London: Fontana-Collins.
- (1984b). 'Wooing the working class'. In J. Curran (ed.), *The Future of the Left*. Cambridge: Polity, pp. 90–9.
- (1985). 'Class struggle and the trade union movement'. In D. Coates, G. Johnston and R. Bush (eds), *A Socialist Anatomy of Britain*. Cambridge: Polity in Association with Blackwell, pp. 99–123.
- (1987). 'Strategy or structure? Capital, labour and control'. *Work, Employment and Society*, 1: 25–55.
- (1989a). *The Political Economy of Industrial Relations: Theory and Practice in a Cold Climate*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- (1989b). 'The sickness of British trade unionism: is there a cure?' In R. Hyman (ed.), *The Political Economy of Industrial Relations: Theory and Practice in A Cold Climate*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, pp. 166–87.
- (1989c). *Strikes*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

- (1994a). ‘Changing trade union identities and strategies’. In R. Hyman and A. Ferner (eds), *New Frontiers in European Industrial Relations*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 108–39.
- (1994b). ‘Introduction: economic restructuring, market liberalism and the future of national industrial relations systems’. In R. Hyman and A. Ferner (eds), *New Frontiers in European Industrial Relations*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 1–14.
- (1994c). ‘Theory and industrial relations’. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 32: 165–80.
- (1995). ‘Industrial relations in Europe: theory and practice’. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 1: 17–46.
- (1997). ‘The future of employee representation’. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 35: 309–31.
- (2001a). ‘Trade union research and cross-national comparison’. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 7: 203–32.
- (2001b). *Understanding European Trade Unionism: Between Market, Class & Society*. London: Sage.
- (2003). ‘Varieties of capitalism, national industrial relations systems and transnational challenges’. In A.-W. Harzing and J. Van Ruysseveldt (eds), *International Human Resource Management: An Integrated Approach*. London: Sage, pp. 411–32.
- (2004). ‘Is industrial relations always ethnocentric?’ In B. E. Kaufman (ed.), *Theoretical Perspectives on Work and the Employment Relationship*. Champaign, IL: Industrial Relations Research Association, pp. 265–92.
- (2006a). ‘Flexible rigidities: a model for social Europe?’ In L. E. Alonso and M. Martinez-Lucio (eds), *Employment Relations in a Changing Society: Assessing the Post-Fordist Paradigm*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 215–22.
- (2006b). ‘Marxist thought and the analysis of work’. In M. Korczynski, R. Hodson and P. Edwards (eds), *Social Theory at Work*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 26–55.
- (2009). ‘La Lutte Continue’. British Journal of Industrial Relations Conference in Honour of Richard Hyman. London School of Economics & Political Science.
- (2010). ‘British industrial relations: the European dimension’. In T. Colling and M. Terry (eds), *Industrial Relations: Theory and Practice*. Chichester: John Wiley, pp. 54–80.
- and Brough, I. (1975). *Social Values and Industrial Relations: A Study of Fairness and Inequality*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- and Elger, T. (1981). ‘Job controls, the employers’ offensive and alternative strategies’. *Capital and Class*, 15: 115–49.
- and Gumbrell-McCormack, R. (2010). ‘Trade unions, politics and parties: is a new configuration possible?’. *Transfer*, 16 (3): 315–31.
- Kahn-Freund, O. (1954). ‘Legal framework’. In A. Flanders and H. Clegg (eds), *The System of Industrial Relations in Great Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 42–127.
- Kelly, J. (1998). *Rethinking Industrial Relations: Mobilization, Collectivism and Long Waves*. London: Routledge.
- Kerr, C. (1964). *Labor and Management in Industrial Society*. New York: Anchor Books.
- , Dunlop, J. T., Harbison, F. H. and Myers, C. A. (1960). *Industrialism and Industrial Man*. London: Heinemann.
- Kochan, T. A. (1980). *Collective Bargaining and Industrial Relations: From Theory to Policy and Practice*. Homewood, IL: R. D. Irwin.

- Lane, T. and Roberts, K. (1971). *Strike at Pilkingtons*. London: Fontana.
- McGovern, P., Hill, S., Mills, C. and White, M. (2007). *Market, Class, and Employment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mahnkopf, B. and Altvater, E. (1995). 'Trade unions as mediators of transnational economic pressures?' *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 1: 101–17.
- Marsden, R. (1982). 'Industrial relations: a critique of empiricism'. *Sociology*, 16: 232–50.
- Martin, R. (1998). 'The British tradition of industrial relations research: the contribution of W.E.J. (Lord) McCarthy'. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 36: 83–97.
- Müller-Jentsch, W. (2004). 'Theoretical approaches to industrial relations'. In B. E. Kaufman (ed.), *Theoretical Perspectives on Work and the Employment Relationship*. Champaign, IL: Industrial Relations Research Association, pp. 1–40.
- Noon, M. and Blyton, P. (2007). *The Realities of Work*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Parkin, F. (1979). *Marxism and Class Theory: A Bourgeois Critique*. London: Tavistock Institute.
- Poole, M. (1984). *Theories of Trade Unionism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Shalev, M. (1992). 'The resurgence of labour quiescence'. In M. Regini (ed.), *The Future of Labour Movements*. London: Sage, pp. 102–32.
- Smith, C. and Thompson, P. (1998). 'Re-evaluating the labour process debate'. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 19: 551–77.
- Strauss, G. and Feuille, P. (1978). 'Industrial relations: a critical analysis'. *Industrial Relations*, 17: 259–77.
- Terry, M. (2009). 'Richard Hyman: The Warwick Years'. British Journal of Industrial Relations Conference in Honour of Richard Hyman. London School of Economics & Political Science.
- Thelen, K. (2009). 'Institutional change in advanced political economies'. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 47: 471–98.
- Voskeritsian, H. (2010). *Industrial Relations in Crisis? The 'New Industrial Relations' Theory and the Field of Industrial Relations in Britain*. *Employment Relations and Organizational Behaviour*. London: London School of Economics & Political Science.
- Waddington, J. (2003). 'Trade union organization'. In P. Edwards (ed.), *Industrial Relations: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, pp. 214–56.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1929). *The Aims of Education and Other Essays*. New York: Free Press.
- Winchester, D. (1983). 'Industrial relations research in Britain'. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 21: 100–14.
- Wood, S. (1976). 'The radicalisation of industrial relations theory'. *Personnel Review*, 5: 52–7.