



The University of Sydney

AUSTRALIAN CENTRE FOR INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
RESEARCH AND TEACHING (ACIRRT)

**INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS TEACHING AND
RESEARCH: INTERNATIONAL TRENDS**

edited by Russell D. Lansbury



MONOGRAPH No. 4

Industrial Relations Teaching And Research: International Trends

edited by

Russell D. Lansbury

ACIRRT Monograph No. 4

Published December 1991

by

Australian Centre for Industrial Relations Research and Teaching (ACIRRT)
University of Sydney
NSW 2006
Australia

Tel: (02) 692 3786/3869

Fax: (02) 692 4729

ISBN 0 86758 709 1

Contents

	<i>Contents</i>	i
	<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	ii
1	Introduction <i>Russell D. Lansbury</i>	1
2	Is There a Future for the Field of Industrial Relations in the United States? <i>Peter Cappelli</i>	3
3	Commentary <i>John Niland</i>	41
4	The Rise and Fall of the Golden Ages: The British Experience of Industrial Relations Research and Teaching <i>David Winchester</i>	48
5	Commentary <i>Gill Palmer</i>	66
6	Industrial Relations Teaching and Research in New Zealand <i>Kevin Hince</i>	72
7	Commentary <i>Suzanne Jamieson</i>	101
8	Extending the Boundaries: Industrial Relations and Research and Teaching in Australia <i>Lyndal Jenkins, Russell D. Lansbury and Mark Westcott</i>	104
9	Overview <i>David H. Plowman</i>	143

Notes on the Contributors

Peter Cappelli is Associate Professor and Director of the Centre for Human Resources, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, USA

Kevin Hince is Director of the Industrial Relations Centre at the Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

Suzanne Jamieson is Lecturer in the Department of Industrial Relations, University of Sydney

Lyndal Jenkins was Research Officer, ACIRRT, University of Sydney

Russell Lansbury is Professor of Industrial Relations, University of Sydney

John Niland is Professor of Industrial Relations and Dean of the Faculty of Commerce, University of New South Wales

Gill Palmer is Professor of Management, University of Wollongong

David Plowman is Professor of Industrial Relations, University of New South Wales.

Mark Westcott is Tutor in the Department of Industrial Relations, University of Sydney

David Winchester is Senior Lecturer at the Industrial Relations Research Unit, University of Warwick, UK

1 Introduction

Russell D. Lansbury

This monograph brings together papers which review the state of research and teaching in industrial relations within the United States, Britain, New Zealand and Australia. The papers were presented at a conference organised by the Australian Centre for Industrial Relations Research and Teaching (ACIRRT) at the University of Sydney in 1991. The conference is one of a series conducted by ACIRRT to explore issues of importance to the field of industrial relations. By adopting an international perspective, the conference was able to compare the experience of Australia with that of other English speaking countries which share certain common features but have developed different institutions and processes of industrial relations. In all of the countries examined, the field of industrial relations is undergoing significant change as a result of new strategies adopted by employers, governments and trade unions. While the focus of each paper is on research and teaching in industrial relations, it is impossible to separate these issues from broader policy changes which are occurring in each country.

In most advanced industrialised countries, pressures for greater decentralisation of industrial relations and deregulation of labour markets are continuing to grow. Traditionally, the United States was considered to be the most extreme case of a decentralised industrial relations system in the English speaking world, but under the Thatcher government Britain has also followed this direction, while New Zealand has taken the most radical approach to the deregulation of industrial relations. Although Australia appeared to be an exceptional case in maintaining a high degree of centralisation through the Accord in the 1980s, it has embarked on a more rapid process of 'managed decentralism' during the 1990s.

In each of the countries examined in this volume, the union movement has experienced significant decline in its membership strength during the past decade, although the Australian unions have continued to exercise considerable influence through their relationship with the Hawke Labor government and the existence of the conciliation and arbitration system. However, the future shape of industrial relations in Australia, as in the other countries, is characterised by uncertainty.

All of the papers emphasise the importance of public policy for industrial relations research and teaching. Several of the authors and commentators express concern that the research agenda and teaching curriculum is unduly influenced by day-to-day policy matters. Yet this seems unavoidable if the subject is to retain interest and support among policy makers, practitioners and students. This is clearly a consequence of being an applied social science, although it should not preclude more theoretical research which can provide the field of industrial relations with a stronger conceptual basis. Clearly, however, the latter issue emerges as a concern in each of the papers because the legitimacy of industrial relations as an academic discipline (or interdisciplinary field of study) continues to be questioned by those in the more established and 'pure' disciplines such as economics and law.

One of the strengths of industrial relations as an academic field of study in Australia has been a willingness by researchers to extend the boundaries of the subject. Recent interest in workplace industrial relations has been assisted by the publication of the Australian Workplace Industrial Relations Survey (AWIRS), this research has been spearheaded by academics, researchers and policy analysts who recognised that the preoccupation with the arbitration system and related matters had led to a limited and distorted conception of the processes of industrial relations. It provides an example of where academics in the industrial relations field have both responded to changes in the practice of industrial relations and helped to influence the public policy debate by undertaking research which has both theoretical and practical relevance. It is also a good example of where Australian research and teaching has been enriched by adopting a comparative approach, since the AWIRS study built upon earlier projects undertaken in Britain in this field.

A number of warnings are issued in the papers concerning the need for industrial relations research to develop a distinct identity, so that is not simply perceived as a sub-branch of another discipline. It is also vital that teaching departments be further expanded in universities so that there are sufficient clusters of industrial relations academics within institutions who can develop coherent programs of study at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. This is of critical importance as other areas of study emerge, such as human resource management (HRM), which increasingly compete with industrial relations in laying claim to expertise in the study of workplace relations and other matters. In each of the countries covered in this volume, the relationship between industrial relations and human resource management is highlighted as an on-going issue of concern. Clearly, the coming decade will be one in which the field of industrial relations will either retain and expand its claims of relevance or join other areas of the social sciences which have failed to sustain public interest. The resolution of these issues will be strongly influenced by the quality of research and teaching in industrial relations at the university level.

2 Is There a Future for the Field of Industrial Relations in the United States?

Peter Cappelli

INTRODUCTION

As in most fields, the teaching of industrial relations (IR) has been driven by developments in research. In the case of the U.S., industrial relations research over the past decade has been shaped by changes in the practice of industrial relations, by the internal politics of the field (broadly defined), and by its relationship with other academic areas where it overlaps and, to some extent, competes for resources. The most important issue for the future of industrial relations in the U.S. is whether it can capture some of the audience that is currently interested in new ways of managing employees and do so in a way that is academically distinct.

Definitions

Before beginning an analysis of the state of U.S. industrial relations, it is important to define some of the labels used to identify research on employment topics in the U.S. The term "industrial relations" through the middle of the 20th century meant employment issues in industry and included all issues associated with employment. The phrase "labor relations" referred to union-management relations, and personnel referred to employment issues in non-union operations. As IR scholars focussed more and more attention on union-management relations beginning in the 1950s, the phrase "industrial relations" became associated with union-management relations, especially by those outside the field.

Labor economics, of course, refers to the economics-based analysis of individual behaviour in labor markets. Labor economists have in general not had much interest in employment situations, once workers are actually in jobs, because workers are then typically out of the labor market. Organizational behaviour (OB) is the study of the behaviour of individuals in organizations using theories

and methods from industrial and organizational psychology (I/O) and social psychology. I/O psychology in recent years has focussed on measurement issues associated with applied personnel matters, such as how to design selection tests, and most of the intellectual interest in OB has shifted toward social psychology.

The phrase, 'human resource management' gained popularity in the business community during the late 1970s, where it reflected a new approach to employment issues, is one that: (a) treated employees as an important resource in organizations and analyzed them as such, using, for example, sophisticated accounting tools (b) argued for taking the initiative in employment matters (as opposed to reacting to problems) and (c) argued that employment practices could and should be shaped to reinforce the overall goals of the organizations. Because this approach was picked up first in non-union sectors, where firms have greater latitude for making changes, it has sometimes been associated with the non-union sector.

INTERNAL ACADEMIC PRESSURES

The first set of difficulties that contemporary U.S. research in industrial relations faces began in the 1970s within the academic community. IR underwent a transformation as the underlying assumptions about how one should go about explaining industrial relations behaviour changed. Theories and explanations generated inductively and focussed at the organizational level have given way to deductive explanations generated from the social sciences and focussed on individual behaviour. As discussed elsewhere (Cappelli 1985), the reasons for this change are due in part to new methodological assumptions which have had an important influence on research, structuring both the topics chosen for study and the explanations generated.

The early years of U.S. industrial relations research were quite clearly dominated by the first approach. For example, Commons' (1909) arguments about union wage effects and market coverage, perhaps the most enduring and relevant theories in industrial relations, were generated inductively from a detailed investigation of the shoemakers' union. Studies by Perlman (1928) and others followed a similar approach.

In the decades following the war, industrial relations went through a well-documented debate concerning the goals of research and how "scientific" the approach should be (e.g., Brown, 1953; Derber, 1964). Derber (1964) argued that research in the field was transformed after WWII such that the goal of theory construction and explanation supplanted description.

Beginning about 1970, industrial relations underwent a revolution in its approach to theory construction, a revolution that began with a decline of policy issues and culminated in an academic debate over legitimacy. Strauss and Feuille (1978), Derber (1964), Dunlop (1977), and Mitchell (1982) argue that industrial relations research topics typically have followed changing policy questions. The important policy questions raised since the late sixties have been associated mainly with

legislative efforts aimed at protecting individual workers: income maintenance, safety and health, civil rights and equal employment opportunities, etc., questions that have been, for the most part, outside of the mainstream of current industrial relations research. Within the mainstream union-management interests - policy issues declined sharply, first because U.S. governments have not considered altering the basic system of industrial relations since the fifties (public sector industrial relations at the state level provides an important exception). Nor have they considered intervening to rectify problems in specific cases, being willing to let the parties work out problems themselves. For example, the use of Emergency Boards, federally-appointed arbitration panels for labor disputes affecting the public interest, have declined steadily since the 1960s, especially under Republican Administrations. Second, by the late sixties, the parties to collective bargaining had more or less learned the lessons taught by researchers in the fifties about how to deal with each other, and collective bargaining had become routine (Freedman, 1978; Kochan, 1981). Further, unions were not pushing into new areas, such as white-collar employment, and were not pursuing new issues, such as industrial democracy, which would have raised new policy questions.

With policy issues in decline, research efforts began to change. As Strauss and Feuille (1978) noted: "as many industrial relations problems became less urgent, the field's reason for existence became less clear" (p. 265). The remaining justification for research was to provide general explanations of social behaviour, using industrial relations cases as examples to test social science hypotheses. Brown (1953) explained this trend by observing that "the proving of a hypothesis . . . will always be a great temptation to the university-bred scholar of industrial relations. He wants to emulate his colleagues in the natural sciences and gain some share of their prestige in unlocking the secrets of the world" (p. 3).

Without public policy as a source of legitimacy, the field of IR was forced to define its existence in academic terms and, therefore, by academic criteria. IR found itself in competition with the rest of the social sciences in its efforts to understand employment issues. And it began to change in order to be competitive according to the social science rules. There was a general movement toward using theories from the main stream of the social sciences to explain IR phenomena and within that trend, a dramatic shift toward economics and psychology and away from sociology and political science. In part, this development may reflect the change in policy issues noted above. As policy issues shifted from problems associated with unions to problems facing workers as individuals (e.g., discrimination, safety and health), it was not surprising to find researchers looking to the individualist-based social sciences for hypotheses. These changes also have affected the approach to research in the mainstream of industrial relations where the questions do not relate to individuals.

As industrial relations scholars moved toward the application of existing social science theories, IR began to disappear first as an independent discipline and then as a unique topic area. If, for example, one's theory comes from labor economics, then the uniqueness of IR lies only in its choice of topics. And the uniqueness of IR as a topic area began to erode in the 1980s as other disciplines also began to investigate union-management issues. This was particularly true in labor

economics where faculty at Princeton, the University of Chicago, and Harvard (including the labor economics program at the National Bureau of Economic Research) began investigating empirical issues in union-management relations.

As early as the 1970s, therefore, the position of IR in the U.S. began to erode on the academic front. Without a unique set of policy topics to give it legitimacy, IR found itself in competition with other approaches for territory. There is probably no way that IR can survive as a distinct approach in a competition for territory with the social sciences where the rules for survival are set up according to the social sciences.

Changes in the Practice of IR

During the 1970s, as Strauss (1988) concludes, the field of IR in the U.S. had narrowed its focus to union-management issues, typically collective bargaining. Then in the 1980s, union-management relations declined dramatically in importance: The decline of unionized industries and new interpretations of labor laws that allowed management to pursue strategies that moved jobs away from unions sharply reduced union coverage: Union coverage fell to about 16 percent of the workforce, half its peak level of the 1950s. Reduced union organizing efforts and aggressive anti-union management tactics sharply curtailed union successes in organizing campaigns. And as economic conditions turned against them, unions found themselves making concession after concession in collective bargaining in order to save jobs. Suddenly, unions were much less of a problem for management.

As for the public, support for unions continued the steady decline since the late 1950s - indeed, may have accelerated - as unions and the high labor costs associated with them were blamed in the media for the lack of competitiveness in heavy industries. With weak bargaining positions, the unions found themselves effectively unable to strike, eliminating another interest (or concern) that the public may have had about union-management relations. By the 1980s, the explosive growth in public sector unionism had at least been rationalized into stable systems of union-management relations with far fewer conflicts, eliminating perhaps the last important public concern with unions. (It is important to note that IR academics had very significant roles in developing those public sector systems.)

Finally, the rise of "The New Industrial Relations" (*Business Week* 1981) - non-union human resource systems designed to encourage performance by meeting worker needs and reducing or perhaps diffusing workplace conflicts - provided an articulated alternative to the union-based model among the academic and policy communities. (Kochan, Katz and McKersie, 1985) describe some of these developments at length.)

Industrial relations, having narrowed its focus over the years to union-management relations and having excluding consideration of other models, suddenly had very little to say that any important constituent groups cared to hear.

Important constituents in this case are the groups with money - the public sector and the business community. Trade unions had supported the state-sponsored IR Institutes (which, in turn, provided labor education services) through lobbying efforts at the state legislatures, but as union strength declined, so did that support for the IR institutes. These developments had several important consequences for the field:

Research Funding: The U.S. Department of Labor in the past had been a major source of funds for IR research through its Bureau of Labor Management Relations. Those funds basically disappeared in the 1980s. The Bureau was able to shift to labor-management cooperative programs (joint union-management committees at the firm-level, regional union-management economic committees, etc.) and, with a name change (Bureau of Labor Management Relations and Cooperative Programs), funding was salvaged for some projects. But in many years, there has been no money for IR research. Cohen's (1990) survey of IR departments shows how government research funding has declined substantially in recent years.

Research Organizations: The Industrial Relations Research Association (IRRA) was by far the most important affiliation for academics interested in employment issues. With its historic ties to economics (it broke off from the American Economics Association [AEA] in the 1940s), the IRRA over the years maintained some interest in public policy issues other than union-management relations, such as training and manpower planning. But as the field of labor economics expanded in the 1980s, the AEA developed its own interest in these policy areas, and the IRRA was left perhaps even more concentrated on union-related issues.

The IRRA is also hampered in its ability to discuss issues in the growing HR area in part because union members in the IRRA object to sessions devoted to non-union, HR topics. Although it is hard to quantify, there is a clear sense among some faculty in IR that the WWII generation of scholars, who dominated the both the field and the IRRA as an organization almost until the 1990s, saw the traditional union-management model of employment relations as the preferred form and resisted efforts to study alternative models. They saw non-union systems, for example, not as new, emerging approaches but as the old-fashion models (e.g., "Welfare Capitalism" of the 1930s) that were tried and rejected once industrial unionism came along.

The alternative to the IRRA is the Academy of Management, the main research organization for faculty within the broad area of management in business schools. The Human Resources division within the academy traditionally focussed on personnel administration. In the 1980s, however, it changed its name (from Personnel to HR/Personnel) and rode the wave of interest associated with the "New Industrial Relations" and expanded to consider virtually all employment-related topics that operate at the level of the firm, including not only traditional topics (now growing in importance) such as compensation but also questions of employment strategies and union-management relations.

TABLE 1**Survey of Research at Institutes of Labor, Industrial Relations, and Human Resources 1989-90**

	Federal	State	Foundation	Company	Union	Total External	Total External	Percent External
Number with no \$	22	21	22	19	23	3	6	NA
Number with some \$	9	11	6	9	7	24	21	28
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	
Median	40,000	135,895	32,600	90,000	8,202	67,500	15,259	68%
Midrange	21,000	20,000	150,000	6,370	5,400	19,000	5,500	22.5/93%
	-138,636	-315,000	-75,000	-167,500	-36,000	365,581	-280,306	

The Academy has several important institutional advantages over the IRRA. First, it holds large meetings with many programs. The HR division of the Academy, for example, offers as many sessions and papers as the entire IRRA. This allows more faculty participation at the Academy. (The HR division has far fewer members than the IRRA; the entire membership of the Academy is about equal to that of the IRRA, although most members of the Academy are academics in contrast to the IRRA where most are practitioners.) Second, the Academy selects papers and sessions mainly through open competition. This is unlike the IRRA where most papers are commissioned in advance through a process that is not well understood by many members. Junior faculty in particular have complained, apparently for decades, that the IRRA sessions are dominated by a small group of senior "insiders" in the organization and that it is difficult to be selected for sessions. Third, the Academy offers a virtual "Academy Awards" of prizes for participants ("Best paper in the ... category," "Life-time achievement awards," etc.) that help participants gain recognition. As a result, the participation of faculty in the IR/HR area has shifted sharply to the Academy; the HR division is now the largest division in the Academy, and many IR scholars now also participate in Academy proceedings. Partly as a result, the arena for hiring new faculty has shifted from the IRRA meetings to the Academy.

The IRRA has responded to some of the specific concerns above by establishing a series of committees and issuing reports for change. It is important to remember, however, that a majority of the IRRA membership are non-academics with little interest in these issues. The local chapters, for example, generally have few academic members. And the IRRA has institutional mechanisms to guarantee participation of non-academics (informal requirements to rotate the Presidency from academic to management and union representatives, to include practitioners in most sessions, etc.). The initial response of the IRRA membership was to deny that there were any problems, but some reforms have been instituted in the past two years which increase access to IRRA programs at the Spring and Annual Winter meetings. There has been no real increase in HR topics, however, which continue to be limited to one session out of a typical program of 25 sessions at the Winter meeting.

Shifting Emphasis Within Departments

The most important consequence of the academic and policy changes noted above have been in the changing distribution of faculty positions. Given the above changes, it is not surprising that the field of IR should have lost faculty positions. But there is a huge variation in the fortunes of IR across schools that is explained mainly by the organizational structure of the departments where IR is housed. Briefly, those schools where IR operated out of self-standing Institutes, bringing together faculty with IR interests from a range of fields, have suffered almost complete devastation. Those schools with specific faculty lines assigned to IR have in general fared better. And within the latter group, those schools that had senior faculty in IR positions at the time of this transition were in a position to protect the IR area and ensure replacements.

One issue affecting the dramatic decline of IR as an academic field is because of demographics. Opportunities for changing the direction of a faculty, particularly a tenured faculty, occur mainly when there are retirements. Because IR exploded on the academic scene immediately after WWII, a great many faculty positions were filled then. This cohort of scholars approached retirement at roughly the same time - the 1980s, the period when IR was most vulnerable. So the opportunities for change were greatest right at the point where the pressures for change were also greatest. And because this cohort occupied a great many of the faculty jobs in IR, there were relatively few vacancies, and therefore few hires, in the period before the 1980s. As a result, there were relatively few IR faculty in the 30 to 60 year age cohort, the group that typically dominates the research and political life of academic organizations.

It might be useful to outline some of the changes in IR faculty school-by-school to illustrate how these characteristics affected the transition:

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS INSTITUTES

Virtually all IR institutes are funded by state legislatures and are housed at state universities. IR programs and the institutes that support them took their modern form after WWII when the wave of strikes drew the attention of public policy makers to search for the causes of industrial peace. The IR institutes, which were housed mainly in state universities in industrial states (New York, California, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota) remain the centres for IR), promised that an understanding of unions and labor relations could help reduce industrial conflict.

Institutes without Dedicated Faculty Lines

These institutes draw faculty with IR interests from many departments on a part-time or research basis. They do not have the power to hire their own faculty.

Berkeley Arguably the premier IR school in the 1950s and early 1960s and home of an important journal (*Industrial Relations*), IR at Berkeley operated from a free-standing institute where faculty from several disciplines participated in funded research. The Institute of Industrial Relations at Berkeley provided research funds to faculty working in IR area mainly from economics and other disciplines. But the Institute had no control over hiring. As IR became more focussed on union issues and the disciplines moved to their own agendas, departments like economics replaced retiring IR-oriented faculty with discipline-oriented faculty such as labor economists. Berkeley has not hired a faculty member with strong IR interests (let alone anyone directly in IR) in about 15 years, and the field is now virtually dead at Berkeley.

Wisconsin The premier IR school before WWII and perhaps again in the 1970s (at least as judged by its PhDs), the Industrial Relations Research Institute at Wisconsin was organized much as Berkeley and began to suffer a very similar

fate. The disciplines were no longer interested in hiring faculty with IR orientations, and the Institute did not have enough influence on any given hire to determine its outcome. In the early 1980s, however, it became clear to the University that the long tradition of IR at Wisconsin was about to disappear completely, and it took the unusual step of creating several faculty lines in the Institute. That is, the appointments were now in the Institute. With these new appointments, IR at Wisconsin has at least stemmed the tide of decline.

Institutes with Dedicated Faculty Lines

These institutes and schools have the power to hire and tenure their own faculty.

Cornell The Industrial and Labor Relations School at Cornell has been described as "the mother church" of industrial relations. It has some 50 academic faculty lines, an extensive labor education and extension faculty, and the most important journal in the U.S. (*Industrial and Labor Relations Review*). The ILR School has seen its budget cut in recent years and will probably have to shrink somewhat in the 1990s. There has also been some shift away from faculty with IR degrees and mainstream IR interests toward discipline-oriented degrees and human resource interests and some success in raising corporate funds for that shift. But generally, Cornell has preserved IR as an area.

Illinois Certainly one of the dominant programs in the 1980s (especially in terms of its PhDs), the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations at Illinois had a mix of dedicated faculty lines and joint appointments with discipline-based departments. Illinois pulled in some of its resources associated with joint appointments and shifted faculty from union-management issues to human resources. Although its budget has been cut in recent years, Illinois has survived the transformation of IR better than perhaps any other institute.

Rutgers The IR program at Rutgers has arguably improved more in the 1980s than any other. It had perhaps more active faculty below the WWII retirement-age cohort in the 1980s than any other Institute and was able to replace those lines when retirements came. Rutgers has clearly moved toward more discipline-oriented faculty but may still have more faculty with mainstream IR interests and orientations than any other school in the country. Rutgers achieved this in part by converting labor education faculty positions to regular academic positions.

Business Schools

The other important location for IR faculty is in business schools. Because resources have in general flowed to these schools in the 1980s, the "action" in terms of hiring and research in IR has generally shifted from the institutes to the business schools. Although IR groups in business schools are allocated lines, it is always possible to re-locate those lines across groups depending not only on perceived need (teaching demands, external constituent interests) but also on institutional politics.

Chicago The Industrial Relations faculty at the University of Chicago's School of Business was the pre-eminent IR faculty in the U.S. in the mid 1960s. With the departure of influential senior faculty (George Schultz and Arnold Webber to the government; Bob McKersie to Cornell), there was no one with enough influence to protect the vacant IR lines. The strong economics presence at Chicago grabbed the vacant lines in the 1970s and transformed the department to a labor economics group. There are no faculty with IR or even HR interests left at Chicago.

Wharton The IR group at the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania suffered perhaps more from demographic imbalance than at any other school. At one time, the 40-person Department of Industry (now the Management Department) was dominated by the IR group who saw employment issues only in union-management terms. Discipline-based approaches (behavioural and economics) were rejected as was personnel as a topic. With the rise in discipline-based approaches, of HR, and the decline of interest in union-management problems, the WWII cohort lost influence in the school. IR faculty lines were transferred to other groups, mainly Organizational Behaviour, and the IR group is now roughly half its former size.

Columbia The IR group at Columbia Business School had senior scholars in positions of influence in the 1980s when the transformation of IR began. They were able to replace the retiring generation of IR faculty and to capture some of the resources associated with HR. While hiring at Columbia is controlled by the group, tenure is a University-wide process influenced by disciplinary departments such as economics and sociology. Recently, the IR group there has run into resistance from faculty in these departments who believe that IR is simply a topic area, not a field. They have resisted tenuring IR faculty unless they pass muster in a discipline, and this appears to have crippled Columbia's IR group.

MIT The IR Department at MIT's Sloan School is the great success story of the 1980s. It received a transfusion of senior IR faculty (from Cornell) in 1980 just before the transformation in IR. MIT has been able to retain all its IR lines and to capture interest in HR areas with an IR approach.

Harvard The Harvard Business School (HBS) also experienced the retirement problems associated with the WWII cohort, but given the very applied nature of HBS, it was impossible to abandon the study of employment issues. Instead, HBS now has a mix of faculty working on IR topics and those working on HR topics. Indeed, HBS may be the school most tolerant of traditional IR research methods (case studies, inductive techniques, sensitivity to institutions) and has done the most to advance a new HR curriculum (see below).

IR TEACHING PROGRAMS

Caples (1958) surveyed education programs at the IR institutes in these early years, and they look surprisingly familiar now. Labor relations dominated most programs, although some also pursued personnel administration.

Rezler (1967) surveyed IR programs in the late 1960s to see their relationship with their host institutions, and Krislov and Mead (1987) updated his survey in the mid 1980s. There has been a significant growth in the number of programs (from 47 to 77), although 24 of those programs reported annual budgets below \$100,000, suggesting that their functions may be minimal. The programs have migrated away from regular academic departments toward independent institutes; there was a sharp move away from affiliation with university extension departments. The programs have also shifted sharply toward degree programs (32 percent to 67 percent). Most importantly, 75 percent reported a shift in their emphasis from labor relations to human resources.

The University Council of Industrial Relations and Human Resources Programs conducted a survey of its 45 member institutions which grant graduate (masters and above) degrees in 1988. While there are something like 110 IR or HR college-level teaching programs, these 45 are clearly the largest and most important ones. Table 2 from Wheeler (1989) reports the required courses in these programs.

As Wheeler (1988) notes, 60 percent of the programs require collective bargaining, organizational behaviour, and personnel; 50 percent also require labor economics; 75 percent of the programs require a basic statistics course and 58 percent a course in research methods. Dispute settlement/arbitration is the most widely available elective.

Begin (1988) reports (from what appears to be a different survey of IR programs) that enrolments and student quality have fluctuated somewhat over the 1980s but have generally remained stable. Virtually all of the programs reported that there was a shift in their emphasis underway from labor relations to HR issues: ten of the 25 programs represented at a recent meeting of IR centre directors reported that they have either changed their names or are planning to make a change that will signify greater involvement in HR. Franke (1987) reports that at Illinois, the proportion of students with undergraduate backgrounds in economics dropped from about one in three to one in ten during the 1980s while the proportion with degrees in psychology rose from one in ten to one in four. Enrollment in union-management elective courses dropped rapidly in the 1980s, and that decline was matched by a proportionate rise in personnel electives over the same period. Perhaps the most worrying trend, reported at Illinois and by respondents to Begin's survey, is the decline in Ph.D students in the IR area. While there is a similar decline among many U.S. Ph.D programs (see Bowen and Schuster 1986), it is important because the characteristics of the next generation of professors will shape the direction of the IR/HR area in the future, and these professors may not come from IR backgrounds.

IRRA 41st ANNUAL PROCEEDINGS

TABLE 2

**Percentage of Master's Degree Programs in Industrial Relations/Human Resources
Requiring Selected Courses^a**

Course	All Programs	Overall ^b	US Programs IR ^c	HR ^d
Labor Relations/Collective Bargaining	75	92	88	100
Organisational Behaviour	47	58	56	60
Human Resource Management/ Personnel	72	77	63	100
Labor Economics/Markets	58	77	75	80
IR Systems/theory	39	38	50	20
Labor or Employment Law	47	54	44	70
General Business	31	27	6	60
Number of Programs	36	26	16	10

^a Courses selected are the substantive courses most frequently required, N>10

^b Does not include MBA or Labor Studies Programs

^c Programs without terms Personnel, Human Resources or Employment Relations in title

^d Programs with term Personnel, Human Resources or Employment Relations in title

Labor Education

Labor education in the U.S. refers to the teaching of IR directed primarily for those who will serve trade unions. Certainly, any graduate of a regular university IR program has the basic skills needed to work in a trade union. While there are some specific issues associated with working for a union (compliance with union-specific legislation such as the Landrum-Griffin act, running organizing campaigns, etc.), labor education exists in the U.S. primarily because trade unions have not hired university graduates of IR programs. Instead, members of the union themselves tend to staff administrative positions. Labor education, therefore, is typically extension education provided on a part-time basis to union officials.

It is interesting to see how labor education has evolved into a separate field driven largely by pressures from the broader academic community. The University and College Labor Education Association represents 51 schools with labor education programs and dates back to 1946, the post-war foundation of modern IR in the U.S. Early programs tended to draw faculty from the ranks of the trade unions and to teach very practical, applied courses. Faculty did little research. Nash (1978) describes labor educators in this period as crusaders for ideological issues or union establishment types; those with more academic orientations were not as accepted by the trade union audience.

Most labor education programs are part of IR institutes, in turn part of large, research-driven, public universities, and the values of those universities inevitably came to labor education. What Marrone (1989) and others refer to as the academization of labor education in the past decade included the establishment of a refereed journal (*Labor Studies Journal*), the hiring of degreed faculty, typically with PhDs, and promotion to tenure based in part on research. A recent survey of labor education programs (see Clark and Gray 1989) found that 39 percent hold doctorate degrees and that most are engaged in research. The tension between this new, more academic role and the traditional demands of serving trade unions is causing problems on many campuses, however. As Seeber (1990) notes, labor education faculty also find themselves as advocates for unions and the union-based system of industrial relations. This is in contrast to regular IR faculty who typically have a more detached view of developments in the real world. One reason for this advocacy might be that these University labor education programs compete for students with similar programs run by trade unions - especially the AFL-CIO's programs run through the George Meany Labor Studies Institute.

In terms of the courses themselves, Friedman (1989) finds that collective bargaining forms the basis of labor education programs and that public sector collective bargaining is perhaps the most popular elective. Other required courses are labor history, labor law (that is, union-management law), and a research methods course. Industry-specific courses in collective bargaining, organizational behaviour, labor economics, and a mix of practical (government of unions, occupational safety and health) and more academic (industrial sociology, economic history) courses round out the electives.

Overall, the programs in IR departments and institutes do not seem to have changed all that much over the 1980s. Despite the revolution in IR practice, IR programs appear to be a remarkably similar, albeit often smaller, version of their former selves.

WHAT'S IN THE COURSES?

The discussion about industrial relations and human resource courses is often a discussion about changes in form rather than substance: As noted above, many programs and courses have dropped the words "Industrial Relations" and replaced them with "Human Resources," yet it is not clear whether the actual material in them has changed.

It is helpful, therefore, to look within courses to see what is actually being taught. Schwindt (1990) offers a collection of reading lists for IR courses across the U.S. and Canada. Perhaps the most striking thing about these reading lists is the considerable variance across them. There are, of course, some general themes. Courses on union-management or labor relations may be the most common single category of courses; 11 of the 38 courses described fall into this category. For the most part, these courses rely on labor economics for their explanations. Remarkably few have any significant discussion of employment law, a surprise given that labor law provides most of the framework for union-management issues in the U.S. Most discuss empirical issues such as the size of union wage premiums.

The variance in union-management courses seems to turn largely on the nature of the institutions where they are taught. IR institutes are typically located in state universities which are sensitive to the needs and interests of legislatures. Because unions have influence on legislative agendas and budgets, IR institutes tend to be more concerned in their teaching about the interests of unions. For example, institutes often have courses in union administration, labor education programs, and certainly courses in public sector labor relations. In general, however, these institutes are more free from the influence of constituents than business schools - budgets tend to have a fair amount of inertia - and the institutes are more or less free to carry on teaching as they have always done. IR courses in institutes tend to have the least variance and to focus on traditional research topics in labor relations. The most common themes include: The mechanics of collective bargaining, strikes, grievance procedures, and public sector industrial relations.

Business schools, on the other hand, need to be more sensitive to the interests of their constituents in part because they often compete with each other for resources (e.g. from corporate donors) and because the interests of those constituents may change considerably over time. Because IR must compete with other courses for attention in a business curriculum, it may be under more pressure to prove that it is contemporary and relevant, so courses in labor relations tend to have more cases and to illustrate themes with current union-management examples. Union-management cooperation, often in the context of quality of worklife programs, may be a somewhat more common theme in business school IR courses, for

example. There is also a tendency for IR courses in business schools to have comparative sections describing IR systems in other countries - typically Germany and Japan.

The next most common courses are called "Human resources management" - seven out of 38. The most common of these courses are personnel systems courses which seem to parallel union-management courses for the non-union sector. Typical themes include selection, staffing, training, and compensation. Such courses typically offer descriptive rather than conceptual material.

The next most common group - four out of the 38 - are courses with both IR and human resources in the title. In some ways these courses are the most interesting of all because they actually try to merge material on managing in the union and non-union sectors around some coherent themes. Typically, the courses suggest that union and non-union are simply two variants of the common problem of managing employees. Most of the problems of managing people, such as creating motivation, setting norms for performance, reinforcing desired outcomes, have to be accomplished in either setting. These courses are much more likely to rely on organizational behaviour for their arguments and to use more of that literature even than many of the straight human resources courses (which have a personnel orientation). Topics such as organizational culture, employee participation, and employee commitment are typically discussed in these courses. Many of these courses borrow rather heavily from the human resource course developed at the Harvard Business School (see below).

The remaining courses described in Schwindt (1990) represent a series of special topics including industrial relations systems (typically PhD seminars in union-management areas), labor economics (which usually contains sections on union issues), comparative IR systems, and personnel sub-topics such as compensation, training and development, and career management. These courses are typically taught at IR institutes where there are enough students with specialized interests to support that amount of detail.

In contrast to IR programs, which appear to have changed little, IR courses in the 1990s at least seem to have increased in variance: Many remain largely untouched by the transformation in practice, but have at least attempted to address the new realities of contemporary IR practice in the U.S.

The Harvard Human Resources Course

If the teaching of IR in the U.S. is to undergo anything like a transformation, it will have begun in the early 1980s at the Harvard Business School. Until that point, the teaching of IR, broadly defined, revolved either around courses in personnel or courses in labor relations, and both sets focussed on training and developing personnel and labor relations specialists. Relatively little of the teaching was directed at more general managerial functions. The implicit assumption was that general managers didn't need to know much about human resources and industrial relations because this was an area for specialists.

IR and HR were seen as specialist topics because they did not seem to relate in any way to the other functions of management. In particular, there were no perceived links between the business strategies that firms pursued in their product markets and their approaches to managing their employees. This view was tied up with the assumption that there were not many options or choices for managing employees. This was most notably the case in the union sector where unions were seen as setting the agenda, and management simply managed the union demands: Even in the non-union sector, the goal was seen as simply complying with government regulations and meeting market tests for competition.

Yet there were also examples of firms that were taking a different approach to managing employees. General Motors, for example, perhaps the epitome of the stable, unionized employer, began pursuing a "Southern Strategy" of moving plants to the non-union south of the U.S., developing more flexible work systems there, and then attempting to transfer those systems to its union subsidiaries. Companies like Hewlett Packard used innovative employment practices to retain key employees at a time when other hi-tech companies saw new firms and tight labor markets emptying their corridors. People Express, a wildly successful new airline (at least initially), built its whole business strategy of low cost operations around a flexible work system where self-supervising workers eliminated much of the need for management, and profit sharing and stock ownership plans helped keep current compensation levels down.

By 1980, there were enough of these firms, especially among the more successful companies, to suggest that human resources could be different. *Business Week* (1981) trumpeted the "new" human resources at innovative firms like the above. The key elements of this new approach were first, that there were options for managing unions and employees and that it was possible to do more than simply react to external pressures. Second, that the options for managing employees could be aligned to reinforce the choices of basic business strategy, presumably leading to higher performance. And finally, that these options were not the preserve of specialists but should be undertaken at the highest levels of the organization.

The faculty at the Harvard Business School introduced a new course in human resources in 1981 that incorporated at least part of these principles. It was the first new course required of all students in 20 years. The course has several notable themes. For the purposes here, perhaps most notable is that it organizes its material without drawing sharp distinctions between union and non-union employment systems. Unionization is simply one model of employee influence. A second notable theme is that most of the issues associated with IR and HR are combined into four topics:

Employee influence: The course refers to unions and to employees as one set of "stakeholders" who have claims on the organization, much as stockholders. It considers a range of methods through which employees might exert influence on the organization - U.S.-style unions, co-determination systems, government legislation, etc.

Human Resources Flow: This refers to selection, staffing, and career development issues and addresses general themes such as employment security.

Reward Systems: This section concerns both pecuniary and non-pecuniary rewards as ways of reinforcing and changing employee behaviour.

Work Systems: Both individual-level job design and organizational design issues are examined in this section of the course.

The material in each section discusses the options available and the trade-offs demanded by such choices - for example, the improved motivation and retention of employee security programs versus the rise in fixed labor costs. Toward the end of the course, there is an effort to consider the choices in these four areas in the context of overall business goals.

There are also limitations to this approach. One is that it still excludes important issues associated with managing employees, perhaps more heavily on the behavioural side. These include the role of leadership, organizational culture, the socialization of employees, etc. There is also little guidance as to how managers should make choices among the various trade-offs. While there are obvious polar cases where the relationships between business goals and IR and HR practices fit neatly together, it is less obvious what should be done in the majority of intermediary situations.

OTHER TEACHING ISSUES

Microcomputers in Industrial Relations Teaching

The single development that has received the most attention in discussions of the teaching of IR has been the use of microcomputers in the classroom. A review of the discussions concerning this development suggests that this attention is entirely misplaced. Microcomputers add no new ideas, arguments, concepts, or even illustrations to the classroom. In general, they simply provide a means for making the calculations involved in some of the more practical and mundane issues of IR and HR.

A good deal of the interest in microcomputers has been generated by grants from IBM to IR institutes. IBM contributed computers and related support materials to the institutes to help stimulate the development of software for HR issues. In some cases, the schools had explicit joint projects with IBM (see Boudreau 1989 for an example). And, in many cases, faculty have incorporated the use of computers directly in the classroom.

What can one do with microcomputers in IR and HR? Micros run software, and software mainly calculates numbers. The software being used in IR and HR classrooms falls into the following categories (Moore, 1989 describes these packages in more detail):

Data-base management systems for employee records These can be used for manpower planning and calculating reports for government requirements (e.g., on meeting affirmative action guide-lines).

Costing labor contracts These are basically spread-sheet programs. The hard part of costs contracts, of course, is interpreting contractual language and assigning cost items to the appropriate categories, and the software gives little help in these areas.

Compensation programs generate pay structures from appropriate information about jobs and wages. This is perhaps the most useful HR software precisely because compensation structures often require a great many calculations (maintaining relations between pay grades, e.g.). But as any compensation expert will attest, the hardest part about designing a pay system is managing trade-offs - raising pay for job A where the labor market is tight creates a pay compression problem with job B - and the software cannot help in making those judgements.

Negotiations exercises (see Wheeler and Klaas, 1989 for an example). Software is available to allow students to get practice in negotiations by negotiating against a computer program. The problem in teaching negotiations, however, is to provide students with realistic practice, and that means negotiating against real people. Such software is wildly inferior to role playing as a learning device.

What using micros in IR and HR teaching really mean, therefore, is teaching students how to run HR-oriented software. The software is directed at what are ultimately low-level, accounting-type problems associated with low-level personnel or IR-specialist jobs, not the kind of positions to which university graduates would aspire. Further, there is absolutely no consensus as to whether software will become dominant in these areas, and if so, which brand of software the specialists will use. So far, IR and HR software seems mainly to have been developed by faculty for use in their courses. What if a student takes a course where they learn manpower planning software 'A' and they take a job with a firm using manpower planning software 'B.' It would be unfair to suggest that their learning was entirely wasted, but can one be sure that there is enough carryover to make the class worthwhile?

Given the rather fundamental problems that IR and HR have in the U.S. in establishing academic legitimacy and maintaining relevance, it seems rather incredible that so much attention has been devoted to exploring the possibilities of microcomputers which ultimately provide nothing more than calculations. Learning to operate software is something that might best be left to employers and vendors.

No doubt much of this attention is simply a passing fascination. We have now had ten years of microcomputers in U.S. colleges and universities. Word processing has become a standard practice as has the use of spreadsheets in the accounting area, but beyond that, the introduction of microcomputers has failed to transform higher education in the U.S.

The teaching of statistics provides a good analogy for the ultimate impact that software might have on IR and HR teaching. The area where computers have had their most important effects is arguably in making the calculations required in applied statistics. Yet one does not see regular university courses in statistics departments concerning the operation of statistical software; most statistics courses do not use the software at all, and those that do are applied courses where the software is made part of outside class exercises, simply as a way to illustrate calculations.

International and Comparative Industrial Relations:

Discussions about the economy in the U.S. in the 1980s are dominated by the theme of a "global" economy, a theme which suggests not only growing competition from abroad but also the possibility of operating businesses on a global basis; both customers and suppliers can be international now. What this means for the teaching of management, specifically the management of people and employment issues, is not yet clear. Does this mean, for example, that students should simply understand how systems in different countries operate (a descriptive approach); should they learn something both general and systematic about issues such as employment by through a study of other systems (a comparative approach); or is there something fundamentally different about how organizations and employment should be managed when the context becomes international? No consensus has yet emerged in the U.S. Indeed, it is not even clear what, if anything, changes about management when the context is global.

Nevertheless, the need to pay at least lip service to globalization is an important factor in most programs. This interest also represents an important opportunity for IR programs where the study of comparative/international employment systems is clearly one of the foundations of any study of global management.

Adams (1990) surveys comparative IR courses in many countries and concludes a) that such courses are more popular outside the U.S. than inside b) are perhaps more popular in business schools than in IR institutes c) may not have increased overall in the U.S. as compared to the 1960s. The studies that associated with *Industrialism and Industrial Man* (Kerr et al., 1964) in the 1960s focussed attention on comparative IR issues at a time when both the U.S. economy and the U.S. model of IR appeared to be dominant. The decline in research on comparative issues since then has no doubt contributed to the most serious problem in teaching comparative IR and the lack of faculty who know anything about it. Teaching comparative topics requires a tremendous investment in learning the institutional details of different systems, and it is not a good bet for faculty who must establish their careers within the confines of a very short tenure clock.

Anecdotal experience suggests that comparative IR courses are popular with students, are seen as relevant by constituents, and provide an important direction for future IR teaching. Most IR programs in the U.S., however, have been

searching for years with very little success for new faculty able to teach comparative courses - a growing problem as the WWII generation of faculty who often had comparative interests retires. The constraint in this area is clearly on the supply side, and the decline of Ph.D students in industrial relations should only make that constraint worse.

IS THERE A WAY FORWARD?

The field of IR in the U.S. clearly faces a number of difficulties. The traditional analysis of union-management relations may still be important enough in practice to sustain a small field, especially at large universities. But even then, it must be housed somewhere, and without IR departments to hire scholars and a vigorous external research community to promote scholarship (and help tenure faculty), it may be difficult to sustain any field at all.

The first problem, then, is whether IR can define for itself a unique approach - something like a discipline - that would be distinct from other fields that also do research on employment issues. The most important of these are labor economics and organizational behaviour. As economists continue to expand their research into issues associated with unions and as scholars in organizational studies explore new issues concerning employment relations, industrial relations is losing a unique set of topics and will increasingly be challenged to define its uniqueness in other ways.

There appear to be ways for IR to define both an identity and a distinct set of topics. These options are available largely because labor economics and OB have in many ways even worse internal problems than IR, problems that have kept them from exploring many of the most interesting issues in the area of employment.

The Arguments Behind Organizational Behaviour (OB) and Economics Research

With its roots in industrial and organizational psychology, OB research continues the psychologist's tradition of using the individual as the unit of analysis, and it has a long history of research on topics that address the attitudes and behaviour of workers. Indeed, Staw (1984) suggests that topics such as absenteeism, turnover, and job attitudes constitute the core of OB interests. Most OB research relies on explanations that reside within the individual characteristics of personalities or other dispositions to act in given ways that are intrinsic to a given worker or aspects of a worker's situation such as demographic characteristics, etc. Objective information about the context in which employees work such as characteristics, or their labor markets, are typically considered, if at all, only through the perceptions of individual workers.

This cognitive approach and its focus on perceptions represent the most important reason why OB has found it increasingly difficult to address the external

environment. In such models, as Ilgen and Klein (1989, p. 329) conclude, "the nature of the environment to which the individual responds is at least partially constructed by that individual." And it is not a great leap to suggest that objective accounts of the environment are therefore irrelevant. As Steiner (1986) notes, it is now rarely the case that research includes data from anything but participating observers - that is, data in the form of perceptions. It is easy to see how the rise in OB of even implicit aspects of this cognitive paradigm could lead to a sharp reduction in concern with the external environment in OB research. If individuals construct their own images of the environment, then why bother with the objective environment? The gradual rise of this paradigm in OB, documented by Ilgen and Klein (1989), coincides closely with the gradual erosion in the role for context in OB research.

Economics also focuses on the behaviour of individuals as its unit of analysis, and a sizable portion of the history of economic thought has been devoted to issues associated with employment. The important difference with OB research, however, is that the explanations for individual behaviour focus explicitly on factors external to the individual. While economists acknowledge that preferences and tastes may differ, those differences are assumed away rather than examined. Instead, explanations centre on the relationship that individuals have to the labor market, and the behaviour of employees is explained by characteristics of, and conditions in, their respective labor markets. Because workers maintain a relationship with the labor market external to their employers, changes in that external labor market affect their behaviour even within their current employment. We can illustrate the differences in economic and OB approaches to employment issues by examining how they treat topics addressed in both fields; absenteeism and turnover. Individual-level employee behaviours, like absenteeism and turnover, are the focus of the contemporary human resources concern.

Absenteeism

Traditional studies of work attendance in OB examine it as a form of withdrawal behaviour. Perhaps the most comprehensive model is by Steers and Rhodes (1978) who consider attendance as a function of ability and motivation to attend where the latter is driven by attitudes such as job satisfaction and to a lesser extent organizational commitment (Mowday, Porter, and Steers 1982). Personal characteristics (Ilgen and Hollenback 1977) and characteristics of the job (Garrison and Muchinsky 1977) are sometimes considered, although as Clegg's (1983) survey makes clear, these considerations appear rarely, and when they do are not examined *per se* but are typically used as control variables.

Studies such as Morgan and Herman (1976), which examine how potential costs of absenteeism might affect attendance, and Staw and Oldham (1978), which consider the potential benefits for the worker of absenteeism, see the process as a rational decision where individuals weigh the costs and benefits of being absent. This development is important because the factors that affect the costs and benefits of an individuals' decision on any issue, including whether to attend work

or not, may include factors from the totality of their experiences and are certainly not limited to considerations within the confines of the work place. The Staw and Oldham (1978) argument relies on the match between worker and job characteristics, implying the need to examine the selection process through which workers enter from the outside, an issue we examine below. But so far, efforts to examine these costs and benefits have been limited to such things as demands from non-work activity (Chadwick-Jones et al., 1973). The failure to pursue these external environment factors is consistent with the critique made by Clegg (1983) of this literature and stands in the way of efforts to explore the rational decision approach to absenteeism.

Economists also pursue a rational decision approach to absenteeism but focus more narrowly on the potential costs associated with being caught and dismissed; costs reflected in the opportunities for alternative work. Taylor (1979) attributes the decline in absenteeism in the late 1970s to rising unemployment and reduced opportunities for alternative jobs. Leigh (1985) finds that for a national sample, absenteeism is lower when unemployment rates are higher. He finds this due not only to the fact that those laid off when unemployment rises tend to be those with higher absenteeism, an artifact, but also that those who remain employed reduce their absenteeism. Allen (1981) finds that absenteeism is lower where wages are higher and for older workers. Cappelli (1989) also finds that absenteeism is lower at plants within the same firm where wage premiums over the outside market are higher and where a greater proportion of workers are on layoff. Winkler (1980) and Jacobson (1989) find that absenteeism is higher where pay is not lost and lower where bonuses are paid for better attendance.

Turnover

Because much of the OB research on turnover has its roots in the rational individual decision-making approach associated with March and Simon (1958), it is closer in argument and spirit to the economics approach than is perhaps any other issue in organizational behaviour. Mobley's (1982) account of the development of OB theories of turnover shows that over time these theories have not only grown more complex but systematically reduced the role for the external environment. Steers and Mowday (1981) survey 1,000 or more turnover studies and find them focussed primarily on job attitudes, presenting some evidence for the role of personal characteristics, but generally ignoring information about external issues. Similarly, Clegg's (1983) survey found no behavioural studies that examined labor markets or the context in which employment takes place. Most of these studies are similar to absenteeism in looking for association between attitudes toward one's current job and turnover.

In contrast, economic studies of turnover focus explicitly on the situation in the outside labor market and the opportunities for movement. For example, even more so than with absenteeism, the quit rate varies directly with the business cycle; it was high in the 1960s when labor markets were tight and then dropped off substantially with the recessions in the 1970s. This is true in other countries as well (Jones and Martin, 1986). As Akerlof, Rose, and Yellen (1988) argue, one

reason for this is that as some workers leave for better jobs as the economy is expanding, they create vacancies - a "vacancy chain" - which then creates opportunities for other workers to switch jobs. Price (1977) finds that the strongest and most consistent predictor of firm-level turnover appears to be the wage level; higher wages and increases in wages (other things equal) reduce turnover; more recent studies continue to support this conclusion (Antel, 1988). Perhaps the second strongest and most consistent predictor of individual turnover in Price's survey is with opportunities elsewhere.

The general themes of these approaches should be clear. Both have important problems, however. Not only do empirical results in both fields demonstrate that the other is omitting important aspects of the explanation for worker attitudes and behaviour, but there is a very important, practical drawback common to both approaches. While it is in some ways useful for organizations to know that absenteeism will decline in a recession and that some workers have dispositions to be absent more, it is much more useful to understand how their organizational characteristics, policies, and practices affect individual attitudes and behaviour.

Studies using organizational-level explanations in OB are rare, and they tend to be raw empiricism with little theoretical guidance, as Rousseau (1985) argues. Examples of efforts in economics to examine the effects of organizations on individual employer attitudes and behaviours are sometimes described as "the new institutional economics" because like the John R. Commons' generation of institutional economists, their concern is with the institutions of market economies. These studies bring to that analysis well-established, a priori explanations from neoclassical economics which focus almost entirely on incentives as a mechanism and compensation as the administering device.

The Middle Road of Industrial Relations

The behaviour of individuals (as opposed to organizations like unions) is the important, applied employment topic for the future in the U.S., and both OB and labor economics should be able to claim that topic. This is especially so for OB where the focus has been on workers in their jobs (in contrast to economics) and with the range of job attitudes and behaviours at work. But following the lead of psychology, OB has largely divorced itself from looking at explanations of these behaviours and attitudes that are of any relevance to decision makers. This is because OB is unwilling to look at organizational practices as explanations. As a result, it is more likely to be labor economics than OB that provides the major competition for territory in the employment area.

Industrial relations has long shared with economics a concern with the environment external to individuals and organizations but cast its net more broadly to examine not only the effects of markets (product as well as labor) but other aspects of the environment such as social attitudes, the legal and regulatory structure, the state of technology, etc. (see Dunlop, 1957 for the seminal taxonomy). From its roots in institutional economics, industrial relations has also focussed on employment institutions, many of which operate at the organizational

level between individuals and markets. Institutions such as unions, internal labor markets, and employment policies moderate and change the influence of markets.

But there is a growing body of research suggesting relationships between these institutions and individual behaviour. Perhaps the best examples are Freeman and Medoff's (1984) research showing how union membership provides "voice" as an alternative to quitting; Dalton and Perry (1981) find that relationships between labor and management, expressed in collective bargaining agreements, can have a strong effect on absenteeism by creating norms (e.g., acceptable levels of absence). Quit rates vary widely by industry and by job, reflecting characteristics of the work and labor markets and employment relationships (see Stoikov and Raimon 1968; Price 1977 for a survey). Construction jobs have among the highest quit rates because the craft labor market creates workers with interchangeable skills, and hiring halls make it possible to swap jobs and workers; government employment has the lowest quit rate not only because of large pensions which encourage attachment (see Ippolito, 1987 below) but because of the nature of the relationship which makes the demands and rewards from work very stable. Quit rates are also very low in Japan compared to the U.S. not only because of cultural differences but also because of labor market institutions which help tie workers to their firms (Taira, 1970).

Labor economics, not OB or even IR, has so far made the most extensive use of arguments explaining employee behaviour based on institutions. These arguments invariably examine compensation systems to see how they create incentives that shape employee behaviour (bonus plans, etc: See the articles in the special issue of *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 1990 for examples). But it is difficult to see labor economics looking beyond incentives as an explanation or even compensation as a mechanism for examining employee behaviour and attitudes, and that will certainly limit its influence.

The demand for research will be to link these organizational issues to a wider range of individual responses currently examined within OB research, such as worker attitudes. Certainly one of the more important roles for institutions such as unions, internal labor markets, and employment policies more broadly defined is to buffer and moderate not only the economic environment but also the social environment in order to change the values and attitudes that workers hold toward their jobs and their organizations. (The best examples of these buffering effects are in facilities that are trying to adopt non-traditional work attitudes, such as the Japanese firms operating in the U.S. or "greenfield" plants trying to remain non-union.) There are clear reasons for believing that employment institutions should affect worker attitudes and values, and this is an area that industrial relations should pursue.

We know, for example, that unions can play a direct role in shaping employee responses. Cappelli and Sherer (1988) find that the extent to which workers received their information about employment issues from the union was inversely related to satisfaction. As Mills (1948) argues, unions exist to channel discontent and use it (along with the threat of strikes driven by it) to secure changes from

management. They can manage dissatisfaction not only by pointing out existing problems but, more importantly, by shaping comparisons and expectations.

We also know that commitment to organizations can be affected by employment policies. Salancik (1977) explains how commitment is increased by reducing opportunities to leave. Policies that increase organization-specific skills tie the worker more closely to the organization, making it difficult to leave by reducing the fit between the worker's skills and the demands of the jobs in the external labor market. These skills are an example of the "side bets" literature (Becker, 1960; Rusbult and Farrell, 1983) which argues that investments in the job that are lost in moving provide important costs that restrict turnover. Seniority-based employment decisions not only reduce turnover but increase behavioural commitment by increasing the rewards associated with long service.

Organizations that make little effort to influence employee attitudes and behaviours through the use of employment institutions correspond to the "secondary" labor markets described by Doeringer and Piore (1971). They argue that employees in such labor markets have high rates of turnover and absenteeism, little if any attachment to the employer, and often poor attitudes toward their jobs. At the other extreme, organizations with many internal labor market characteristics fit Walton's (1985) definition of "high commitment" employers where workers have strong attachment - attitudinal as well as behavioural - and positive work attitudes.

Industrial Relations as a Bridge

By focusing on the effects of employment institutions, industrial relations can make an important contribution to organizational studies and possibly to economics as well. At present, organizational studies is divided rather sharply between micro OB studies with its focus on individual behaviour and explanations at the individual level and macro organizational theory (OT) with its focus on organizations and the external environment as a source for explanations. A research program that would establish relationships between organizational characteristics, such as employment institutions, and individual employee behaviour could provide a bridge between the environment-organization studies of OT and the individual studies of OB. Recent arguments in economics that attempt to explain macro phenomenon in terms of the effects of employment policies on individual workers (e.g., efficiency wage models, trade unions and insider-outsider models) suggests an interest and a need for such bridging explanations in economics as well. One way forward for industrial relations, therefore, is to focus explicitly on this middle level of analysis between the external environment and the individual. In doing so, it can make explicit use of the theories of both organizational studies and economics in an effort to contribute to both fields.

A NEW SET OF TOPICS

The arguments above suggest that IR can find a unique market niche taxonomy by examining the effects of employment policies on individual worker behaviour, mining middle ground abandoned by both organization studies and labor economics. But there are other topics of perhaps even greater importance that are at present largely unexamined by any other field. Perhaps the most important of these is "Human Resource Strategy" - how organizations (presumably nations as well) decide which of many possible models of employee relations they should pursue.

As the discussion of the Harvard HR course illustrates, the great disadvantage of most traditional IR or HR courses is that they are directed at specialists and can therefore only be taught in programs that are large enough to develop IR or HR professionals. (These specialists are not a powerful constituency as they rarely hold powerful jobs in organizations.) It is difficult, as a result, to fit such courses into the "core" or required set of general courses in business schools. Courses that discuss alternative models and how they are used, in contrast, can be directed at general managers and higher-level executives who make strategic decisions.

The first step in developing a teaching program around the notion of employment strategies is to identify the range of employment models currently in use. This is not a topic where other fields have expertise (with the possible exception of labor history or sociology). The Appendix in this chapter includes a course outline by Professor Peter Sherer at the Wharton School which outlines for students some of the alternative models of employment current in use. The second step is to identify relationships between employment systems and other aspects of organizations, such as business strategies and goals or characteristics and capabilities of the existing workforce: What factors determine the choice of employment model? With the exception of occasional discussions within the field of strategic management (where the focus is on business strategy), these relationships have not been discussed elsewhere. The Harvard Business School has recently developed a new set of four teaching cases which illustrate strategies in human resources and their relationship to overall business goals, and this may help expand teaching in this area.

Whether IR in the U.S. has a bright future depends largely on whether it can capture some of the interest and resources associated with the development of the growing human resource field. IR was not well-positioned to explore the HR area initially, having rejected many of the systems that are now prominent. The good news for IR, however, is that other competing fields with interests in this area are riddled with their own problems, especially OB, which may keep them out of the most promising and relevant topic areas.

REFERENCES

- Adams, Roy J. "Teaching Comparative Industrial Relations: Results of an Informal Multinational Survey," *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Industrial Relations Association*, Victoria, B.C., 1990.
- Akerlof, George A, Andrew K. Rose, and Janet L. Yellen "Job Switching and Job Satisfaction in the U.S. Labor Market," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* No. 2 (1988), pp. 495-582.
- Allen, Stephen G "An Empirical Model of Worker Attendance," *Review of Economics and Statistics* Vol. 63 (1981), pp. 77-87.
- Antel, John J "Inter-related Quits: An Empirical Analysis of the Utility Maximizing Mobility Hypothesis," *Review of Economics and Statistics* (February 1988), pp. 17-22.
- Becker, H.S "Notes on the Concept of Commitment," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 66 (1960), pp. 32-42.
- Beer, Michael, Bert Spector, Paul R. Lawrence, D. Quinn Mills, and Richard E. Walton *Managing Human Assets*. (New York: The Free Press, 1984).
- _____. *Human Resource Management: A General Manager's Perspective* (New York: The Free Press, 1984).
- _____. *Readings in Human Resource Management* (New York) The Free Press, 1984).
- Begin, James P "What's Actually Happening: The IR Academic Survey," *Proceedings of the Fortieth Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association* (Madison, WI: IRRRA, 1988, pp.467-473).
- Berger, Chris J., and Larry L. Cummings "Organizational Structure, Attitudes, and Behaviors," In *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, ed. Barry M. Staw, (Greenwich, CT : JAI Press, 1979), Vol. 1, pp. 169-208.
- Boudreau, John W "Building a PC-Based Human Resource Management Curriculum at the School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University," *Proceedings of the Forty-Second Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association* (Madison, WI: IRRRA, 1989, pp.441-453).
- Bowen, Howard R. and Jack H. Schuster *American Professors: A Natural Resources Imperiled* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).
- Brown, J. Douglas "University Research in Industrial Relations," *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Industrial Research Association*. Madison, WI: IRRRA 1953, pp. 2-9.
- Business Week* "The New Industrial Relations," 11 May 1981, pp.85-93.
- Caples, William G "Survey of the Graduate Curriculum in Industrial Relations," *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association* (Madison, WI: IRRRA, 1959, pp.224-236).
- Cappelli, Peter "Theory Construction in IR and Some Implications for Research," *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 24 No. 1 (Winter 1985) pp.90-112.
- _____. "Absenteeism and the Labor Market," *Working Paper*, Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., 1989.
- _____. "Economics and Organizational Behaviour: Finding a Middle Path for Industrial Relations," *Proceedings of the Forty-third Annual Meeting of the IRRRA* (Madison, WI: IRRRA, 1990).

- _____ and Peter D. Sherer "Satisfaction, Market Wages, and Labor Relations: An Airline Study," *Industrial Relations*, Vol 27, No. 1, (Winter 1988), pp. 56-74.
- _____ "Assessing Worker Attitudes Under a Two-Tier Wage Plan," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, (January 1990).
- _____ and W. P. Sterling "Union Wage Decisions and Contract Ratification: The 1982 and 1984 UAW-Auto Agreements," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* Vol. 41, No. 1 (January 1988).
- Chadwick-Jones, et al. *The Social Psychology of Absenteeism*, (New York: Praeger, 1973).
- Clark, Paul F. and Lois S. Gray "Research Activity Among Labor Educators: Results of A Survey," *Proceedings of the Forty-Second Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association* (Madison, WI: IRRA, 1989, pp. 416-424).
- Clegg, Chris W "Psychology of Employee Lateness, Absence, and Turnover: A Methodological Critique and an Empirical Study," *Journal of Applied Psychology* Vol. 68 No. 1, (1983), pp. 88-101.
- Commons, John R "American Shoemakers, 1848-1895: A Sketch of Industrial Evolution", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol.24, (November 1909), pp.39-84.
- Dalton, D.R., and J. L. Perry "Absenteeism and the Collective Bargaining Agreement: An Empirical Test", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 24 No. 2 (1981), pp. 425-31.
- Derber, Milton "Divergent Tendencies in Industrial Relations Research," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 17 (July 1964), pp.598-616.
- Doeringer, Peter, and Michael Piore *Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis*, (Lexington, MA: Heath, Dore, 1971).
- Dunlop, John T. "Policy Decisions and Research in Economics and Industrial Relations," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 30 April 1977, pp. 275-282.
- Dworkin, James B. "IR Graduate Study in Business Schools: The Case of Purdue University", *Proceedings of the Forty-First Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association* (Madison, WI:IRRA, 1989, pp.459-467).
- Franke, Walter "Accommodating to Change: Can IR Learn from Itself?," *Proceedings of the Fortieth Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association* (Madison, WI:IRRA, 1988, pp.474-481).
- Freedman, Audrey *Managing Labor Relations*. (New York: The Conference Board, 1978).
- Freeman, Richard B "Exit, 'Voice' and Loyalty," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* (1981).
- _____ and James L. Medoff *What Do Unions Do?* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1984).
- Friedman, Harvey L "Labor Studies Curricula: The Development of the Professional Labor Specialist", *Proceedings of the Forty-First Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association* (Madison, WI: IRRA, 1989, pp.468-473).
- Garrison, K. R., and P. M. Michinsky "Evaluating the Concept of Absentee-Proneness with Two Measures of Absence", *Personnel Psychology* Vol. 30 (1977), pp. 389-93.

- Goodman, Paul S "An Examination of Referents Used in the Evaluation of Pay," *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 12 (1974), pp. 170-95.
- Hallaby, Charles "Worker Attachment and Workplace Authority", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 51, No. 5 (October 1986), pp. 634-49.
- Herman, Jeanne Brett, and Charles L. Hulin "Studying Organizational Attitudes from Individual and Organizational Frames of Reference", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 8 (1972), pp. 84-108.
- Hulin, Charles L., and Mary Roznowski "Organizational Technologies: Effects on Organization's Characteristics and Individual's Responses," In *Research in Organizational Behavior*, eds. L. L. Cummings and Barry Staw, (Greenwich,CT. JAI Press), Vol. 7, pp. 39-45, 1985.
- Ilgen, Daniel R., and J. R. Hollenback "The Role of Job Satisfaction in Absence Behavior", *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, Vol. 19 (1977), pp. 148-161.
- _____ and Howard J. Klein "Organizational Behavior", in *Annual Review of Psychology*, NY: Annual Reviews Inc., Vol. 40 (1989), pp. 327-351.
- Industrial and Labor Relations Review* "Do Compensation Policies Matter?" (Special Issue.) Vol. 43, No. 3, February 1990.
- Ippolito, Richard A "Why Federal Workers Don't Quit," *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 22 (1987), pp. 281-99.
- Jacobson, Stephen L., "The Effects of Pay Incentives on Teacher Absenteeism", *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (Spring 1989), pp. 280-86.
- Kerr, Clark, John T. Dunlop, and Frederick H. Harbison, and Charles A. Myers, *Industrialism and Industrial Man*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964).
- Kochan, Thomas A. *Collective Bargaining and Industrial Relations*.(New York: Irwin, 1981).
- Kochan, Thomas A., Robert B. McKersie, and Peter Cappelli, "Strategic Choice and Industrial Relations Theory", *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 23 No. 1 (Winter 1984), pp. 16-39.
- Kochan, Thomas A., Harry C. Katz, and Robert B. McKersie *The Transformation of U.S. Industrial Relations*. (Boston: Basic Books, 1984).
- Krislov, Joseph and John Mead "Changes in IR Programs Since the Mid-Sixties", *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 26 No. 2, (Spring 1987), pp. 208-212.
- Lakhani, H "The Effect of Pay and Retention Bonuses on Quit Rates in the U.S. Army", *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 41, No. 1 (January 1988), pp. 430-38.
- Lazear, Edward P "Retirement from the Labor Force," in *Handbook of Labor Economics*, eds. Orley Ashenfelter and Richard Layard, (Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publishers BV), Vol. 1, pp. 305-356, 1981.
- Leftwich, Howard M "Industrial Relations Programs in Economics Departments: The University of Cincinnati", *Proceedings of the Forty-First Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association* (Madison, WI: IRRA, 1989, pp.452-458).
- Leigh, J. Paul "The Effects of Unemployment and the Business Cycle on Absenteeism", *Journal of Economics and Business* Vol. 37, (May 1985), pp. 159-70.

- Lewin, David "The Industrial Relations (IR) Content of MBA Degree Programs in the U.S.", *Proceedings of the Forty-First Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association*, (Madison, WI: IRRA, 1989, pp.475-478).
- "Strategy as a Variable in IR", In Morris Kleiner, et. al. (eds.), *Human Resources and the Performance of the Firm* (Madison, WI: IRRA, 1989), pp.1-42.
- March, James G., and Herbert A. Simon *Organizations*, (New York:Wiley, 1958).
- Marrone, John J "New Directions: Labor Education, Labor Educators, and the U.C.L.E.A.", *Proceedings of the Forty-Second Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association* (Madison, WI: IRRA, 1989, pp. 425-434).
- Mills, C. Wright *The New Men of Power*, (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1948).
- Mitchell, Olivia S "The Labor Market Impact of Federal Regulation", In Thomas A. Kochan et. al. (eds.), *Industrial Relations Research in the 1970's: Review and Appraisal*, (Madison, WI: IRRA, 1982).
- Mobley, William H *Employee Turnover: Causes, Consequences, and Control*, (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1982).
- Moore, Michael L "Use of Software Packages in Teaching Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations", *Proceedings of the Forty-Second Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association* (Madison, WI: IRRA, 1989, pp. 460-467).
- Morgan, L. G., and J. B. Herman "Perceived Consequences of Absenteeism", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 61 (1976), pp. 738-42.
- Mowday, R. T., L. W. Porter, and R. M. Steers *Employee-Organizational Linkages*, New York: Academic Press, 1982.
- Nash, Al, "The University Labor Educator" *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 32 1978, pp. 40-55.
- Pfeffer, Jeffrey, "Organizational Demography" in *Research in Organizational Behavior*, eds. Larry L. Cummings and Barry Staw, (Greenwich, CT: JAI Press), Vol. 5, pp. 299-357, 1983.
- Porter, L. W., and E. E. Lawler III "Properties of Organization Structure in Relation to Job Attitudes and Job Behaviour", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 64 (1965), pp. 23-51.
- Price, James L. *The Study of Turnover*, Vol 10; Ames: The Iowa State University Press, 1977.
- Rezler, Julius "The Place of the Industrial Relations Program in the Organizational Structure of the University", *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 21 No. 1, 1968, pp. 251-262.
- Rousseau, Denise M "Characteristics of Departments, Positions, and Individuals: Contexts for Attitudes and Behavior", *Administrative Science Quarterly* 23 (December 1978), pp. 521-39.
- "Issues of Level in Organizational Research: Multi-Level and Cross-Level Perspectives", in *Research in Organizational Behavior*, eds. L. L. Cummings and Barry M. Staw (Greenwich, CT: JAI Press), 1985, Vol. 7, pp. 1-38.
- Rusbult, Caryl E., and Dan Farrell "A Longitudinal Test of the Investment Model: The Impact on Job Satisfaction, Job Commitment, and Turnover of

- Variations in Rewards, Costs, Alternatives, and Investments", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 68 (1983), pp. 429-38.
- Salancik, G. R. "Commitment and the Control of Organizational Behavior and Belief", in *New Directions in Organizational Behavior*, eds. Barry M. Staw and Gerald R. Salancik, (Chicago:St. Clair Press, 1977) pp. 1-54.
- Schwindt, Richard *Reading Lists in Industrial Relations*. (Durham,NC: Eno Press, 1990).
- Seeber, Ronald L "The Labor Education/Industrial Relations Nexus: Challenges and Opportunities", *Proceedings of the Forty-Second Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association* (Madison, WI: IRRA, 1989, pp.408-415).
- Staw, Barry M "Organizational Behavior: A Review and Reformulation of the Field's Outcome Variables", *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 35 (1984), pp. 627-66.
- _____ and Greg R. Oldham "Reconsidering Our Dependent Variables: A Critique and Empirical Study", *Academy of Management Journal* Vol. 21 (1978), pp. 539-58.
- Steers, R. M., and R. T. Mowday "Employee Turnover and Post-Decision Accommodation Process", in *Research in Organizational Behavior*, eds. Barry M. Staw and Larry L. Cummings, (Greenwich, CT: JAI Press), Vol. 3, 1981.
- _____ and Susan R. Rhodes "Major Influences on Employee Attendance: A Process Model", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 63 (1978), pp. 391-407.
- Steiner, Ivan D "Paradigms and Groups" in *Advances in Experimental and Social Psychology*, ed. L. Berkowitz, (Orlando: JAI Press), Vol. 19, 1986.
- Stoikov, Vladimer, and R. L. Raimon "Determinants of Differences in the Quit Rate Among Industries", *American Economic Review*, Vol. 58 (1968), pp. 1283-98.
- Strauss, George "Industrial Relations as an Academic Field:What's Wrong with It?", Unpublished manuscript, January 1988.
- _____ and Peter Feuille "Industrial Relations Research: A Critical Analysis", *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 17 No. 3, (October 1978), pp. 259-277.
- Taira, K *Economic Development and the Labor Market in Japan*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.
- Taylor, Daniel E "Absent Workers and Lost Hours", *Monthly Labor Review*, Vol. 101 (1979), pp. 49-53.
- Turner, Arthur N., and Paul R. Lawrence *Industrial Jobs and the Workers: An Investigation of Response to Task Attributes*, Boston: Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration, 1965.
- Walton, Richard E "From Control to Commitment in the Workplace", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 64 (1985), pp. 76-84.
- Weiss, Andrew "Determinants of Quit Behavior", *Journal of Labor Economics*, Vol. 2 (1984), pp. 371-87.
- Wheeler, Hoyt N "Is There A Pattern? A Report on a Survey of Graduate IR Curricula", *Proceedings of the Forty-First Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association* (Madison, WI: IRRA, 1989, pp.445-451).
- _____ and Brian S. Klaas, "Microcomputer Support for Teaching Union Management Relations", *Proceedings of the Forty-Second Annual*

Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association (Madison, WI: IRRA, 1989, pp.454-459).

Williamson, Oliver E Michael Wachter, and Jeffrey Harris, "Understanding the Employment Relationship: The Economics of Idiosyncratic Exchange", *Bell Journal of Economics*, Vol. 6 (1975), pp. 250-77.

Winkler, Donald "The Effects of Sick-Leave Policy on Teacher Absenteeism", *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 33, (1980), pp. 232-40

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS AND HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Course Overview, Requirements and Reading List - The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania

Course Overview

This course is an introduction to industrial relations and human resource management. The course focuses on employment policies and practices regarding the conditions of employment and the nature of work.

To study the conditions of employment and the nature of work requires that we look at features of the *external* environment of firms - their labor market, whether they are unionised and their structure and way they bargain, their competitive environment, their legal and regulatory environment, and technology - and their *internal* environment - compensation, ways of organising work, training and promotions systems, voice mechanisms, employment security and other human resource policies and practices, as well as the business strategy. Over time, a variety of *employment systems* (ie interrelated employment policies and practices) have evolved.

The course is divided into three major sections and a conclusion. The first section focuses on the external labor market - what it is and what its characteristics are - by looking at such issues as male versus female labor force participation rates, unemployment, and various views of labor force attachment. We continue this section by looking at wage differentials between various groups (males/females, blacks/whites) and then examine the bases for these differentials. The last part of this section is on the changing nature of the workforce and work and its implications for employment as we approach the 21st century.

In the second section, we examine several employment systems in the US, both by historical overview and by examining the policies and practices that go together in these systems. We examine, for example, the employment practices and policies of the union sector, which had its origins in the New Deal and was the dominant image of employment in the Post World War II era. We also examine professional employment systems such as are found in large law and accounting firms. There, partnership and ownership in the firm are integral to discussing the employment system, which features an up-or-out (making partner or being asked to leave the firm) policy for promotion and life-time employment for those who make partner.

The growing integration of the US in the world economy and the more general internalisation of the world serves as the basis for the third section of the course. For an overview, we will compare the US with that of its key competitors abroad on several key employment indices, such as wages, productivity and strike rates. We will then examine the employment systems in Japan and Germany. In recent years both of these countries have been the source of considerable attention because of their economic success and success in industrial relations and human resources.

In the conclusion we consider employment futures by addressing several important questions such as: What will be the managerial employment system of the future? Are systems of employment that track or otherwise differentiate employees such as the mommy track or core-periphery systems the way of the future and are they good for employees, employers, and society? Are professional employment systems a model for other types of work?

Course Requirements

Your grade will be based on four requirements:

1. *Mid-term exam* (March 5). The mid-term consists of short questions and two essay questions (one will be very structured, and the other one will require you to do much of the structuring). The exam is worth 25 percent of your grade.
2. *12 page double-spaced typewritten paper* (due April 23). Everyone is required to write a paper from one of several general topics:
 - a) *Women, Men and Diversity* - topics under this heading include the mommy track, affirmative action in hiring and promotion, and multiculturalism in the workplace.
 - b) *Individual and Employer Rights at the Workplace* - topics under this heading include individual drug testing (privacy rights and employer rights to a drug free workplace), AIDS and the workplace, and employment-at-will (employer rights to dismiss employees without showing just cause).
 - c) *Reform of Labor Law* - topics under this heading include reforming the labor law to encourage better union management relations and writing a new labor law to meet the workforce 2000 and beyond.
 - d) *Employment Systems* - topics under this heading cover such issues as whether it is good as a general rule for an employer to offer employment security, whether home-based work is good for employees and the employer, and whether it is good practice for an employer to have a core-periphery system of employment in which

two or more groups of employees who work together have very different employment security.

The paper counts for 30 percent of your grade. For your papers, you will have to develop a point of view that uses the theme and then draw on materials to substantiate your view.

In addition to the paper, you will be required to participate in a group exercise that corresponds to your topic area. For these exercises, you will be in either a panel discussion, debate group or team reporting on a case. I will work with each group in developing the topic of the exercise and format of the presentation. Your involvement in the group exercise counts towards your participation grade.

3. *Participation* You are expected to come to class prepared, having read assigned materials and ready to participate. Participation in class and in the group exercise counts for 10 percent of your grade.
4. *Final Exam* The final counts for 35 percent of your grade. It will be cumulative.

Class Schedule and Reading Assignments

Jan 15 Introduction and course overview

I. LABOR MARKETS AND THE IMPLICATIONS FOR EMPLOYMENT

Jan 17 Labor Markets - External And Internal (2 Sessions)

Hirsch - Free Agent Management
 Business Week - The End of Corporate Loyalty
 Business Week - The Disposable Employee
 Current Population survey - Definitions and US Data NYT articles
 on recent unemployment rate

Jan 22 Work and Workers for the 21st Century

Selection form *Workforce 2000* report

Jan 24 Women, Minorities and the Labor Market (2 sessions)

Blau and Ferber, from *Economics of Men, Women and Work*
 Trends in Labor Force Participation
 Differences in Occupations and Earning
 Summary and Human Capital Model
 Role of Market Discrimination

Rees and Hamermesh - The Economics of Discrimination
 Kahn and Sherer - Racial Differences in Professional Basketball
 Player's compensation (intro only)
 Roosevelt Thomas - From Affirmative Action to Affirming
 Diversity

Jan 31 Dealing with Workplace Discrimination and Diversity

Schwartz - Management Women and New Facets of Life
 Devanna - Women in Management: Problems and Promise
 WSJ - Flexible Formulas
 NYT Labor Dept. takes on Bias

II. EMPLOYMENT SYSTEMS

Feb 5 Historical Perspective on Employment Systems

Jacoby - Development of Internal Labor Markets
 NYT articles - Catfish plant, garment workers in Texas
 Frederick Taylor - from *Scientific Management*

Feb 7 Craft System

McPhee - *Looking for a Ship*
 Montgomery - Worker control of Machine Production
 Ulman - Skill and Craft Unionism
 Piore - The Decline of Mass Production

**Feb 12/
14 "New Deal" Industrial System - Economic, and
Social and Legal context (2 sessions)**

Fraser - The "Labor" Question
 Kassalow - The Development of Western Labor Movements
 Kerr - Industrial Relations and Pluralism
 Reiseman and Compa - The Case for Adversarial Unionism
 Freeman and Medoff - Slow Strangulation of Private Sector
 Unions
 Gold - Chps 1-4 *Introduction to Labor Law*
 Weiler - Reflections on National Labor Relations Act

**Feb 19/
21 Bargaining Structure and Strategy - Auto, Telephones and
Airlines (2 sessions)**

Kochan/Katz - Excerpts from Chapter 4
 Katz - Auto Industry
 Cappelli - Competitive Pressures and Labor Relations in the
 Airline Industry

CASE: ATT and the Telephone Industry

Feb 26 Conflict and Conflict Resolution

Work Stoppage Statistics

Gold - Chps 5,6 from *Introduction to Labor Law*

Perry - from *Plant Operations During Strikes*

NYT articles about Daily News strike

Kochan/Katz - Excerpt from *Administering the Employment Relationship*

Feb 28 The outcomes of Collective Bargaining: Union Effects

Freeman and Medoff - *New Portrait of US Unionism and Conclusion and Implications from What Do Unions Do?*

March 5 MIDTERM EXAM

March 7 Employer and Employee Rights

Crown and Rosse - *A Review of Assumptions Underlying Drug Testing*

Inquirer articles - *Cumberland Farms, Restaurant Manager with AIDS*

WSJ article - *White Collar Layoffs*

March 8-17 SPRING BREAK

**March 19/
21 Collective Bargaining Exercise (2 sessions)**

March 26 High Commitment System - Unionised Settings

Walton - *From Control to Commitment*

Katz - *Automobiles*

Brown and Reich - *When Does Union-Management Cooperation Work? A look at NUMMI and Van Nuys*

Business Week - *Strange Bedfellows backing Workplace Reform*

March 28 High Commitment System - Nonunion Settings

Foulkes - *Large Non Union Employers*

NYT articles on Nordstroms

April 2 Professional System

Mills - *Old Professions and New Skills, from White Collar*

Spangler - *Hired Guns: Partners and Associates in Large Law Firms*

Maister - Partnership Politics
 Art of Partner Compensation
 NYT articles on Trammell Crow, Peat Marwick and Layoffs for Lawyers

April 4 Managerial System

Kanter - Variations in Managerial Career Structure in High Tech Firms
 Hirsch - from *Pack Your Own Parachute*
 The New Managerial Work

III. INTERNATIONAL COMPARISONS/THE FUTURE OF EMPLOYMENT AND WORK

April 9 Overview

Foreign labor statistics

April 11 Germany

Schregle - Workers' Participation in the Federal Republic of Germany
 Kassalow - Employee Representation on US and German Boards
 Freeman - Employee Councils, worker Participation etc

**April 16/
18**

Japan (2 sessions)

Shimada - Perceptions vs Reality of Japanese Industrial Relations
 Dore - Japan's Version of Managerial Capitalism
 Diffusion and Viability of Japanese Employment System
 Taira - From the "Americanization of Japan" to the "Japanization of America"

**April 23/
25**

The Future of Employment and Work

Topics include:

Europe 1991 - What Outlook for Industrial Relations/Human Resource Management?

A Two-tier Society?: Core and Periphery Employees in the US Labor Market

New Forms of Employee Representation

A review session course will be scheduled during the reading period.

3 Commentary

John Niland

Nothing can be closer to the hearts of any group of academics than whether or not their field of study has a future. Cast this way, the issue is a good deal more serious than the question of where a particular discipline should be going and who should be involved. One approach focuses on demise and survival, the other on change and growth. The lesson to be drawn cautiously from Camellias paper is that in the United States industrial relations may have a future if it is able to adapt to changing circumstances. His considered assessment of the issues and options provide rich thought for Australian academics as we too come to the crossroads facing us.

American academics have been particularly inclined to introspection about the nature and meaning of their disciplinary life. We in Australia have not spent quite as much time exploring whether or not our field is passing through a golden age, has already exited such hallowed territory, or has yet to enter it. But like our colleagues in Britain and North America, we are wont to worry from time to time about whether industrial relations constitutes a genuine field of study. Definitions abound, and it would not be too difficult to teach a standard undergraduate course built around the competing perceptions of what is and what is not industrial relations. But this would be self-indulgent and of little value to our students. What would be useful is a course in the History of Industrial Relations Thought, which could claim a respectability and relevance similar, for example, to the History of Economic Thought. A coherent treatment of shifting paradigms and their contribution to policy development and public policy debate would be a worthy contribution to the scholarly literature, but this is a PhD. thesis yet to happen!

Part of our penchant for disciplinary introspection is explained by Bill Howard's argument that industrial relations academics, collectively, suffer from inferiority complexes, or at least this was seen to be so several decades ago. At one of our earlier exercises in self-analysis, the Conference on "Industrial Relations Teaching and Research in Australia and New Zealand" at the Victoria University of Wellington in 1978, Howard argued that:

"Social scientists in general are afflicted with a heavy burden of cultural cringe, and economists who enjoy high status among social scientists certainly quail before even an applied, much less a

pure, mathematician. Industrial relations stands well below economics ... and this lowly status has, in Australia, inhibited the development of vigorous debate and enquiry in industrial relations theory." (Howard 1978, p. 27)

One school of thinking, therefore, is that industrial relations might embrace respectability through the pursuit of theory, perhaps even grand theory. However, in commenting on the Howard thesis, Geare adopted a different stance:

"In my view, industrial relations courses tend too much to the theory and neglect the practice. Thus, essays written on the theory of collective bargaining get more weight, in most courses, than works on tactics and strategy in collective bargaining and actual role-playing of negotiations, and the preparation of cases get even less weight. This, I feel, is in part due to our low status and resulting defensiveness. We do not wish to appear academically inferior by indulging in practical work. This ignores the fact that academically "superior" subjects like physics, chemistry and to an even greater extent medicine, spend a lot of time doing very basic practical work." (Geare, 1978: 53)

These concerns were not limited to a corner of the Southern Hemisphere either, for the antipodean exchange between Howard and Geare coincided with what Cappelli refers to as "a revolution in its approach to theory construction, a revolution that began with a decline of policy issues and culminated in an academic debate over legitimacy." (Cappelli 1991, p.2)

The import of all this, it seems, is that legitimacy and theory are closely intertwined, at least in the self-image we academics in industrial relations construct for ourselves. Certainly there is a strong undercurrent among Australian academics that moves us to pursue theory, whatever that might be. A good deal depends obviously on just how theory is defined, but two elements seem to be important. First, the notion of theory implies a higher order of academic endeavour, something in which the mere practitioner or policy maker is not qualified to engage (or indulge!); and second, it carries with it the implication of explanatory power, even to predicted future outcomes. Presumably the wider and grander the theory, the more respect it generates.

Three specific factors might be cited to explain the pursuit of theory. First, as we see from the exchanges noted above, there is the quest for peer respect. This must be recognised as an understandable, and perhaps even legitimate, manifestation of the frailty of human nature. Why should industrial relations academics, as distinct from any other group of workers, eschew the warmth and reward that come from standing and respect. This said, the pursuit of theory for such purposes becomes a worry, however, if it can be demonstrated that such an orientation is a false dawn in terms of explaining significant events of interest. Worse still, unless the pursuit of theory produces results which practitioners and policy makers (which are what most students of industrial relations become) see helps better explain such events, this itself could very well hasten the demise of a

discipline. It is difficult to foster high worker morale in a discipline when the discipline itself is dead and gone!

Second, theory holds attractions because of its potential ability to aid prediction. Certainly in the more traditional sciences, the scientific method is interpreted to mean, among other things, replicability in experimentation, and therefore the ability to forecast with high levels of accuracy the consequences of manipulating particular variables in an overall system of relationship. Such replicability and predictability would seem a forlorn prospect in an area as inherently complex and unstable as industrial relations. Yet academics are widely encouraged to explain what the future holds. Hosts of talk-back radio shows, politicians and other policy makers display almost gargantuan appetites for details of what the future holds. Industrial tribunals, trade unions and employers could be expected to beat paths to the doors of those who can say with certainty the effect in the future of doing this or that in the present. Yet the fact that there is such little traffic of this nature must surely tell us something.

Third, and this perhaps is the more honourable of the several reasons for seeking theory, is the natural tendency among academics to try to construct orderly understanding out of chaotic evidence. To fuse disparate pieces into a coherent whole is a wonderful skill, and is rightly applauded. But the question persists, are not industrial relations phenomena so inherently complex that they defy grand theory or even theory of the partial kind, except in the most limited respects? And in any event, do we really need theory to organise disorganized evidence.

The challenge before us, which Camellias paper well exemplifies, is how to maintain and even enhance respectability for the discipline in the eyes of those who matter. The difficulty is that the stakeholders (to fall into the way of modern jargon) themselves do not necessarily have convergent interests or value systems.

Put simply, industrial relations as a field for teaching and research, at least in the universities, will only survive if the resources are there to sustain it. The issue turns on the matter of funding, an issue which I addressed at that 1978 conference on "Industrial Relations Teaching and Research in Australia and New Zealand", referred to above. Now, as then, there are two dimensions to the funding issue - one within and one without the universities.

"Balances and alliances within universities, as in all large bureaucracies, determine how the discretionary component is allocated between competing interest groups. At most universities, if not all, the industrial relations interests groups lie well removed from the important power networks. In a nutshell, the long-established areas such as medicine, science, the humanities, etc. hardly display sympathy to a new position in industrial relations if that can only be obtained at the expense of a new position in gynaecology, or physics or history. It should be emphasised that the existing lecturers in these fields are no more sympathetic to industrial relations than is the professor." (Niland, 1978: 250)

Now, nearly fifteen years later, the position is little changed. In order to attract positions which will provide the basis for research effort, the Industrial Relations Department needs students - the EFTSU Factor (Equivalent Full Time Student Unit!). Two issues are crucial here. The first is the ambient level of student demand for industrial relations subjects. There is clear evidence that this ebbs and flows with newspaper headlines, which seem to suggest that potential students are influenced by the extent to which they see any future field as relevant, interesting and, most important, offering employment opportunities. Second, even though the student demand might be there, course structures act either as delivery chutes or barricades to entry. If the Industrial Relations Department is located in a Faculty of Commerce and Economics, will Arts students be allowed to enrol in an industrial relations major? If the Bachelor of Economics or Bachelor of Commerce degree mandates certain disciplines as part of a common first year, or common thread through the degree, will industrial relations be included in or excluded from that crucial list? If an industrial relations major is provided, can students commence in first year or must they wait till second year to enrol? The cut and thrust of academic politics has a strong bearing on just how these questions are answered and the answers given are vital for the funding base for industrial relations teaching and research.

While the provision of a substantial student base will help guarantee the future viability of industrial relations teaching and research in Australia, it is also important to access non-university funding sources. The position in the mid-1970s, as noted at the 1978 conference, was that Australia lacked any tradition of government departments contracting out research to academics and others. The view, it seemed, was that if something could not be researched from within the public service, then it was not worth researching:

"As for Australia, universities in Canada, Britain, the United States, Sweden, etc. may not give high priority to industrial relations research, although there are individual exceptions. Overseas, however, the problem is moderated through government departments specifically concerned with industrial relations and labour market matters contracting out research. That is, the power-based difficulties within their own universities are overcome for industrial relations academics in other countries by the fact that research funding is provided from areas in a broader community where the industrial relations priority is well placed within the bureaucracy. If the contracting out of research is a tradition, then a Department of Labour will give strong preference for funding industrial relations research. In Australia, such research is not particularly supported within universities or by the various Departments of Labour." (Niland, 1978: 246)

The 1980s, particularly the latter part of that decade, saw a significant shift in research funding support for Australian universities from within Departments of Labour. Other special sources of Government funding, such as for the Key Centres in Industrial Relations Teaching and Research have also had a significant effect. Indeed, the funds flowing to industrial relations research from these

sources in the past five years is probably greater than what came forward in the previous twenty or thirty years.

This discussion leads me to a modest level of optimism about the future of the discipline in Australia. Since the potential for its funding is clearly visible, its survival would seem assured. Yet there is good reason for caution and concern. Unmet student demand at Australian universities is growing, and often most aggressively in areas such as accounting, banking and finance and information systems where students compete with industrial relations for student places in degree programs. This leads to the argument that industrial relations academics must discover strategies to ensure and even expand the provision of industrial relations within universities. On the other issue, the issue of government-based research support, there is an equal need for action. Government research funding, whether it be through a Department of Labour (or Industrial Relations) or through the wider university funding system such as with the Key Centres, is particularly sensitive to perceptions of relevance. If public policy in the area of industrial relations in the 1990s is essentially concerned with the same issue as in the 1980s, then industrial relations academics can safely continue on as before. However, the indicators are very strong that a sea change is occurring and university-based research effort will ignore this at its peril. Each of these considerations - the need for new sources of EFTSU within the universities and the need to maintain research relevance in the eyes of those outside the universities who support and commission research - must be addressed effectively. A possible key lies in what Cappelli prescribes for the United States.

Cappelli's thesis is that industrial relations in the United States has a bright future provided it can capture "some of the interest and resources associated with the development of the growing human resource field". Not all would agree, as reflected in the sometimes acrimonious debate raging within the Industrial Relations Research Association in the USA which, incidentally, we are likely to see flowing over into the International Industrial Relations Association within the next five years. But it is difficult to quarrel with the lesson at large that species survive when they either repel invaders or adapt to changing circumstances. Great courage, and not a little foolhardiness, is warranted for the defensive strategy. The adaptive strategy, in which industrial relations seeks to better integrate itself with the world of human resource management has much greater appeal. Understandably, the relative attractiveness of one approach over the other may be correlated with age. The older academics, those whose careers have been forged over the years in the industrial relations dimension, feel that they both have more to defend and less to lose with a last ditch stand. The younger academics, with careers still ahead of them, are likely to be much more adaptive. And Cappelli seems to speak for the younger generation of scholars. To me, the most interesting part of his paper is an understanding of the wider opportunities that lie beyond our tradition of serving the specialist. This is particularly relevant given developments in the last three years in Australian industrial relations. Cappelli argues:

"... the great disadvantage of most traditional IR or HR courses is that they are directed at specialists and can therefore only be taught

in programs that are large enough to develop IR or HR professional. (These specialists are not a powerful constituency as they rarely hold powerful jobs in organisations.) It is difficult, as a result, to fit such courses into the "core" or required set of general courses in business schools. Courses that discuss alternative models and how are they used, in contrast, can be directed at general managers and higher-level executives who make strategic decisions." (Cappelli, 1991: 28)

The way in which industrial relations teaching and research are structured and conducted are influenced by the wider institutions and practices in the country. Perhaps the quest for theory is an attempt to get above the ethnocentric plain, but the evidence is scant that this has happened. Certainly in Australia one would have to accept that the powerful influence on thinking of the centralised tribunal system is reflected in the way in which industrial relations programs are structured. As distinct from Britain and North America, industrial relations instruction in Australia is primarily at the undergraduate level, preparing professionals who will specialise in this area. The future viability of such an approach, however, is now seriously in question, particularly as the implications of the 1987 National Wage Case Decision unfold.

So long as industrial terms and conditions were mostly set at a tribunal level, and so long as wage decisions conformed with the principle of comparative wage justice, the industrial relations infrastructure could be operated and maintained by the industrial relations specialist, with little need to call on the time or concerns of line managers. The advantage of an entitlement-based wage adjustment system, in which all can expect to receive the standard or uniform adjustment, is its efficiency in administration. But by concentrating on fair shares, the system generally failed to address the more fundamental issue of output and production upon which that distribution was based. With the two tier wage decision in 1987, the Australian Industrial Relations Commission acknowledged the sea change that was building in Australian industrial relations. The significance of the decision is that it moved away from a pure entitlement technique, to one requiring productivity offsets. While the entitlement-based adjustment system could be administered by industrial relations specialists and pay managers adjusting their computer software, the conditional adjustment technique requires input from those who would know whether or not the offset was being met, which is to say the line manager.

This shift in emphasis is away from industrial relations specialists toward the line managers, as the system at large shifts from arbitration towards negotiation techniques. For management, there is little point in negotiating an agreement if the offsets it is promised at the bargaining table are not delivered on the factory floor, in the office or down the mine. Line managers, not industrial relations specialists, bear prime responsibility for monitoring the agreement and ensuring its adherence.

The 1987 National Wage Case Decision, and the subsequent events leading to the acceptance of enterprise bargaining in Australia, have changed immeasurably the

way industrial relations should be taught and researched in Australia. It is sobering that such significant shifts have been brought not by mainstream thought patterns in the academy, but rather by thinking on the periphery and the actions of practitioners and policy makers.

The 1990s, it seems, will be a decade of decentralism, or at least one in which the centre of gravity in industrial relations is much lower than it has been. The opportunities this presents for teaching and research are enormous. Future managers studying engineering, science, etc. at universities should not have to wait until their subsequent MBA programs for initial industrial relations learning. Some academics might protest that service teaching is a low grade activity, but that stand rather understates the challenge of the task. More critical is the fact that academics in other disciplines are not usually happy to give up space in degree programs already overcrowded as to content, and the old problem of internal resource dispersment will continue. However, we can expect pressure on universities from the professions, and leaders in commerce and industry for the provision of undergraduate management subjects, including industrial relations and human resource management, in undergraduate courses in engineering, science, etc. The question is whether the industrial relations academic will be ready to seize this opportunity.

On the research side, we can expect external funding bodies, particularly government departments, to encourage attention to issues and problems of contemporary concern. This inevitably will mean a focus on negotiation skills and enterprise bargaining, an area where there is not a strong academic expertise or tradition in Australia. But whatever the particular focus the industrial relations academic brings to the task of discovering and forming new knowledge, his or her primary contribution will be in the ability to bring a wider perspective to the task; to provide useful explanations of inherently complex issues; to provide a better understanding of how disparate pieces might be brought within a coherent framework of understanding; and how scenarios for the future might unfold. I doubt whether any of this will require grand theory, although certainly it will warrant profound analysis. Which, perhaps, is all we really mean by theory; and in that respect little has changed in the past fifteen years.

REFERENCES

- Geare, A.J. (1978), "Doctrine, Theory and Teaching in Industrial Relations" in D.J. Turkington (ed.), *Industrial Relations Teaching and Research in Australia and New Zealand*, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, N.Z., pp.54-57
- Howard, W.A. (1978), "Doctrine, Theory and Teaching in Industrial Relations" in D.J. Turkington (ed.), *Industrial Relations Teaching and Research in Australia and New Zealand*, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, N.Z., pp.25-48
- Niland, J.R. (1978), "Funding Aspects of University Research in Industrial Relations" in D.J. Turkington (ed.), *Industrial Relations Teaching and Research in Australia and New Zealand*, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, N.Z., pp.234-53

4 The Rise and Fall of the Golden Ages

David Winchester

INTRODUCTION

This paper summarises some of the main findings of my review of industrial relations teaching and research in the United Kingdom. Its main focus is on the activities of three or four hundred teachers and researchers employed by universities and polytechnics in the higher education sector. The education and training programmes of the further education sector, and the private provision of management and trade union organisations, are mentioned only briefly. Similarly, the discussion of trends in research is focussed largely on work located in university and polytechnic departments, although the relationship between 'academic' research, and the reports produced by consultants and 'non-academic' publications, will be noted.

The review is not based on a comprehensive survey of all industrial relations departments, programmes, courses, teaching materials, and research output in the United Kingdom. Apart from the time constraints that discouraged such an approach to the project, the initial research confirmed that a more detailed examination of a representative sample would highlight both the range and diversity of developments in teaching and research, and some more general, near-universal trends. Interviews and informal discussions were therefore arranged with a substantial sample of academics, especially those employed in major industrial relations centres or in departments known to be engaged in significant re-organisation or programme developments. Documentary materials - including departmental brochures, course outlines and teaching materials, and the 'further particulars' attached to advertised industrial relations teaching and research posts - provided a very useful source of data for the project.

The interview and documentary sources of data provide the basis of the arguments and conclusions of this paper, but they have, of course, been filtered and interpreted by my academic experience, teaching and research interests. In responding to my view of the past development, present position, and future direction of industrial relations teaching and research in Britain, you should be

aware that after a two year research post in a large trade union, I have taught industrial relations at the London School of Economics and the University of Warwick for the last twenty years. In other words, alongside Gill Palmer, who will comment on my paper, I belong to the generation of academics that benefited from the rapid expansion of industrial relations in the early 1970s. Moreover, I have had the opportunity to develop my teaching and research interests in the two most significant centres of postgraduate industrial relations teaching; for the last thirteen years, as a dual member of the Industrial Relations & Organisational Behaviour teaching group of a rapidly-expanding business school, and the Industrial Relations Research Unit, the major centre of industrial relations research in the United Kingdom.

Many colleagues will not share my view of the development of the subject, especially in the brief form in which it is outlined here. My broad argument is a fairly simple, and perhaps predictable, one. It divides the last twenty-five years into two distinct periods and explores the ways in which public policy pre-occupations and the organisation and funding of higher education have shaped the agenda, style, and orientation of academic industrial relations. The development of industrial relations in the 1960s and 1970s is characterised as a 'golden age' in which a distinctive identity of the subject vis-a-vis other academic disciplines was established, and its policy relevance was beyond doubt. In contrast, the last ten years are characterised as a 'cold climate' in which teaching and research fragmented into two broad tendencies; one rooted in an explicitly managerialist conception of 'human resource management', and the other located in different expressions of a more radical conception of the 'political economy of industrial relations'. Until very recently, it could be argued that the HRM agenda had undermined the coherence and identity of industrial relations teaching and research, but some grounds for optimism about the future development of the subject will be suggested in the conclusion.

THE 'GOLDEN AGE' OF TEACHING AND RESEARCH (1965-80)

The origins and development of modern academic industrial relations in the United Kingdom are sufficiently well-known to require only brief treatment here. The first university chairs in the subject, endowed by Montague Burton in Cambridge, Leeds and Cardiff in the 1930s, and the focus of teaching and research conducted by a small group of scholars at Oxford University in the 1950s and 1960s, both reflected a long-standing public policy commitment to the importance of voluntary collective bargaining. It was the appointment of the Royal Commission on Trade Unions and Employers' Associations in 1965, the publication of its series of Research Papers, and the policy debates and initiatives surrounding its recommendations on the reform of collective bargaining in the 1968 Report, that stimulated the rapid growth and visibility of academic industrial relations (Clegg, 1990).

For the following decade or more, the 'problem of trade union power', and attempts to reform the structure and outcomes of collective bargaining through legislation and incomes policies, dominated policy debates and electoral politics.

This was mainly because of the widespread belief that industrial relations problems contributed significantly to Britain's relatively poor economic performance. Initially, academic research and teaching focused on workplace industrial relations, especially on the power of shop stewards and the loss of management control expressed in unofficial strikes, wages drift, and restrictive practices in manufacturing industry. Later in the period, more attention was paid to the political repercussions of the failure of industrial relations legislation and incomes policies, expressed vividly in the major public sector disputes of the 1970s.

Throughout the whole period, the orthodox definitions and pluralist values of leading academics gave the subject a powerful pragmatic focus centred on the reform of collective bargaining. This facilitated the active involvement of senior academics in shaping the development of public policy, and the employment of a new generation of graduate students in public agencies charged with reforming industrial relations (for example, the National Board for Prices and Incomes and the Commission on Industrial Relations).

There was, of course, a second pre-condition for the rapid development and vitality of industrial relations teaching and research at this time; the substantial expansion in higher education generally, and in social science teaching and research in particular. The former followed the implementation of the Robbins Report of 1963, and the latter was greatly assisted by the establishment of the Social Science Research Council in 1965. The SSRC allocated research grants - including the five-year contract that set up an Industrial Relations Research Unit at Warwick in 1970 - and it awarded postgraduate studentships, including a substantial number for the doctoral and taught Masters degree programmes in Industrial Relations at London School of Economics Warwick and elsewhere.

Students on these and other courses throughout the 1970s were offered a lively and interesting curriculum. Alongside the pragmatic and reformist core of the subject, an influential 'radical' challenge to the dominant definitions and perspectives in academic industrial relations was developed in the work of Alan Fox, Richard Hyman, John Goldthorpe and others. This was encouraged by the scale and intensity of industrial conflict in Britain in the 1970s, in part a reflection of the limits of 'pluralism' and 'reformism' in a period of economic and political crisis. It was shaped also by the much greater influence of Marxist and critical social science teaching and research in universities and polytechnics at the time.

This challenge introduced a lively debate on perspectives, values, and priorities in industrial relations teaching and research, but while some collegial relationships may have become a little strained, the industrial relations academic community seemed to grow and prosper without excessive division or fragmentation. This happy state of affairs may have been sustained partly by the creation of additional posts arising from the expansion in higher education, the spectacular growth of publicly-funded shop steward training, and the greater demand for places on personnel management and other management education programmes. The relative failure of a constant stream of legislation, incomes policies, and other

government initiatives increased, rather than diminished, the demand for industrial relations teaching and research.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS IN THE 'COLD CLIMATE' OF THE 1980S

Throughout the 1980s, academics and politicians offered differing assessments of the extent and nature of change that had occurred in industrial relations. These contributions disputed the significance of different sources of change, the permanence of particular developments, and their impact on economic efficiency and social welfare (see for example, Bassett, 1986; MacInnes, 1987; Kelly & Richardson, 1989; Nolan, 1989; and Brown & Wadhvani, 1990). A year ago, however, Daniel was able to argue confidently that 'there is universal agreement that the 1980s was a decade of unprecedented change for industrial relations in Britain' (1990:20).

I want to suggest that over the last ten years, the focus and coherence of industrial relations teaching and research was threatened and partially undermined. In support of this view, it is first necessary to discuss briefly the impact of some of the policies of three Conservative governments led by Margaret Thatcher, and second, to explore the changing environment of higher education in order to understand the way in which industrial relations teachers and researchers adjusted to the threats and opportunities of the decade.

Given the rare opportunity of an unbroken period of office spanning three Parliaments, the Conservative government was able to develop a thorough attack on most parts of the post-war Keynesian consensus that had guided its predecessors. In its place, a series of policies designed to impose harsh financial disciplines on industry, restrictions on trade unions, limitations on individual employment rights, and the 'privatisation' of the public sector were introduced. These policies led to a major restructuring and deregulation of economic and work relations, three features of which require brief consideration.

First, in the early 1980s, the sectoral distribution of employment shifted dramatically away from the large establishments in manufacturing and nationalised industries employing substantial numbers of male, full-time, manual workers - the locations that had previously attracted most industrial relations research. Employment growth since then has been concentrated in smaller workplaces in the private service sector, characterised by more precarious forms of part-time and casual employment, undertaken mainly by women.

Second, trade union influence declined significantly in the 1980s. The most obvious expression of weakness can be seen in the substantial decline in trade union membership arising from job losses in well-organised sectors. Another source of weakness can be seen in the success of explicitly anti-union state policies that contributed to a series of highly-publicised defeats in disputes, most notably in the motor industry, printing, and coalmining. A further, political, dimension of the decline of union influence arose from the exclusion of union leaders from even the most dilute forms of tripartite representation, and the failure

of the Labour Party in three general elections. The power, effectiveness, and legitimacy of trade unionism were challenged more generally by the apparently popular ideological appeal of individual and unitary values, some of which were appropriated by the more strident versions of 'new realism' preached by trade union leaders (most notably, in the electricians' union, the EETPU).

Third, while survey evidence suggested that trade union organisation and the institutional procedures of negotiation and representation remained intact in many areas, it seemed clear that there had been a widespread reduction in the scope and effectiveness of collective bargaining. With the demise of the previous public policy commitment to collective bargaining, employers were able to choose more freely whether to avoid unions altogether, or marginalise their role by reforming the 'institutions of joint regulation'. The latter option has often involved a further decentralisation of single employer bargaining in manufacturing and privatised enterprises to unit or divisional levels, 'consistent with profit centres or business units' (Purcell, 1991:37).

These changes gradually undermined the focus and reformist orientation of most industrial relations teaching and research. In response to the shift in the balance of power in industry, many industrial relations academics adjusted the focus of their teaching and research away from trade unions and collective bargaining towards a consideration of employers' strategies and patterns of management control. This was not, of course, an entirely novel development, but one that was pursued with much greater vigour than hitherto.

For some industrial relations academics, the change amounted to no more than a minor shift of emphasis within 'mainstream' industrial relations; surveys and case studies explored different strategies and styles in the management of collective bargaining and tried to link changes in the level, scope, and form of bargaining to the business strategies of companies and characteristics of product and labour markets (for example, Purcell & Sisson, 1983; Marginson et al., 1988; Purcell & Ahlstrand, 1989). Others implicitly or explicitly challenged the boundary definitions of the subject by emphasizing the distinction between the management of industrial relations, and the management of 'work' or 'employment'.

To oversimplify, two broad approaches can be identified: the first, expressing a significantly revised version of the 'reformist' tradition; the second, linked with the 'radical' tradition in industrial relations. As might be expected, they elaborate quite different research orientations and priorities, build on different disciplinary foundations, and appeal to quite different student audiences. The one characteristic they share is the recognition that trade unions and collective bargaining 'are contingent elements rather than essential components of the subject' (Hyman, 1989:12).

HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

There has been a phenomenal recent interest in human resource management (HRM) in the United Kingdom (Storey, 1989). The term has been associated with a bewildering variety of meanings in academic and personnel management journals, in the retitling of management departments and functions, and in the redesign and labelling of programmes and courses in universities and polytechnics. Many of the developments in management practice and the debates in the literature, concern the differences, if any, between HRM and traditional personnel management, and by implication, industrial relations policy and practice. This issue can be resolved only by recognising the considerable diversity of past personnel practice and recent HRM innovations, and by specifying the dimensions on which they can be compared.

The debate has explored a number of discrete but overlapping questions. To what extent do new HRM policies and practice embody a strategic link with business policy in the search for competitive advantage? How much priority is attached to the optimisation of organisational control and labour cost minimisation in comparison with the desire to elicit higher degrees of employee commitment and involvement (the *hard* and *soft* versions of HRM)? How narrow or wide is the breadth and scope of the policies (*restricted* or *extended* HRM)?

Moreover, if HRM is rooted firmly in unitarist and individualistic values and the pursuit of strategic integration, employee commitment, flexibility, and quality as its central policy goals (Guest, 1989), it offers a fairly direct challenge to the pluralist values of industrial relations and personnel managers. Either they will have to abandon their earlier 'uncertain boundary status... managing the inherent tension and conflict between the imperatives of the market, the organisational demands for control of employees, and the individual needs of people in work' (Keenoy, 1990:8), or their function will be redefined as a less ambiguous one, and performed by senior line managers.

For the purpose of this paper, it is not necessary to estimate how far British management has progressed in implementing a new HRM agenda, although the evidence suggests that the scale of change has been limited outside the special case of greenfield sites, (Storey & Sisson, 1990). The crucial issue concerns the extent to which even the more naive or idealistic formulations of HRM have attracted the attention of students and their teachers, and the purchasers and providers of research and consultancy services. The evidence here is fairly clear; recent developments in teaching and research have been dominated by an interest in HRM. A wide-ranging discussion of the 'new industrial relations' has been accompanied by a debate on the nature and vitality of a new, more business oriented, HRM paradigm (see Dunn, 1990 and 1991, Keenoy, 1991).

THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

The traditional core of academic industrial relations has not, of course, been abandoned. An 'institutionalist' approach to trade unions and collective bargaining still appears on reading-lists and in research programmes; a 'pluralist' critique of government policies has been elaborated; and a 'reformist' agenda for public policy change has been developed. In the 'cold climate' of the 1980s, however, it was more difficult to demonstrate the 'policy relevance' of much of this teaching and research and, as will be argued later, not so easy to find a paying audience to support it.

For some academics with relatively secure posts and a commitment to radical positions within the established social science disciplines, the promise of a 'political economy of industrial relations' was an attractive one. The wide definition of the subject as embracing 'all aspects of the employment relationship' was unexceptional, but an emphasis on the distinctive nature of the employment relationship, and its connection with industrial relations institutional forms and wider social, economic and political forces, provided more than enough space for a rich menu of loosely-related teaching and research.

Many of the contributions have been associated closely with the labour process debate of the last fifteen years. This has generated a vast output of theoretical, and some empirical, research in the overlapping fields of organisation theory, industrial sociology, labour economics, business studies and industrial relations. While many academics and students have ignored or rejected the more esoteric and abstract contributions to the literature, important concepts and insights have been absorbed into industrial relations analysis. Discussions of management strategy and control, technological change, patterns of workplace conflict and cooperation, labour market segmentation, and the links between gender, skill and work organisation, for example, often draw on parts of the labour process debate. Important theoretical contributions have been made by academics in the major industrial relations centres (for example, Wood, 1982, 1986 and Kelly, 1982 at the London School Of Economics, Hyman, 1987 and Edwards, 1986 at Warwick), and there has been a fairly widespread acceptance of the conceptualisation of 'the unique characteristics of labour as a commodity: its potential to produce value and the indeterminacy which surrounds the harnessing of this potential' (Knights & Willmott, 1990:21).

A second set of contributions to 'a political economy of industrial relations' offered a critique of issues that were central to domestic political debate. The 'free market' ideological core of Conservative government policies, rooted in the writings of Hayek, and expressed in the publications of the Institute of Economic Affairs (e.g. Hanson & Mather, 1988), encouraged research and teaching focussed on the theoretical and practical connections between labour market and legal policies. As Wedderburn (1986), Lewis (1990) and others have argued, the separate elements of the 1980s legislation (for example, strike ballots, reduced union immunities, attacks on the closed shop, repeal of protective employment legislation) were based on a systematic rejection of collectivism that was

consistent with the economic, fiscal and social policies of the government, and constituted a sharp break with the convictions and policies of its post-war predecessors. Theoretical analysis of the contradictory forces of 'juridification' and 'deregulation' have been accompanied by attempts to evaluate the impact of industrial relations legislation on economic performance (Brown & Wadhvani, 1990).

The focus of other contributions within a broadly-defined 'political economy' approach are too numerous to discuss in detail, but a few can be mentioned in passing. The debate between Metcalf and Nolan & Marginson in the BJIR (July 1990), for example, raised important theoretical and methodological issues in the different interpretations of the proclaimed 'productivity miracle' in United Kingdom manufacturing in the 1980s. Other studies have tried to link theoretical debates on economic restructuring - for example, on flexible specialization, the new international division of labour, and gender and labour market segmentation - to case study data on industrial relations (Tailby & Whitston, 1989; Pollert, 1991; Beechey & Perkins, 1987).

While the focus, method, and normative stance of these studies vary considerably, they may be grouped under the imprecise label of a 'political economy' of industrial relations for several reasons. They share with earlier 'radical' perspectives a hostility to studies that treat industrial relations institutions as autonomous or discrete entities, and they are more concerned to critically evaluate managerially-defined problems than offer solutions to them. They attempt to analyse work, employment, and industrial relations phenomena with reference to wider, and inherently unstable, processes of production and accumulation, and broader patterns of social and political power.

For this reason, often there is a preference for an historically-grounded analysis, and for an international and comparative focus in the specification and development of theoretical analysis and in the collection of relevant empirical data. The latter is scarcely surprising given the increasing influence of transnational corporations and regional economic and political blocs (such as the European Community) on economic restructuring. Nonetheless, it should be noted that many of the contributions to a 'political economy of industrial relations' have been stimulated by theoretical arguments formulated in other countries and languages; their translation into different cultural and intellectual *milieu* offers an exciting, if daunting, challenge, if misunderstanding and tortuous prose are to be avoided.

HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE 1980S

It has been argued that the identity and coherence of academic industrial relations had been undermined by the late 1980s. Changes in the practice of industrial relations, encouraged by a radical shift in the ideological stance and policy initiatives of central government, contributed substantially to the declining 'policy relevance' of the core interests of industrial relations teachers and researchers established over the previous fifteen years. The fragmentation of the subject into

the two broad approaches focussed around human resource management and a 'political economy of industrial relations', however, was encouraged also by more parochial matters concerning the funding and organisation of higher education in the United Kingdom.

The last decade has not been an easy one for higher education generally, and academic staff in particular. Universities and polytechnics were subject to severe financial constraints imposed on all centrally-funded public services. A system of annual cash limits on expenditure produced cuts in the aggregate purchasing power of government grants, with significant variations in the impact on individual institutions. The cuts were most severe in the first four years of the 1980s; approximately 15% of university posts were lost, full-cost fees for overseas' students and restrictions on home student numbers were imposed, and financial support for students on one-year taught Masters' degrees was reduced substantially. Throughout the decade, the government sought to redistribute some of the costs of teaching and research to the 'users', to encourage universities and polytechnics to seek additional sources of income, and to make 'efficiency gains'.

These policies have had a considerable impact. By the beginning of the 1990s, staff-student ratios had declined significantly throughout higher education, and especially in polytechnics; one-in-three academic posts, mainly research staff on short-term contracts, were funded from non-university sources; and academic salaries had declined vis-a-vis comparable professional groups in the United Kingdom, and in comparison with the pay of academics in most other countries (with the exception of Australia). More important for the purpose of this paper, universities and polytechnics have had to reorganise and merge departments and change the balance of their teaching programmes in response to shifts in student demand and the need to maximize fee income. As might be expected, the opportunities for entrepreneurial initiatives have proved to be greater in the area of business and management studies than in most other parts of higher education.

BUSINESS SCHOOLS AND MBA PROGRAMMES

The single most important change in the institutional context of industrial relations teaching in the 1980s has been the growth of business schools and the development of MBA programmes. The very late and limited development of management education in Britain (Mangham & Silver, 1986; Constable & McCormick, 1987), combined with potentially spectacular career opportunities for 'high fliers' signalled by the expansion of business and financial services during the period of rapid economic growth in the mid-to-late 1980s, offered the promise of rich rewards from the provision of MBA and executive short-course programmes.

More than a hundred universities and polytechnics now offer some kind of MBA. The established business schools in London, Manchester and Cranfield - and a few others, including, Warwick, Bradford, Bath, City, Aston, Cardiff, and Lancaster - have large full-time MBA programmes, often with 'premium-price' fees, and Oxford university has fairly advanced plans to join this group. In

contrast, most recently-established business schools (i.e. renamed management and business studies departments) concentrate on various patterns of part-time study, sometimes tailored to the interests of client-companies in the locality. Finally, Warwick, Henley, Durham and the Open University have developed distance-learning MBA teaching packages.

The demand for industrial relations courses has been limited by several characteristics of the recent rapid growth of MBA programmes. In the 'enterprise culture' of mid-1980s Britain, Strategic Management, Marketing, and Finance courses invariably achieved a high priority in the design of the core programme and in students' choice of options. Courses concerned with 'managing people' naturally secure an established place in MBA programmes, but the contest between industrial relations, organisational behaviour, and human resource management is rarely a close one. On the full-time MBA at Warwick, for example, Organisational Behaviour is one of six compulsory first-term 'core' courses, HRM is a popular second-term 'option' chosen by 80% of students, and a third-term Industrial Relations 'elective' typically attracts 15% of the students.

While industrial relations teaching has a higher profile on some MBA programmes, it is hardly surprising that the balance between the 'old industrial relations' and the 'new' human resource management is invariably tilted towards the latter. HRM seems closer in academic orientation to the concerns of 'strategic management' and parts of the established Organisational Behaviour agenda in Britain (for example, the 'management of change' and organisational 'culture'). It more easily facilitates teaching methods and styles based around case studies and syndicate group discussions of management policy problems, and it seems more relevant to the previous management experience and future career aspirations of the students.

As will be argued later, human resource management courses are not irredeemably managerialist in their construction and delivery; research for this project unearthed a number of examples that combined a critical examination of current HRM policy issues and developments with a serious consideration of conceptual and methodological problems in the social sciences. It can be suggested, however, that the opportunity and temptation to offer descriptive case studies and prescriptive solutions derived from check-lists and over-simplified social science insights is greatest on MBA programmes. This is because the MBA is generalist in its structure and orientation. In comparison with the specialisation of most postgraduate degrees and major streams in undergraduate degrees, the crowded curriculum of most MBA programmes does not offer much time for teachers or students to reflect critically on the insights of social science literature. And while it would be misleading to impute a homogeneity in the political values of MBA students, a significant proportion seem to prefer discussions of the choice between a limited number of prescriptive solutions than a teaching style and a reading-list indicating that the 'problem' is more complex and potential 'solutions' more contentious.

POSTGRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING

The importance of the rapid expansion of human resource management courses on MBA programmes in business schools has been stressed because of the relatively weak - or fragmented - institutional identity of academic industrial relations in Britain. First, there are very few explicitly-named Industrial Relations Departments left after the mergers and reorganisation of the 1980s. The department at the London School of Economics is the most important exception: most industrial relations academics are located in teaching groups or divisions of business schools, or in departments of business studies, management, or economics; and they are more likely to be members of a 'human resource management' teaching group than one with an 'industrial relations' label.

Second, the number of undergraduate degrees with Industrial Relations in the title - always quite small - has declined, and formally-recognised 'programmes of study' or 'majors' in the subject are relatively rare. In practice, undergraduates following the BA in Business Studies degree, available in most polytechnics, and general BSc (Econ), Management Sciences and Business Administration degrees in many universities, may be able to choose 40% or more of the courses contributing to the final degree classification in the area of human resource management and industrial relations, if this is broadly-defined to include options in Labour Law and Labour Economics, as well as Introductory and International/Comparative Industrial Relations papers, one or more Personnel Management/HRM courses, and courses in Organisational Behaviour.

The evidence suggests, however, that relatively few undergraduates on business studies and management science degrees choose to specialise in the Industrial Relations/HRM area, in comparison with marketing, accounting and other subjects. Many will choose one, or at the most, two courses and the majority will favour the apparently greater vocational relevance of Personnel Management/HRM course over those with industrial relations in the title. One response to this pattern of student preference has been to combine some elements of 'traditional' industrial relations and personnel management courses with the new 'HRM agenda' in an introductory, and preferably compulsory, course in the attempt to create demand for more specialist options in subsequent years of the programme.

It is difficult, however, to generalise about the pattern of course provision, and the balance between analytical and prescriptive/vocational content and teaching styles. Some of the differences arise from variations in undergraduate degree structures; for example, the balance between compulsory and optional courses and restrictions on the choice of the latter, and the opportunity to offer courses to students on other degree programmes. At Warwick, for example, the introductory Industrial Relations course is not compulsory for any student, and of the ninety who choose it each year, there are as many students from Economics as from Management Sciences; and the increasing demand for the International & Comparative Industrial Relations course (as well as some of the changes in

content) has arisen partly from the interests of students from International Studies and the joint degree in German and Business Studies.

Other differences arise from the profile of teaching programmes covered by each department or teaching group. Staff in polytechnics who teach Diploma in Personnel Management students, as well as Business Studies undergraduates, for example, will be more familiar with teaching methods and materials designed to develop 'skills'. In many universities and polytechnics, there seems to have been some cross-fertilisation between MBA and undergraduate course design and teaching styles. This may have led to a more 'managerialist HRM agenda' in some places, but there seem to be wide variations in the way in which individual teachers, with differing academic and ideological preferences, have responded to pressures from heads of department, new programmes, and shifts in student demand. As might be expected, some 'new' courses in HRM are little more than old wine in new bottles, while other courses, still labelled 'industrial relations', cover new material and use innovative teaching methods.

For the last twenty years or so, the Masters' degrees in Industrial Relations offered by the London School of Economics and the University of Warwick have provided an important focus for the development of the subject. These programmes have been enriched by their proximity to an active group of researchers and doctoral students, and many of the best graduates of the two degree programmes have accepted academic appointments elsewhere in the United Kingdom. Both programmes grew in size in the early 1980s, despite the drastic reduction in the number of postgraduate studentships available for United Kingdom postgraduates, and they have sustained the higher intakes over recent years - around eighty students at London School of Economics (40-50% from overseas) and forty at Warwick (20-25% from overseas). The content and orientation of both programmes, however, has changed in the last decade in ways that reflect several of the themes of this paper.

First, international and comparative industrial relations has been given more emphasis in course design and student choice. At the London School of Economics there are two core courses - British Industrial Relations and Comparative Industrial Relations. Relatively few students choose to study both (15% in 1991); most prefer to combine one of these courses with two or three options. A few more students chose the course in Comparative Industrial Relations than British Industrial Relations in 1991. At Warwick, within the one core course in Industrial Relations, students can choose to be examined on a substantial comparative component, mainly focussed on European industrial relations, or a course on the Political Economy of Industrial Relations, which combines a critical approach to economic and legal analysis of employment relations, and especially an evaluation of state policies. There are also plans to increase the amount of international and comparative material that is already covered in the optional courses.

Second, and perhaps more important for the purposes of this paper, course design and student preferences now reflect a strong emphasis on the 'HRM agenda'. On the Warwick MA, a new Personnel Management option was introduced in the

mid-1980s and it has become more popular each year. More students opted for this course in 1991 than the combined number of students studying Labour History, Labour Economics, and the Sociology of Industry & Industrial Societies options, each of which is taught within the broad 'political economy of industrial relations' approach outlined earlier. The attraction for many students is the greater 'vocational relevance' of the course, and the opportunity to gain graduate membership of the Institute of Personnel Management if, in addition to meeting the requirements of the MA, they complete a further sixty hours of courses focussed on a range of 'personnel management skills'.

At the London School of Economics, a more formal 'professional stream' within the MSc in Industrial Relations and Personnel Management degree has existed for some time. This grew out of the previously-separate graduate diploma course in Personnel Management and the rich tradition established by Nancy Sear, and continued in the work of Keith Thurley, David Guest and others at LSE. Within the British Industrial Relations course, students on the professional stream follow a programme on fifteen topics of Personnel Management, while other students opt for a course on State and Public Policy or the British Labour Movement. The much greater popularity of the inter-disciplinary and applied options on Manpower Policy and Industrial Organisation, than the other optional courses - Labour Economics, Sociology of Employment, Labour Law and Labour History - offers further evidence of a reorientation in the balance of the programme in comparison with earlier years.

It is not, of course, being suggested that the staff responsible for the London School of Economics and Warwick Masters' degrees have abandoned a former commitment to theoretically-challenging and critical scholarship and introduced a narrow, managerial, or vocational curriculum. It is clear, however, that changes in industrial relations practice, and in the values and career prospects of students, many of whom face considerable financial hardship in pursuing their studies, have combined to produce significant shifts in course design at London School of Economics, Warwick and in other institutions offering smaller full-time Masters' degree programmes (for example, Templeton College, Oxford).

It is apparent also that difficult choices have to be made in designing industrial relations courses at undergraduate and postgraduate levels - and in drawing the boundaries between Industrial Relations and PM/HRM courses where they run side-by-side. An infinite variety of compromises can be found in the way that programmes and courses have resolved the difficult question of what should be included and excluded from the vast literature of British and comparative industrial relations, the new human resource management, and the disparate contributions to a 'political economy of industrial relations'. Almost inevitably, there is a tendency towards greater fragmentation in some programmes and courses, amongst cohorts of students in their choice of options, and in the orientation and interests of teaching staff.

RESEARCH FUNDING AND ORIENTATION

In the earlier part of this paper, it was argued that a considerable volume of research focussed on the traditional concerns of academic industrial relations continued throughout the 1980s. It was accompanied, however, by a new and widespread interest in human resource management and the substantial further development of research and publications located within a broad 'political economy' approach. The balance, focus, and orientation of research was, of course, influenced by the policies of funding organisations and opportunities for research access, as well as by changes in industrial relations practice.

In the early years of the decade, the climate of social science research was indeed a 'cold' one in the United Kingdom. Research funding did not escape from the tight constraints on higher education budgets, but an additional threat emerged from the hostility of some government ministers to social science research. The Rothschild enquiry into the Social Science Research Council generally supported the work of the SSRC, but the Report, published in 1982, included an allegation by Lord Beloff that there was dissatisfaction 'with the strong pro-TUC bias of the SSRC Industrial Relations Research Unit at Warwick University'. An independent enquiry subsequently rejected the allegation of bias in the IRRU's choice of subjects, use of evidence, and presentation of findings, but the uncertainty generated by the twelve months delay between the publication of the allegation and its rejection did not provide a very congenial environment for the Unit's work.

More generally, it was apparent that other industrial relations research, especially that focussed on monitoring the new employment legislation, was not exactly welcomed by government ministers. Independent academic research was rarely viewed as a desirable prelude to policy initiatives; government ministers had a clear strategy and firm policy commitments and could call on more favoured 'think tanks' if they required specialist information, advice, or an intellectual rationale for their reforms. The SSRC became the ESRC - satisfying an education minister's prejudice that 'science' should be deleted from its title - and with a greater representation of businessmen on its council, attempted to allocate its increasingly modest budget in areas that reflected the new 'policy relevance' of the time.

The IRRU - and the academic industrial relations research community generally - survived, and in some ways prospered thereafter. Perhaps the most notable achievement of the 1980s was the development of a series of data sets based on large-scale surveys. The results of the third Workplace Industrial Relations Survey and a second Company Level Industrial Relations Survey should be available in 1992. These projects have received substantial funding from the Department of Employment and the ESRC and they provide a valuable point of reference for the many case studies exploring different dimensions of change in industrial relations in the 1980s. The results of the annual New Earnings Surveys conducted by the DE, and more recently, access to the Pay Database of more than one thousand 'settlement groups' compiled by the Confederation British Industry

since 1979, also have offered a very rich source for academic analysis (Ingrain, 1991; Brown & Walsh, 1991).

The intense competition for research funding and the demands of universities and polytechnics for increasing contributions to the 'overhead' costs of research, however, present difficulties in establishing continuity in research programmes, or ameliorating the precarious employment conditions of most research staff. It has become necessary to spend an increasing amount of time pursuing applications for new sources of research funding, and calculating how the focus and orientation of the proposal will be judged by potential sponsors. With some important exceptions, especially in the area of comparative and collaborative research in Europe, often this calculation has led to an emphasis on one or more parts of the human resource management agenda.

As Richard Hyman has noted, the growth of academic industrial relations in Britain rested on the 'relevance' of its analysis to those involved in the 'management of industrial relations'. Twenty or more years ago, the pluralist argument that collective bargaining reform would involve and benefit workers, trade unions, management, and government provided a comfortable ideological niche for most industrial relations researchers. Given the substantial change in the 'texture of industrial relations' in the 1980s, especially the promise of a mainly unitarist, anti-collectivist, human resource management, there is a more discomfiting prospect that 'the job description of the industrial relations scholar-consultant is... to aid, advise and reinforce management in exerting unilateral control over the workforce' (1989:13).

While it would be unreasonable to argue that this has occurred so far, research in the HRM area exhibits in a much sharper form, many of the perennial problems facing industrial relations academics. What is the dividing-line between independent research, commissioned research, and management consultancy? Do industrial relations academics have any comparative advantage over their colleagues in Organisational Behaviour, or the staff in the specialist HRM divisions of large consultancy organisations, in the competition for resources? Does research funding from a consortium of participating organisations undermine academic independence? And even if research is supported by entirely 'clean' funding, is access to sensitive areas of management often dependant on a trade-off that implicitly shapes a quasi-consultancy relationship?

Answers to these questions will emerge more clearly over the next few years. Meanwhile, it is clear that research in industrial relations (broadly-defined) covers a vast range of theoretical and empirical interests, rooted in quite different disciplinary and analytical approaches. Research papers are presented at an increasing number of conferences and published in a growing number of specialist and practitioners' journals. If industrial relations research is 'alive and well' in Britain, then the heterogeneity of its expressions may be a source of confusion to many academics and students.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The general argument of this paper is that the core assumptions and practice of academic industrial relations were undermined in the 1980s, and that the subject fragmented into the two broad, and largely incompatible, approaches of human resource management and 'political economy'. In commenting briefly on the future of the subject in the United Kingdom, this argument must be re-examined and qualified.

First, the economic and political environment of industrial relations had changed in important ways by the beginning of the 1990s. The 'economic miracle' of sustained growth, low inflation, labour productivity gains, and real income improvements came to an end by 1989. The subsequent leadership crisis at the heart of the government changed the political climate and the industrial relations public policy agenda. In the last few years, parts of the 'old industrial relations' have returned to command more attention than the less substantiated claims of the proponents of the 'new HRM'. Public sector pay problems returned to the news headlines with the ambulance dispute, the productivity 'miracle' crumbled in the face of mounting recession, and the Labour Party's policies (including commitments to a statutory minimum wage, a national economic forum, and an extension of employment rights) began to be taken more seriously because of the government's unpopularity in the opinion polls. In short, there were a series of reminders of the powerful cyclical pressures on industrial relations that a five year period around the mid-1980s had concealed.

Second, the response of industrial relations teachers and researchers to the very substantial challenges posed by human resource management has been more creative and consequently, less traumatic than might have been expected. Academics with a track-record of critical and scholarly research in 'mainstream' industrial relations have contributed significantly to the debates on HRM theory and practice and in the editorial direction of new journals in the area. Teachers who initially resisted or grudgingly acquiesced in their involvement in new programmes and redesigned courses often now report that it has proved possible to combine elements and perspectives of the 'old' and 'new' material in creative ways; and that some of the teaching methods and materials introduced to meet student expectations on HRM/MBA courses can be adapted to improve more traditional industrial courses.

Thirdly, the focus and style of many recent contributions to the 'political economy' approach seem closer to the interests of 'mainstream' teachers and researchers in industrial relations. Many contributors appear to have moved beyond earlier highly-abstract, and polemical arguments to a more active engagement in policy debates and empirical research. Industrial relations academics within this broad approach, as in each of the others, seem to have fairly well-developed skills in organisational survival and career development.

These three qualifications to the overall argument of the paper are not intended to undermine its general validity. Perhaps the coherence and identity of industrial

relations in its 'golden age' concealed an innocence and modesty of ambition, but it contrasts fairly vividly with heterogeneous and specialist interests expressed in industrial relations teaching and research in the early 1990s.

REFERENCES

- Bassett P. (1986) *Strike Free: New Industrial Relations in Britain*. London, Macmillan.
- Beechey B. & Perkins T. (1987) *A Matter of Hours: Women, Part-time Work and the Labour Market*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Brown W. & Wadhvani S. (1990) 'The Economic Effects of Industrial Relations Legislation since 1979', *National Institute Economic Review* (February).
- Brown W. & Walsh J. (1991) 'Pay Determination in Britain in the 1980s: The Anatomy of Decentralisation', *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* Vol. 7 (1).
- Clegg H.A. (1990) *The Oxford School of Industrial Relations*. Warwick Papers in Industrial Relations, No. 31. Coventry, IRRU.
- Constable R. & McCormick R. (1987) *The Making of British Managers*. London, British Institute of Management.
- Daniel W.W. (1990) 'Needed: a Policy for Industrial Relations', *Policy Studies*, Vol. 11 (1).
- Dunn S. (1990) 'Root Metaphor in the Old and New Industrial Relations', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 28 (1).
- Dunn S. (1991) 'Root Metaphor in Industrial Relations: A reply to Tom Keenoy', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 29 (2).
- Edwards P.K. (1986) *Conflict at Work: A Materialist Analysis of Workplace Relations*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Guest D. (1989) 'Personnel and HRM: Can You Tell the Difference?', *Personnel Management* (January).
- Hanson C. & Mather G. (1988) *Striking Out Strikes*, London, I.E.A.
- Hyman R. (1989) *The Political Economy of Industrial Relations*. London, Macmillan.
- Hyman R. (1987) 'Strategy or Structure? Capital, Labour and Control', *Work, Employment and Society*, Vol. 1 (1).
- Ingrain P. (1991) 'Ten Years of Manufacturing Wage Settlements: 1979-89', *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, Vol. 7 (1).
- Keenoy T. (1990) 'HRM: A Case of the Wolf in Sheep's Clothing?', *Personnel Review*, Vol. 19 (2).
- Keenoy T. (1991) 'The Roots of Metaphor in the Old and New Industrial Relations', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 29 (2).
- Kelly J. (1982) *Scientific Management, Job Redesign and Work Performance*, New York, Academic Press.
- Kelly J. & Richardson R. (1989) 'Annual Review Article', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 27 (1).
- Knights D. & Willmott H. (eds) (1990) *Labour Process Theory*. London, Macmillan.
- Lewis R. (1991) 'Reforming Industrial Relations: Law, Politics, and Power' *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, Vol. 7 (1).

- Mangham I. & Silver M. (1986) *Management Training: Context and Practice* London, ESRC.
- Metcalf D. (1991) 'Union Presence and Labour Productivity in British Manufacturing Industry: A Reply to Nolan and Marginson', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 28 (2).
- MacInness J. (1987) *Thatcherism at Work*. Milton Keynes, Open University Press.
- Nolan P. (1989) 'Walking on Water? Performance and Industrial Relations under Thatcher', *Industrial Relations Journal*, Vol. 20 (2).
- Nolan P. & Marginson P. 'Skating on Thin Ice? David Metcalf on Trade Unions and Productivity', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 28 (2).
- Pollert A. (ed) (1991) *Farewell to Flexibility?* Oxford, Blackwell.
- Purcell J. (1991) 'The Rediscovery of the Management Prerogative: The Management of Labour Relations in the 1980s', *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, Vol. 7 (1).
- Purcell J. & Sisson K. (1983) 'Strategies and Practice in the Management of Industrial Relations', in Bain G. (ed) *Industrial Relations in Britain*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Purcell J. & Ahlstrand B. (1989) 'Company Strategy and the Management of Employee Relations in the Multi-Divisional Company', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 27 (3).
- Storey J. (ed) (1989) *New Perspectives on Human Resource Management*. London, Routledge.
- Tailby S. & Whitston C. (1989) *Manufacturing Change: Industrial Relations and Restructuring*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Wedderburn Lord. (1986) *The Worker and the Law*, 3rd edn. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.
- Wood S. (ed.) (1982) *The Degradation of Work? Skill, De-skilling and the Labour Process*. London, Hutchinson.
- Wood S. (ed) (1989) *The Transformation of Work? Skill, Flexibility and the Labour Process*. London, Unwin Hyman.

5 Commentary

Gill Palmer

Both David Winchester and Peter Cappelli have spoken of the rise and fall of Golden Ages for industrial relations academics in their countries. This inevitably raises the question of whether Australia is entering a Golden Age, and what the comparisons can tell us of the opportunities and threats that might be involved.

In the U.K. the Golden Age dates from the mid 1960s to 1979. This was a time when public policy included incomes policies and the industrial relations reforms associated with the 1968 Donovan Commission - a Royal Commission of Inquiry into Trade Unions and Employers Associations. It was also a time when powerful alliances of industrial relations academics set agendas for research and established new centres of teaching. In the USA the Golden Age can be associated with the New Deal of the 1930s and the growth of Industrial Relations Institutes which set the agendas for research and teaching in industrial relations for North America's post war decades.

In the development of these periods of growth and consolidation for industrial relations, two crucial elements are worth noting. The first is that in both the UK and USA the development of new academic opportunities in the field was closely associated with changes in public policy. New legislation and government programs in industrial relations focussed public attention on the subject area. The spread of new prescriptions helped to set agendas and facilitated the provision of public funds for new departments and research projects. The second common element was that key academics played a pro-active, not simply a reactive, role in the construction of the public policy that helped build academic empires.

In the U.K. Flanders, Clegg and McCarthy were the key players in the Oxford School, so named because they were all at Oxford university in the early 1960s. They argued the need for workplace reform, and their prescriptions for the restructuring of collective bargaining in order to incorporate shop stewards within formal negotiating procedures at enterprise levels were influential. These academics played a major role in setting the agenda for debate, in advising labour governments on the form of public policies and in managing the public agencies established to implement the policies of reform. All were associated with the

work of the Donovan Commission. Hugh Clegg was a member of the Devlin committee (which reported on the decasualization of the docks) and of the National Board for Prices and Incomes in the mid 1960s. In 1979 he was appointed Chair of the Standing Commission on Pay Comparability which lasted until 1981. Allan Flanders was a major figure in the establishment and management of the Commission of Industrial Relations. The NBPI, the CIR and similar agencies provided jobs for academics and post graduate students in industrial relations who were recruited as the carriers of the Oxford message of reform. This was a message that would not have been so familiar to the public servants who joined them in these agencies. Clegg moved from Oxford to Warwick University in 1967, established a new masters program and in 1970 gained funds for a Social Science Research Council Centre of Industrial Relations. Warwick became the academic symbol of Britain's golden age in industrial relations.

From 1980 Winchester argues that the golden age ended in the U.K. and that since that date British industrial relations academics have endured a 'cold climate'. The radical shift in public policy was an obvious cause of change. Unlike her predecessor as Conservative Prime Minister Mr Heath, Mrs Thatcher eliminated all the agencies that had been established as part of the previous labour government's neo-corporatist interventionism. The public sector jobs for academics went with them. Debates about industrial relations reform continued, but they were not led by academics in the field. The new public policies required implementation through the state's court machinery, rather than the tripartite agencies of pluralist intervention. From the USA Cappelli also notes the importance of a changing public policy focus. America did not experience the pendulum shift in policy that occurred in Britain, but the policy issues that had fuelled industrial relations growth were in decline: "as many industrial relations problems became less urgent, the field's reason for existence became less clear" and "without a unique set of policy topics to give it legitimacy, IR found itself in competition with other approaches for territory." (see Capelli chapter ?)

Other factors that Winchester and Cappelli mention as contributing to the cold are changes in the distribution of employment to economic sectors where unionism did not have a strong hold, declining union membership, and the effectiveness of managerial strategies designed to construct closer corporate, preferably non-union, relationships with employees.

I believe we also need to consider the possibility that Golden Ages carry the seeds of their own irrelevance in changing times. To construct a new and powerful academic focus requires all the skills of an empire builder. Territories have to be claimed and protected from the invasion of rivals. Walls will be built around these territories. Within the walls, ideologies of purity are likely to provide cultural support for insiders in the defence of their ambitions. As this occurs, influences and ideas from outside the group will not be valued or credited.

In the academic world, the inevitable and necessary strategies of organisational development may build inflexibility into the teaching and research of a subject. A cohesive body of scholars may be resistant to the analysis of ideas that do not fit

within the confines of territories that have taken great efforts to establish and protect.

The British and American Golden Ages inevitably suffered some perceptual rigidities. The strengths of the Oxford School lay in the analysis of workplace industrial relations, in national prices and incomes policy-making and the associated needs to restructure collective bargaining. As with the Americans, union-employer relations were emphasized. Management, government and other workforce issues were not defined as of central relevance. The academic fortresses of the Golden Age had not been built to cater for these issues and challenges from these directions were likely to be difficult to handle. For academics outside the Oxford School, concern to address these issues may have been stronger.

Winchester explains how, in response to the changed climate of the 1980s, many academics in Britain adjusted their focus of interest away from trade unions and collective bargaining towards a consideration of employer strategies and patterns of control. Work in this area was not new, but was given much more emphasis than hitherto in teaching and research. Winchester notes that the researchers who challenged the old boundary definitions of industrial relations to focus on management, split into two distinct and sometime warring camps. On one side were those he groups under 'Human Resource Management' who became interested in the management prescriptions that flourished in the 1980s and who found a ready audience for their interests in Business Schools and among management practitioners. On the other side were a group Winchester classifies under the political economy of industrial relations who, as he notes, generally held secure and tenured jobs and adopted a radical approach which rested on labour process theory or comparative analysis.

The theoretical and political conflicts between these two approaches has caused tension not only in the U.K. but in the U.S.A. and Australia. No central, dominant approach has developed to impose peace or integration on the warring factions. Many within the traditional industrial relations community are concerned about the danger of a form of managerialism where academics adopt managerial agendas and promote prescriptions to increase managerial control at the cost of unions or the workforce. Within Australia these concerns have been clearly expressed by Guille, Sappey. and Winter (1989).

Cappelli's argument, which I endorse, is that the growing interest in the problems of management provides opportunities for the industrial relations community to extend its academic territory into new fields. The same argument is made by Strauss (1990).

"if IR is to continue to thrive as an academic field it should broaden its scope; it should focus less exclusively on union- management relations and instead re-assert the jurisdiction over the personnel field (now HRM) that it exercised in the 1950. In particular it should be concerned with what I might call macro- HR or HR policy".

In this regard two issues need discussion. First the concerns of bias - that entering management territory implies the adoption of management's agendas. If this concern is satisfied, the second issue concerns the strengths of the industrial relations discipline against rivals in the area.

All social science faces the interminable problem of bias. In the discussion Capelli suggested there were particular dangers with the study of management and industrial relations because of the clash in economic interests surrounding employment relations. I would argue that academics in any field of management face the problems of bias that apply to the study of any social situation with divisions of power. There are inevitable pressures on academics to become incorporated into, or unquestioningly accept, reality as constructed by dominant power-groups. Accountancy academics can get caught in value-laden conflicts over the nature and purpose of accountancy controls. Marketing academics can question the social values promulgated by an advertising campaign. In many ways industrial relations academics have advantages in the management area. They are encouraged to address crucial questions of power and conflict because of the presence of organised and articulate pressure groups, in the form of trade unions, which carry alternate definitions of reality. Management education as a whole can benefit from a clear understanding of pluralist interests and the need for a critical approach to the social structures and policies that affect managerial work.

If industrial relations academics do choose to study management issues and find ways of overcoming the difficulties surrounding the clear conflicts of values that are apparent in the area, then the next issue concerns the contribution they can make. Cappelli argues that in the USA the study of management and the management of employees has been neglected by competitive disciplines. He argues that Organisational Behaviour has vacated the field and focuses on the minutiae of individual differences in reaction to employment. He sees strong possibilities for industrial relations - led developments in this academic area.

Within Australia and the U.K. it would seem that the psychology-based disciplines have a firmer hold on organisational analysis. Within the major business schools Organisational Behaviour and Organisation Development are flourishing and important areas, and psychological studies are not all focussed at the micro level. On the other hand, a long tradition of industrial and organisational sociology in the UK has been used to provide an academic base on which to build bridges from industrial relations to management. For many years masters students have been able to combine industrial relations and industrial sociology at London School of Economics and Warwick. Early in the 1980s industrial sociology was being used in some texts to provide the base for a focus on management in the employment relationship (Purcell, 1981; Palmer, 1983). This became the basis upon which Warwick built a new strength in the study of the management of industrial relations (Batstone et al., 1977; Batstone et al., 1978; Edwards & Scullion, 1982; Batstone et al. 1987; Edwards, 1987; Marginson et al, 1988; Sisson, 1989).

Warwick University and its Centre for Industrial Relations must be commended for the way that its teaching and research have adjusted to meet the challenge of a new focus on management. This flexibility was probably a major factor in assisting the Centre's survival in the face of the Conservative Government's concern to re-shape the structure and purpose of the Social Science Research Council, and in the face of the inquiry set up under Sir Kenneth Berrill in 1982, into the alleged bias of the Centre's research. This enquiry arose from allegations made by Lord Beloff in evidence to the Rothschild Report on the Social Science Research Council. Its report, in 1983 cleared the unit of bias. In the face of this attack, industrial relations academics associated with the Oxford School displayed another feature that Cappelli lists as one of the advantages that should guarantee the survival of industrial relations. The study of industrial relations provides a good introduction to the political realities of work life. The theoretical understanding of the importance of political lobbies and the value of alliances in defence of certain positions can often be put into practice in the creation or protection of academic centres of strength. These political skills were called for, and used, to defend Warwick.

In the U.K. researchers have been working to redress the earlier deficiencies in the study of workplace and corporate industrial relations activities. There are two other areas where I believe the Golden Age was weak, and where change might still condemn the traditionalist studies to irrelevance. The first concerns the politics of industrial relations. Although industrial relations academics displayed political skills, politics or political sociology was not part of the academic grounding of the Oxford School. The Oxford School analysis of British industrial relations did not discuss the significant changes in the role of government that were undermining the pluralist theoretical foundations of their subject matter. Even in the Golden Age the political context of British industrial relations was changing. Indeed the prescriptions of the Oxford School introduced new forms of state intervention which could be analysed as forms of neo corporatism. Significant changes in the role of the British state in industrial relations did not start with the Thatcher conservative government and these changes require new forms of analysis. The reforms were not 'voluntary' in the tradition of British collective bargaining (Flanders, 1965) but had similarities with the micro and macro corporatism traditionally found in Europe (Palmer, 1986 and 1988). The importance of studying the political sociology of industrial relations in order to keep the subject relevant for Britain is now increased by the impact of new forms of regulation in the EEC.

The final area where the expertise and analysis of the British Golden Age was ill equipped to adjust to changes in the subject area relates to the impact of changing gender roles. Industrial relations has been constructed around male agendas. Not surprisingly for a subject with roots in labour economics and based on the analysis of employment relationships, male forms of work and male issues have been central. Relatively little attention has been given to female work or female issues. Equal pay and equal representation have found a place in research and curricula as industrial relations practitioners and academics have adjusted to the claims of groups disadvantaged by ethnicity or gender. However the analysis of the changes in work structures and cultures that may emerge in response to a radically

different division of labour in society is still in its infancy. I suspect that any analysis that is taking place is to be found in sociology, womens studies or management, rather than in industrial relations departments. The tensions that these changes create may be mediated through legal, rather than industrial relations institutions. If equal opportunity legislation and equal opportunity officers become the mediators of these changes in employment relationships, then the relevance of traditional approaches in industrial relations will be lessened.

Winchester's paper provides a clear picture of the way British industrial relations academics are expanding the studies on which the Golden Age was founded. The academic fortress that was built at Warwick as the main bastion of the Golden Age was strong enough to withstand the fiercest of attacks launched in the freezing climate of the 1980s. The continuing output noted in Winchester's paper is an impressive testimony to the legacy of that age.

REFERENCES

- Batstone, E., Boraston, I., & Frenkel, S., (1977) *Shop Stewards in Action*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Batstone, E., Boraston, I. & Frenkel, S. (1978) *The Social Organisation of Strikes*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Batstone, E., Gourlay, S., Levie, H. & Moore, R. (1987) *New Technology & the Process of Labour Regulation*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Edwards, P.K., & Scullion H. (1982) *The Social Organisation of Industrial Conflict*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Edwards, P.K. (1987) *Managing the Factory*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Flanders, A. 1965, *Industrial Relations: What is Wrong with the System?* London, Faber.
- Guille, H., Sappey, D., Winter, M., (1989) "Can Industrial Relations survive Without Unions" in Bray, M. & Kelly, D. *Issues and Trends in Australasian Industrial Relations: Proceedings of the 4th Biennial AIRAANZ Conference*
- Marginson, P., Edwards, P.K., Martin, R., Purcell, J., Sisson, K. (1988) *Beyond the Workplace*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Palmer, G. (1983) *British Industrial Relations*, London, Allen & Unwin.
- Palmer, G. (1986) "Donovan, the Commission on Industrial Relations and Post-Liberal Rationalisation" *British Journal of Industrial Relations* Vol. 24 No. 2 (July).
- Palmer, G. (1988) "The Corporatism Debate: Does it Illuminate the Australian Experience?" Paper presented to The British Universities Industrial Relations Association conference at Warwick University.
- Purcell, J., (1981) *Good Industrial Relations: Theory & Practice* London, Macmillan.
- Sisson, K. (1989) *Personnel Management in Britain*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Strauss, G. (1990) "Toward the Study of Human Resources Policy", Chapter 4 of Chelius, J., & Dworkin, J., *Reflections on the Transformation of Industrial Relations* IMLR 1990.

6 Industrial Relations Teaching and Research in New Zealand

Kevin Hince

INTRODUCTION

The earliest conferences of teachers of industrial relations in Australia were organised by Kingsley Laffer (University of Sydney) and Bill Ford (University of New South Wales) in the 1950s and early 1960s respectively. Laffer was also a prime mover in the establishment of the Industrial Relations Society of New South Wales (1958), and *The Journal of Industrial Relations* (1959). He was founding editor of that journal.

Ford organised the first meeting involving teachers of industrial relations from both Australia and New Zealand. That conference was held at the Australian National University, Canberra in 1970. A second trans-Tasman meeting was convened in Wellington in 1978, and with the formation of the Association of Industrial Relations Academics of Australia and New Zealand (AIRAANZ) at the Gippsland Institute, Victoria, in 1983, such meetings became a regular and welcome feature of the professional organisation of industrial relations academics in Australasia.

Between 1974 and the mid-1980s a separate industrial relations section of the Australian New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science also facilitated such meetings. Research issues and outcomes dominated the formal ANZAAS programme: teaching issues were restricted to informal dialogue. Teaching received more prominence at the other gatherings. AIRAANZ adopted a special brief for itself with issues related to the teaching of the discipline. The current research project of the Australian Centre for Industrial Relations Research and Teaching (ACIRRT) builds on and extends this, albeit recently developed, tradition. The ACIRRT review approaches the task in a more cohesive and coordinated fashion and, for the first time in the region, seeks an evaluation against wider international yardsticks.

At the initial trans-Tasman conference at the Australian National University, John Young, of the Victoria University of Wellington, presented an overview of the situation in New Zealand (Young, 1971). The paper was significant at the time as a report on developments (or lack of) to 1970. It is even more valuable for it

provides base data for the task in hand of describing, analysing and evaluating the current position, and the extent and directions of change over the intervening years.

Young's analysis commenced from the proposition that the dominant feature of the New Zealand system of industrial relations between 1894 and 1970 was the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act (first passed in 1894). That statute, Young argued, created an environment in which law and the state were the prime forces regulating industrial relations, and the general thrust was for the continued maintenance of the status quo. Consequently, prior to the 1970s, there was little discussion of modern industrial relations philosophy and practice. And the education system reflected these community values. In the 1960s teaching of business administration and public administration developed within the universities (the first Professor of Business Administration was appointed in 1962), but the long-standing dichotomy between "personnel administration" and "industrial relations" was maintained (Young p.68). Business courses at universities began to incorporate the mechanics of the former, whilst continuing to ignore the latter.

One enigma left unexplained by Young, but alluded to by Anderson (1987), was that the New Zealand system, although based on legislation similar to that of the Australian Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Acts of 1904 and later, and, with legally qualified judges heading the Arbitration Court, did not develop the legalisms, or province for lawyers, that occurred in Australia. Undoubtedly the absence of constitutional issues was an important, although not sufficient, explanatory variable. Lay advocacy and lay assessors became the rule, within the New Zealand system. Labour law did not develop as a sub-set of legal teaching within law faculties until the 1960s. Initial developments in industrial relations teaching at New Zealand universities date from the same decade. A small group of economists sought and achieved a broadening of labour economics courses to incorporate industrial relations (especially institutional) material.¹ The same group of academics were also involved in the concurrent development of the 1960s, namely the extension of university teaching in industrial relations toward providing non-degree courses for union officials. Each type of development occurred in the mid-1960s at Victoria and Otago universities.

In 1969 a National Development Conference addressed the need for better trained managers, personnel officers and supervisors. The Labour Committee of that conference endorsed recommendations of an earlier report (Hare, 1946). Hare had argued that improvements were essential in the management of labour and that training of foremen, business executives and personnel officers was essential. He had recommended a School of Social Studies be established to provide training in the areas of labour economics and industrial relations. The 1969 Conference recommended "a special industrial relations conference, and the establishment of an industrial relations centre at a university" (Young p. 67).

In summary, it can be asserted that industrial relations education in New Zealand generally, and in New Zealand universities particularly, dates from the late 1960s, with the 1970s the key take-off decade. In a later section of this paper the same

general time frame is identified to apply to the development of research in industrial relations in New Zealand.

PROGRAMMES OF STUDY AT THE UNIVERSITIES

Aspects of industrial relations and associated disciplines are part of the programmes of study at each of the seven universities in New Zealand. But diversity, albeit within some elements of commonality, is the norm. The current pattern is largely a product of past factors, although the impetus of more recent events, both external to and within each university, is beginning to accelerate and influence the delivery of industrial relations and related programmes of study. Within the overall pattern there is a clear dichotomy between those universities where the offerings are substantial, and those where less markedly significant offerings exist.

Four universities, Massey, Otago, Victoria and Auckland are in the first group. Each of these universities has had a long term commitment to the teaching of industrial relations. A similar commitment has not existed at the remaining three universities, Canterbury, Lincoln and Waikato, and offerings there are less significant. One qualification to the above position, is that with the advent of the Centre for Trade Union and Labour Studies (discussed later) the situation, both in respect to commitment and offerings, is changing at Waikato.

The Major Providers:

Massey

At Massey University the Bachelor of Business Studies (BBS) is the key programme for delivery of industrial relations and related subjects. Within that degree a designated Human Resources Management stream is one of twelve areas of study that a student may elect as a specialisation after completing a compulsory core of papers. The specialisation requires completion of three core units and four units from an extensive list of options. The core units each titled Human Resources Management include some industrial relations specifics within an overall context of human resource management concepts and issues, personnel management, organisation behaviour, communication and training and development.

More specific industrial relations units (and related study areas) are listed amongst the optional units. These are listed below. The first course is offered at the 200 level, and the remainder at the 300 level. The range of core units offered at Massey and the substance of course content are similar, although not identical, to the position at each of the major providers.

The New Zealand Industrial Relations System: examining the rights and obligations under current industrial relations legislation, together with the administrative and strategic implications for employers and trade unions.

Labour Market Issues and Perspectives: placing economic and industrial relations issues in context, dealing with inter alia employment, unemployment, labour market dynamics, equal opportunity in relation to ethnicity and gender, and questions of sectional demographics.

Industrial Relations Management and Administration: extending the issues raised in the introductory unit above, examining "...various techniques, both theoretical and applied and evaluate(ing) them against the range of administrative needs conditional upon operational location, organisational function and contributory type". (Massey University Calendar 1990 at 486).

Current Theory and Practice in Industrial Relations: examining, in depth, the contemporary New Zealand industrial relations environment. Comparative and operational perspectives are involved.

Industrial Relations Policies: focussing on contemporary policy initiatives by national government, especially labour market reform and the concept of labour market flexibility. Papers in applied Human Resource Management, Current Issues Resource Management, Personnel Management Practice, Communication, Training and Instruction, Safety Management, several psychology units, and an economic theory unit are also available within this specialisation. Related units, for example, Labour Economics and Equal Employment Opportunity, are available as elective subjects. Students pursuing other specialisations within the BBS can undertake industrial relations units as electives.

Massey University also makes use of many undergraduate units as composite parts of the Diploma in Business Studies (a two year full time programme). A Personnel Management stream makes some use of specific industrial relations units, as does the separate Diploma in Safety Management. Because the Diploma in Business Studies is primarily delivered in the external mode further reference to these important industrial relations offerings are made later in the section dealing with distance learning.

Several 400 level units are available in the broad human resource management specialisation, including one paper, Advanced Industrial Relations. This unit investigates the effects of macro/micro change on industrial relations, from both a theoretical and empirical perspective, placing stress upon the implications for corporate and government policies. Industrial relations has a specific role in the MBA programme linked with organisation theory and personnel management in an overall human resources management component.

Otago

Industrial relations material is encompassed in programmes offered by each of the Department of Management and the Department of Economics. In the former instance the offerings are integrated within an organisation theory/general management set of programmes, whilst in the latter instance the industrial relations material is integrated with, and extends from a labour economics basis. The integration with labour economics includes an introduction to labour economics in a general stage 1 paper, a specific 300 level labour economics unit and a 400 level course Industrial Relations available for credit in an Economics honours programme. Issues, specifically focussing on New Zealand, related to collective bargaining (theory, and structure, productivity bargaining, and bargaining and the public sector) industrial conflict and trade unions and worker participation, are included in the syllabus.

The industrial relations material integrated with the management programme is more extensive, with a component (an introduction to the functional area of industrial relations etc.) in the core first year management subject, and specific industrial relations units available at each of the 200, 300, and 400 (honours and post-graduate) levels. The range of topics in the 200 level unit illustrates the inter-link with management. These topics are: a study of New Zealand industrial relations legislation, arbitration, motivation, job satisfaction, industrial conflict, income policies, productivity bargaining and industrial democracy. The 300 level course combines aspects of "a study of industrial relations practice and the development of the relevant skills" with comparative study. Additional related units in organisational theory and personnel management are offered at the 200, 300, 400 level, within the undergraduate management programme.

A paper Human Resource Management is a compulsory component within Part 2 of the MBA degree, whilst more specialised and advanced studies in this topic area are available for students wanting to undertake a Graduate Diploma in Personnel. In each case many traditional industrial relations issues are handled as a part of that broader framework. In the case of the MBA paper, specific industrial relations issues and skills are identified as one-third of the programme. But closely related issues, such as equal employment, comparable worth, health and safety are also identified topics in other components of the syllabus. Industrial relations law is taught as part of the business law module in Part 1 of the MBA programme.

Victoria

At Victoria University undergraduate degree units in industrial relations are included in the Bachelor of Commerce and Administration (BCA) and Bachelor of Arts (BA) degrees. The core programme encompasses one 200 level unit, Introduction to Industrial Relations in New Zealand and five 300 level units (The Practice of Industrial Relations, Comparative Industrial Relations, Labour Economics, Labour Law, and a special topic unit which facilitates use of specific staff talents and/or focus on a contemporary need). Two units of organisation

behaviour and one titled Human Resource Management are also offered. For historical, structural reasons, the labour law unit is only available within the BCA. To further underscore the later and slower (relative to international comparisons) development of industrial relations teaching in New Zealand it can be noted that the separation of the "practice" and "comparative" components of a single course with the concurrent development of a complete unit in each area, and the introduction of the special topic offering, did not occur at Victoria until 1986, and significant expansion of the Auckland undergraduate programme did not occur until even later (in 1988).

At Victoria, 400 level courses are offered in industrial relations and labour economics. One of the industrial relations units at this level focuses on theoretical issues, and the other on policy issues. Industrial relations is available as a compulsory unit within the Diploma of Business Administration, and as an elective within the MBA (for the first time in 1991). A separate Human Resource Management unit, with some specific industrial relations input has been available in the MBA programme for some time.

The Certificate/Diploma in Industrial relations programme is the key industrial relations offering at Victoria University. The programme is of long standing, commencing in 1976. It was unique in New Zealand then, and is so today. The Certificate and Diploma are designed as two separate, but inter-locking qualifications. The two years part-time, block release study provides for intensive examination of the theory and practice of industrial relations. The entry requirements are those of mature age, on-the-job experience and assessed ability to successfully complete the programme. Conventional university entrance is not required, although an increasing number of applicants do satisfy this requirement.

The first year, the Certificate, concentrates on industrial relations practice. The instructional programme encompassing knowledge, skills and enrichment components. Requisite industrial knowledge is distilled from relevant disciplines including economics, politics, law, sociology, history and organisation/personnel studies. Institutional knowledge, descriptive and analytical, is incorporated, within an overall framework designed to fulfil a multi-disciplinary approach to teaching industrial relations. The programme also seeks to cover a full range of skills identified as a necessary part of the tool kit/capabilities of the industrial relations practitioner - statistics, accounting, research, bargaining, advocacy, for example. Much of the teaching is interactive, and experiential. The separation, but inter-connection between the Certificate and Diploma allows students who believe completion of the one-year programme, emphasising knowledge and practice, meets their needs for the time being, can end participation at that time and accept the Certificate as a stand alone qualification of achievement. Others, who meet the required standard (a B level pass) in the Certificate and have further identified needs, can continue for the second year. The Diploma year focuses on industrial relations theory and policy, introduces a wider and in-depth comparative perspective to the studies, and incorporates selected discipline based material, especially law and economics, at a more advanced level.

Both the Certificate and Diploma are presented in modular form. Students attend the university full-time for short sessions of two-week duration, interspersed with the continuation of normal employment. In the case of the Certificate course there are three modules, and for the Diploma two modules. Preparatory and further reading, and assignments are covered between modules. Assessment is based on these assignments and examinations are conducted at the end of each on-campus module. The course/subject matter is evaluated as an entity, rather than by discrete subject/topic testing. An applied project, student selected and frequently work-related, is undertaken as part of the assessment requirements of the Diploma.

Auckland

The overall range and scope of industrial relations and related offerings at Auckland, Otago, Massey and Victoria (excluding the Certificate/Diploma) are broadly similar. Certainly these universities have a depth of courses not present at the remaining three campuses. The main programme of industrial relations and related subjects at Auckland is provided within the Bachelor of Commerce degree of the Faculty of Commerce. At the 100 level industrial relations is taught within an umbrella introductory unit Organisation and Management. This unit is a compulsory component of the B Com degree. Management Studies and Labour Relations is then one of six optional streams. Specific industrial relations units are offered at the 200, 300 and 400 level. At 200 level one specific course, Labour Relations, an introductory course, with special reference to New Zealand, is offered. At 300 level comparative Labour Relations and Comparative History of Labour Relations units are available. Advanced study programmes encompassing contemporary themes and comparative labour relations exist at 400 level.

Organisation theory, personnel policy and practice, training and development and organisational psychology units are available at various levels. A labour law unit offered from the Commercial Law Department and labour economics (from the Economics Department, located solely in the Arts Faculty at Auckland) can be included by the B Com student with the more specific industrial relations offerings. Candidates for the B Com can also include subjects from the Arts Faculty regulations, and Labour Economics, Sociology of Work and Sociology of Industrial Relations units are available. Several industrial law units are taught by the Law Faculty, but are available for LL B students only.

A Human Resource Management specialisation is available as one of the three part II programmes that MBA students may choose after completing a compulsory Part I core. Five papers selected from seven options make up the specialisation. The options are Labour Law, Labour Relations, Personnel Policy and Practice, Organisational Development, Training and Development and two papers incorporating the generic title Human Resource Management. A Diploma of Business Studies, a one-year full-time equivalent programme, includes a specialisation in Personnel Management and Employee Relations. A core of

labour relations, personnel policy and practice and organisational behaviour is the base with selections from a list of titles similar to that described above for the MBA programme. In a high proportion of cases the same prescription and course is involved.

Other Providers:

Canterbury, Lincoln and Waikato

At the University of Canterbury one 300 level unit, Human Resource Management integrating a study of the industrial relations environment in New Zealand and dispute resolution, within a broader "people in organisations" focus, is offered in the B Com programme. Half courses in each of human resource management and industrial relations are offered within the M Com programme. A course Labour Law is available within the LL B. A unit Sociology of Work and two units of social, industrial and organisational psychology, are also included in the BA schedule. Labour economics issues are not specifically identified in a separate course but incorporated within generic economics course offerings. History offerings within the BA do not include a specific labour history component. Lincoln University achieved autonomous status in 1990. It developed from Lincoln Agricultural College (of the University of Canterbury) and the commerce programmes progressively expanded from farm management to a broader based approach. A 200 level unit, People in Organisations is available. It encompasses industrial relations issues from a traditional personnel management perspective, emphasising employment contracts, evaluation, rewards and communication. A further unit at 300 level, a conventional organisational behaviour course, is the only other relevant offering at Lincoln.

A four year Bachelor of Management Studies (BMS) is the main undergraduate programme within the School of Management Studies at Waikato University. Organisation behaviour is a key part of the programme, with units offered at 200, 300 and 400 level. Further units which are available include, Human Resource Management (a study of the personnel function and the management of human resources of the organisation), Organisation Communication (application of principles and practice of communication within an organisational setting). These offerings, in total, clearly indicate the thrust of the Waikato programme. Industrial relations per se is addressed only obliquely in the above units, or in units such as Women in Management (including inter alia, the law, work, equal employment opportunity). Two units of labour economics, one at each of 300 and 400 level, are also offered for BMS and B Soc Sci students. Two units, Social and Industrial/Organisational Psychology, and Human Behaviour in Work Organisations are taught by psychology staff of the School of Social Sciences, the latter solely for students of the School of Management Studies.

Whilst Waikato has elected not to develop specific industrial relations courses within or associated with the BMS, there has been an extensive development of related material from the broader social science humanities perspective. The Centre for Labour and Trade Union Studies has developed from, and is extending,

this particular tradition. Sociology/anthropology courses, Women and Work in New Zealand, Technology Work and Industry and Working Class Culture are offered within the School of Social Sciences. Similarly, two political science based units, The Politics of the Working Class and The Political Economy of Collective Bargaining, are available within that school. A labour history unit, The Making of the Working Class in New Zealand, 1870-1970 is offered within the School of Humanities, and available for students enrolled for the B Soc Sci, BA and Certificate of Trade Union Studies.

Programmes of Study:

The Polytechnics

Polytechnics in New Zealand have been limited to providing sub-degree levels of qualification. This has restricted the scope for the development of industrial relations teaching at these institutions. It can be noted that this restriction was removed in 1990, and many polytechnics are planning the introduction of degree level studies, either independently, or in liaison with other educational institutions, including universities. The range of offerings will undoubtedly expand over time. Given the historic, technical and business concentration base of polytechnics, and of polytechnic education, these changes will, almost certainly, have significant implications for the future of industrial relations education. But that is for the future. To date the teaching of industrial relations has been focussed on the requirements of externally established syllabi, for the National Certificate of Business, the New Zealand Institute of Management Certificate of Supervision, and, in a limited number of polytechnics, a Diploma of Business Studies.

The syllabus and examination of the National Certificate of Business Studies are controlled by an independent agency. The overall prescription of business related subjects includes one sixty-hour course in industrial relations. The course syllabus dictates a list of study areas suggesting the proportion of the total course applicable to each area. The current prescription is: Introduction to industrial relations and historical development in New Zealand (13%) Social partners (unions, employers, government) the relationship of employer/employee (10%) Conflict, causes, definition (10%) New Zealand industrial relations, institutions laws, awards (17%), Rules - wage setting, disputes of interest (20%), rules for grievance handling, disputes of rights (20%), topical issues (10%).

The same course is used to fulfil the industrial relations subject requirements of the NZIM Certificate of Supervision. In the case of the more restricted group of polytechnics offering a Diploma in Business the same syllabus, or a slightly wider syllabus but still encompassing the NCB Studies prescription, is used for the introductory industrial relations course in that programme. However, more advanced studies are usually then available in the Diploma programme. At Waikato Polytechnic, for example, the advanced course introduces comparative industrial relations, as well as extending the scope and depth of the New Zealand studies.

INSTITUTIONAL IDENTITY:

The Universities

The focus in this section of the paper is restricted to Auckland, Massey, Otago and Victoria universities, and the Centre for Trade Union Studies at Waikato. Material presented earlier clearly indicates the minimal attention to industrial relations and related subjects, the service nature of offerings that do exist, and the total integration into management programmes, that occurs at Canterbury, Lincoln and the management studies programme at Waikato. In 1946 A.E.C. Hare completed a substantial in-depth study of industrial relations in New Zealand, and presented his Report on Industrial Relations in New Zealand (Hare 1946). Amongst the incisive comments were several that referred specifically to training for management. Training, Hare asserted:

...is the only means of overcoming the backward methods of labour management and the failures of factory housekeeping. Training is needed for business executives and for foremen and also to provide a steady supply of trained professional personnel officers. (p.310).

Training for supervisors, he noted, was undertaken by an existing Institute of Management, and an extension of that programme, together with greater government and industry support was recommended. With respect to "business executives and personnel officers", he commented ...these classes need a wide understanding of the social problems involved in industrial relations. This could not be imparted at the level of education provided by the Institute of Management; nor could the Institute command the services of a staff of sufficiently high standing. The University is the most suitable instrument to provide training in the management of labour and in industrial relations in its wider aspects for both business men and potential personnel officers. (p.311).

Consequently Hare recommended that a School of Social Studies be established at one of the University Colleges "...to provide a short course on industrial relations for business men as part of the degree of Bachelor of Commerce", (p 311) and to "...provide a Diploma in Social Studies with a specialisation in Labour Management requiring two years full-time study for those who wish to take up the profession of personnel officers". (p 311). Obviously not one to leave matters half-done, Hare then recommended (p 312) that it be obligatory for all private employers with more than one hundred workers, local authorities, state undertakings and offices to employ a personnel officer holding that Diploma or an equivalent overseas qualification.

Apart from a continuation of the Institute of Management training in supervision, nothing happened. By 1960, when the University of New Zealand relinquished control, and the independent universities - Auckland, Canterbury, Victoria, Otago and later Massey (1963) were established - neither industrial relations nor even closely allied programmes (for example, industrial law) had been introduced.

Some change emerged in the decade of the 1960s, although significant developments were not to occur until later. Developments at each of the main providers are summarised below.

By the early 1970s a separate Business Studies component within the Commerce degree at Auckland university existed offering studies in organisational behaviour and organisational theory. Industrial psychology was considered a desirable associated unit. A unit entitled Legal Problems of Industry was part of the business law input to the degree and industrial law as taught separately in the Law Faculty. No specific course in labour economics had been developed. In 1975 the business studies component was offered by a reorganised Department of Management Studies. Industrial relations, as a specified offering first appeared in that year as a course offered by that department. The offering was incorporated in a third year unit titled Industrial Relations and Manpower Management. It was offered within a framework of management and organisation studies with industrial psychology as a desired pre-requisite. The Business Law input was renamed Industrial Law and was taught by the staff of the Faculty of Law.

Developments in industrial relations at Auckland have occurred within the administrative control of management studies, and for over a decade industrial relations courses were limited in the extent and range of offerings, namely one optional 300 level unit. Personnel administration was the dominant part of the relationship. This was a conscious choice given the centralised co-ordination of programmes by the University Grants Committee at that time, and the earlier establishment of the Certificate of Industrial Relations course at Victoria. In 1988 a new departmental structure and a reorganised degree were introduced in the Faculty of Commerce at Auckland. A wider range of industrial relations courses became available, with responsibility taken by the newly identified Department of Management and Labour Relations. The link with management had been retained.

The specialisation within the BBS at Massey originally bracketed industrial relations and industrial law with personnel management and applied psychology. Programmes therefore developed initially from the "personnel" perspective. Responsibility was with the Department of Management Studies. Additional courses with an industrial relations focus were progressively introduced. These courses have been consolidated and re-organised within a Department of Human Resource Management that developed as part of a re-structuring of the faculty in the mid-1980s. Initial developments at Otago involved an association of industrial relations teaching and labour economics. Input to the arts and commerce degrees, and extensive programmes for unionists also developed. The former strand has continued to today. A subsequent development was the establishment of separate industrial relations input to the management stream of the commerce degree, from a Department of Management base. This dichotomy still exists at Otago although the more significant input is that from the management base. Some limited extension course activity continues.

At Victoria University the economics influence, through the teaching of labour economics, and the University Extension Service also combined as the initial avenue of development. These are detailed by Young (1971) and involved formal industrial relations/labour economics units offered by the Economics Department within the BCA programmes, and less structured programmes for extension work, initially as trade union education. However from that point on developments at Victoria differed from those at other New Zealand universities.

The Industrial Relations Centre was established in 1971, initially, with a pooling of resources from the economics department and university extension. It was administratively based within the Department of Economics, although reporting separately to a committee of the University Council. Industrial relations and labour economics units within the BCA and BA degrees developed, as did extension education for both unions and management, together with the development and teaching of the Certificate/Diploma in Industrial Relations.

Teaching staff appointments to the Centre encompassed a range of discipline backgrounds, and teaching, when necessary, encompassed a multidisciplinary approach. The range of units offered expanded slowly, including development of input for management studies programmes. Extension activity progressively changed to reflect external needs. Currently the primary emphasis is involvement in organising regional and national seminars associated with the development and evaluation of industrial relations policy. The Centre also continues to develop specialist practitioner training programmes, although training activities of the more basic and repetitive type are avoided.

The Centre became an independent administrative entity within the Faculty of Commerce and Administration in 1985, but this only formalised existing practice. It had enjoyed *de facto* independence whilst operating within the Department of Economics.

Organisational behaviour and personnel management related units developed separately with the Department of Business Administration, (recently renamed Management). Industrial law developed as an adjunct of business law within the accountancy stream, of the Commerce Faculty, and independently within the Law Faculty. However, the Industrial Relations Centre became a focus for teachers interested in aspects of industrial relations. Research and publication output, referred to later, as well as the range of teaching soon reflected these developments. Such inter-relationships continue.

Until 1989 the Industrial Relations Centre was the only source of industrial relations teaching that had institutional independence from management, economics or other discipline bases. Moreover the Certificate/Diploma programmes at Victoria were the only extant integrated inter-disciplinary and complete stand-alone industrial relations courses offered within the country.

A new development, the Centre for Labour and Trade Union Studies at Waikato University is changing this position, at least to some degree. The Centre launched its first courses in 1989. It has been established with formal departmental

independence, and is developing an inter-disciplinary base for teaching. The Centre is developing specific industrial relations courses which will be more widely available, (for example for management studies degree students). Four units, *The Nature of Work*, *The New Zealand System of Labour Relations*, *Worker Education and Workers and Unions* are to be developed for general degree teaching. Whilst there is a general overlap with industrial relations, the Waikato programme seeks a qualitatively different approach. This difference is most noticeable in the design and delivery of the undergraduate Certificate in Trade Union Studies. The Certificate programme involves part-time block release modular studies in six units over three years. The target audience is union officials and working people interested in union studies. Courses currently offered or being developed are: *History and Culture of the Working Class*, *Management and Organisation of Unions*, *Labour Relations in New Zealand*, *Trade Unions in Contemporary Society*, *Comparative Trade Union Studies*, *Adult Learning and Programme Planning*, and *Project*. The Certificate is approved for Paid Educational Leave (PEL) purposes by the Trade Union Education Authority (TUEA), is organised to take advantage of PEL provisions and at the moment PEL is a key factor in the successful operation of the programme.

A Centre for Labour Studies was also established in the 1980s at the University of Auckland. Initially the development was a shell for inter-faculty co-operation of interested staff. In 1990 a full time Director was appointed with a mandate to inter alia develop a Diploma in Trade Union Studies: plans for such a programme have commenced. The Centre has been established within the Department of Management and Labour Relations.

Several points can be briefly made summarising the process and results of institutional development of industrial relations teaching in New Zealand universities.

1. The current dominance of the link of industrial relations with management studies is a reflection of main basis of origin. To a greater or lesser extent management studies was the base for developments at three of the major contemporary contributors, namely Auckland, Otago and Massey. It was also the original base, and remains so, at the less significant contributions of Canterbury and Lincoln.
2. Both labour economics and university extension departments had a role in the early developments at Otago and Victoria. At Massey earliest developments also had a basis in an appointment made to the extension service.
3. Industrial law developed in law faculties and within the business law offerings at Victoria and Auckland. Only at Massey did a clear and direct association of industrial law with industrial relations courses emerge.
4. Specific links with industrial psychology have been minimal, although such links were part of the earliest developments at Auckland and Massey.

5. Programmes derived from political science and sociology have developed separately, playing a minimal, if any, direct role in the development of industrial relations courses. The development at Waikato is breaking new ground in this respect. Labour history has played little part in developments and is still an almost completely undeveloped field of teaching within the history courses of New Zealand universities.
6. The Industrial Relations Centre at Victoria, and, more recently, the Centre for Labour and Trade Union Studies at Waikato are the only institutions, where the organisational structure has been based on the integration of a range of discipline inputs to facilitate the teaching, study and research in their respective fields of interest. These two centres are also the only bases of industrial relations teaching with a clear and defined institutional identity.

The Polytechnics

Industrial relations has not developed as an independent or even quasi-independent programme of teaching within the Polytechnic system in New Zealand. Where the subject is offered it is a minor contribution to other programmes, either the externally validated National Certificate of Business Studies, the NZPM Certificate of Supervision, or in a few instances a Diploma of Business Studies. In all cases the base of the subject remains with a Department of Business or Management Studies. This situation is, of course, in sharp contrast to developments in Australia and the United Kingdom.

Within the polytechnic sector developments have gone furthest to date at Christchurch Polytechnic where the teaching of industrial relations has been bracketed with presenting additional programmes for trade unionists, in association with TUEA. One member of staff has held a joint appointment. It is possible that industrial relations teaching may be boosted as polytechnics move to take advantage of the relaxation, in 1990, of the prohibition against degree programmes based at polytechnics.

Levels of Teaching - Formal Programmes

To date polytechnics have been the primary focus of formal programmes of less than degree level. The main programmes involved are the National Certificate of Business Studies and the New Zealand Institute of Management Certificate in Supervision. Demand for industrial relations as part of these programmes is related to the demand for the overall programmes. It is reported to be consistent and steady. Industrial relations input occurs in the undergraduate Diploma in Business courses at Massey and Victoria Universities. Overall enrolments in the diploma at Massey make it numerically the most popular course, but two provisos need to be noted. First, enrolment is frequently limited to only one or two units of the course per student each year, and second, industrial relations units are normally incorporated in a few of the Diploma structures (primarily the personnel

management option). The Certificate/Diploma of Industrial Relations at Victoria and the Certificate of Labour Studies at Waikato are two integrated undergraduate, but less than degree level programmes. In the latter case credit for completion is available for those continuing to degree studies.

Undergraduate degree programmes in industrial relations range from the minor contribution described within a BMS at Waikato, and B Com at Canterbury, for example, to a major or specialisation available at Victoria, Auckland, Otago and Massey. The structure of the host degree is one of the facilitators (or inhibitors) of the ease of availability of a range of industrial relations options. At Victoria, for example, a BCA with a key focus on accounting limits potential demand. Further, where industrial relations is linked with undergraduate management programmes, especially in the examples of Auckland and Massey, staffing to teach a wider range of industrial relations offerings is predicated on the resource base generated by serving the mass first year base. Such a link has been of increasing importance as EFTS ratios have become more and more dominant in staffing decisions. Specific provisions (a mixture of some external funding and a more advantageous EFTS staffing ratio) have, in the past, enabled industrial relations at Victoria to develop separately from a wider base of management, or for that matter, other undergraduate students. Budget restrictions, user pays and tighter finance generally are already altering this position, and the independence of industrial relations teaching at Victoria is seriously threatened. One potential direction of change already occurring at Victoria is the extension of involvement in management user-pays programmes, especially the MBA. This particular development is linked with a wider human resource management offering within the Victoria MBA. As such it mirrors earlier developments within the Auckland, Massey and Otago MBA programmes.

Fourth year honours level, and other discipline based graduate level programmes in industrial relations, are clearly the least developed levels of industrial relations teaching in New Zealand. Otago has, since the mid-1960s, provided honours level courses, initially based on an economics focus. And a steady stream of students, averaging eight to ten each year, participate. At other institutions lower and more spasmodic enrolment has occurred at that level. Such a situation has meant few doctoral students, and impacted significantly on the scope and style of research. The latter point is taken up again later.

With respect to doctoral students Victoria, for example, has had only one such student in the past five years. Only two teachers of core industrial relations courses in New Zealand have local doctorates: overseas study has been, and remains, the norm for New Zealand graduate students, and as a source of teachers. A further inhibition has been the dominance of thesis-based masters programmes. Interest in this qualification by students of industrial relations (and for that matter students in commerce, generally) was never very high and has in fact virtually disappeared).

Two recent developments will, hopefully, progressively change this scenario of minimal industrial relations graduate level study, and the concurrent issues of research and research assistance. The first of these is the gradual emergence of

coursework masters programmes in commerce disciplines (now at Victoria, Canterbury, Auckland, and Massey). Such programmes are replacing the four year honours programme with more marketable graduate study programmes. The second development is the reorganisation of structures and teaching programmes at Auckland and Massey. Although these changes have further formalised the link with management studies, especially human resources management, there is, given the wider student base, a potential for more graduate level study and research papers. Similarly there is the potential of more research focussed training, and hence more researchers and research.

Core versus Service Role

The service function of industrial relations exists in all universities. Courses offered invariably service more than one degree. The service role of industrial relations is the only role in the business studies programme at Waikato, at Canterbury and Lincoln. Although precise all-embracing evidence is not available, it is suggested that the service role is also, quantitatively, the more dominant role in all other cases. At Victoria, for example, an entry of fifty students per annum can be expected in the introductory course, perhaps one-third of whom are enrolled for a BCA degree and two-thirds for an arts degree. But only ten to fifteen students will continue to 300 level study of industrial relations and fewer proceed to honours/graduate level. Large scale enrolments occur at introductory course level at Auckland where the credit can be incorporated not only within the industrial relations sequence of study, but with other areas, notably management related programmes. A very small proportion of students complete a major study in industrial relations at the undergraduate level. The service function dominates offerings for management diplomas and MBAs at Victoria, Auckland, Massey and Otago. Industrial relations is a service course at the polytechnic level. The Certificate/Diploma in Industrial Relations at Victoria and the Certificate of Trade Union Studies at Waikato are the main dedicated core industrial relations programmes.

Trade Union Education

Some of the earliest attempts to deliver trade union education in New Zealand are described by Young (1971). In each of these areas the vehicle was the Extension Department of a university. Experiments at Otago were short lived, but the programme at Victoria developed slowly over time. An annual one-week residential seminar/training programme for trade union officials, shorter (usually one-day) topic specific seminars, and the genesis of the idea for a formal qualification, a Certificate of Industrial Relations, developed. The annual seminar specifically for union officials continued until 1986, but the shorter seminar programme soon extended to encompass all practitioners, as did the Certificate programme when launched in 1976. At Otago a one-week extension programme in industrial relations continued, but enrolment was not restricted to any one group.

The Workers Educational Association also offered seminars and postal education service for unionists, and from the 1960s a small, but increasing, number of individual unions began to offer training seminars, particularly as part of the development of a job delegate system. In 1974 the Government established the Trade Union Training Board (TUTB) (and at the same time the Employer Association Training Board). These boards were under the overall administrative control of the Vocational Training Council, and operated within a framework common to other industry training boards encompassed by the Council.

To a large extent the TUTB was simply a conduit for government training incentives to subsidise training provided by individual unions. The Board had tripartite representation, government, employer and union, to develop and monitor operational policy. Course approvals and day-to-day administration were functions of the sole administrative officer. Incentives to unions were a part-subsidy for the salary and expenses linked with employment of a "trainer", and a travel subsidy for course participants. Course approvals were limited by the narrow concepts of "training" and the total government expenditure via the TUTB in 1984 was circa \$230,000. The grant income for the Trade Union Education Authority (TUEA) in 1988 (two years after establishment and hence excluding many of the one off establishment costs) was \$1,526,364. In 1989 it was \$2,456,364. Although the difference in the magnitude of government funding reflects both an increased commitment to union education, and is a key condition precedent for the subsequent success, the impact of TUEA must be measured and evaluated on a much more substantive basis than the level of dollar expenditure.

A task force on trade union education, including paid educational leave (PEL), was established by the Labour Government in November 1984, a few months after election to Government. Subsequently the paid educational leave component was re-directed to a separate working party with employer representation. The reports were presented to government in July and August 1985, and the Union Representatives Education Leave Act 1986 was based on the recommendations. The establishment of the Trade Union Education Authority as from 1 July 1986, and the introduction of a legislatively based scheme of employer paid educational leave for approved union education programmes resulted.

The closest comparable development in trade union education, in both geographic proximity and time, was the establishment of the Trade Union Training Authority (TUTA) in Australia in 1976. Pro-rata TUEA has, in terms of courses/programmes conducted and participants, had a similar qualitative impact. However the structures and course delivery mechanisms have notable differences. In Australia the national college (Clyde Cameron) and regional (state) centres were to be significant providers, and appropriate capital facilities were provided to house teaching and administrative staff, and programme delivery facilities. Initially such centres were restricted to providing multi-union programmes, although this restriction was eased somewhat later. However, direct provision of education by unions was not monitored, remained without co-ordination or integration, and was not funded by government.

The New Zealand model, was to focus on union-based delivery, and emphasise a leadership, co-ordinating, integrating, monitoring and evaluative role for the regional and national centres. Development of resource material was, primarily, centralised at national office level. Pilot programmes, and certain specialist courses were conducted from regional and national offices, training of trainers co-ordinated at those levels, but delivery was primarily the responsibility of subsidised union-based personnel.

Such a division of role is clearly encapsulated in the delivery system endorsed by TUEA, and incorporated in the Mission Statement. The Authority:

- works alongside unions on a consultant basis to assist them plan their own education programme.
- prepares and publishes teaching guides and resource materials.
- works co-operatively with other agencies in the education system, providing advice and resources.
- channels Government subsidies to unions to assist them to employ education personnel and monitors the performance of subsidised unions.
- co-ordinates the provision of union education within sectors and across the country.
- runs seven regional offices where regional co-ordinators work with unions in the local areas.
- monitors and evaluates the quantity and quality of union education being delivered.
- advises Government on matters relating to union education for union members; education about unions; adult education affecting union members, education of workers generally.

Administratively the Authority maintains quality control via approval of all courses intended to be eligible for PEL, approval of union education subsidies and the training of union educators.

Provision for PEL was the second major cornerstone of the legislation establishing the TUEA. Entitlements are based on the number of unionists employed, and broadly can be stated as a minimum of five days per union per workplace with up to forty-seven members, increasing by one day for every eight members to an entitlement of thirty-five days (280 members) and thereafter five days for every additional one hundred members. Leave is mandatory only for TUEA approved courses or those agreed to by the union and employer (and notified to TUEA). The mandatory provision is also restricted to a three day absence at any one time and five days in any year for an employee. Agreement can extend these limits.

Since the establishment of the Authority in 1986 the number of courses conducted has increased rapidly and progressively:

August 1986	March 1987	191
April 1987	March 1988	880
April 1988	March 1989	1297
July 1989	June 1990	1403

Paid Education Leave days usage has increased for the periods mentioned above from 4,923 to 21,863, 27,387, 30,560. In 1989-1990 attendance at courses totalled 21,253 persons.

Courses are conducted in all regions of the country. The 1989-1990 total of 1403 courses is represented by a regional breakdown of:

Course Attendance - on Paid Education Leave

Regions

Auckland/Northland	327	5,346	8,423
Northern	188	2,889	4,192
Central Districts	181	2,622	3,498
Wellington/Wairarapa	263	4,120	6,487
Northern South Island	98	1,086	1,392
Canterbury	223	3,572	4,367
Otago/Southland	123	1,618	2,201
Total Participants	1,403	21,253	30,560

Content of programmes approved by TUEA extends beyond industrial relations. The philosophical position taken is that expressed in the Report of the Task Force - namely that trade union education is:

...that part of worker education that is conducted by a union for union members to enable them to be informed and active participants in their unions and in their employment. At the same time, it can also be seen as part of industrial relations training, but not limited to such training. (p 12).

Nevertheless, a review of the course content reflects a coverage frequently seen in offerings in formal courses in industrial relations at tertiary institutions. Perhaps major differences of content are the absence of overt reference to theoretical issues, and/or limited comparative horizons, in the union based programmes. Accepting 1989- 1990 as a representative year, a survey of course content of TUEA approved programmes showed a coverage of the following topic areas: bargaining/award restructuring, economics, employment equity, health and safety,

industrial democracy, industry studies, international unionism, introduction to unions, job evaluation, Labour Relations Act/state sector legislation/unions and the law, Labour Court, organisational effectiveness, privatisation, union amalgamation, (TUEA, Annual Report, June 1990).

Within this overall framework both general courses, and courses with a specific target audience have been developed. Specific groups catered for in the year to June 1990 included delegates (at both basic and advanced level), women, Maoris, Pacific Islanders, union educators, organisers and union representatives on external bodies.

The basic model of administration and delivery was established in the first years of operation. However, substantial legislative and structural reform of industrial relations, to both the private sector and public sector in New Zealand occurred in this period, overlapping these formative years, and adding considerably to the initial burden on staff and resources. In 1989-1990, for example, considerable training focus was given to union restructuring, bargaining reform, industrial law, employment equity, and union education for Boards of Trustees of schools (pursuant to the delegation of employer representatives in schools to local boards rather than the centralised Education Department). Each of these areas of immediate urgency were superimposed on the base of ongoing education requirements and institutional consolidation.

Nevertheless, pursuit of several of the wider objectives incorporated in the initial goals of TUEA have been well advanced. Pilot projects on workplace education have been conducted under the auspices of a working party established for that purpose. A formal link has been established with the NZ Vice Chancellor's Committee (a joint TUEA-NZVCC committee) to facilitate union/worker access to University education, research and expertise. One example of this co-operation will be the conduct (in June 1991) of a joint TUEA/Industrial Relations Centre, Victoria University/NZVCC seminar on university and union based research focussing on both needs and delivery. Cooperation with the University of Waikato has led to the establishment of the Centre for Labour and Trade Union Studies, and the development of the Certificate of Trade Union Studies at that University. A Maori representatives education unit has been established within the Authority. The National office of the TUEA has been the main focal point for these broad based thrusts and initiatives.

Distance Education

Massey University is the major and dominating focal point for distance education in the university sector in New Zealand. And distance education as a delivery mechanism dominates the role of that university. In 1986, for example, total full time and part-time enrolments at all New Zealand universities were 49,363. In addition 12,275 extra mural (distance education) students were enrolled at Massey. EFTS figures for all New Zealand universities for full-time and part-time students was 41,174. Massey's share was 5,249, including 3,150 EFTS extra

mural enrolments. In 1989 enrolment at Massey was 23,660 comprising 7,516 internal students (full and part-time) and 16,144 extra mural students.

The Diploma of Business Studies, wherein an option in Personnel Management is offered, is only available via the distance mode. Enrolments in the BBS, and hence industrial relations courses within that degree programme are also dominated by extra-mural enrolments. An illustrative example is that in 1991 the introductory course The New Zealand Industrial Relations System had sixteen internal enrolments and thirty-nine extra mural enrolments. Distance education at Massey is based on providing study material for students to use at a distance (at home etc), assignments and other assistance by written/telephone contact, and (usually) one (generally) optional two or three day weekend or vacation school on campus.

The Certificate/Diploma in Industrial Relations at Victoria, and the Certificate of Labour Studies at Waikato have elements of distance education in the delivery. Both are targeted at the enrolment of students based and working throughout New Zealand. Both provide for study material and assignments to be covered during periods students are away from the campus. And a component of on-campus instruction is provided. However, in each of these cases the on-campus components are integral parts of the programme rather than ancillary or supplementary. In the case of the Victoria programme the on-campus segments are the more significant part of the course, and teaching methods, staff/expert delivery, together with interactive and experiential activity, reflect this fact. Further, a student profile reflecting the broad range of perspectives, employers, union, work and educational experience, is a key part of the operational strategy of this programme.

The steady demand for industrial relations training of this type is best illustrated by the story, probably apocryphal, but nonetheless illuminating, that the foundation director of the Industrial Relations Centre, when arguing the case for the establishment of the Certificate/Diploma programme, suggested that perhaps three two year cycles would see sufficient practitioners trained for the foreseeable needs of New Zealand industry and unions. An initial class of twelve students graduated in 1977. In 1989 sixty-two students commenced the Certificate, and fifty-six completed the qualification successfully. Twenty-six continued into the Diploma year and twenty-five qualified for that award. The continuation of the biennial entry is a choice on educational and organisational grounds, although servicing of the existing intake levels is a severe strain on resources. Further, these enrolments result despite a low-level, almost non-existent promotion campaign.

In August 1989 the first intake of twenty-nine students commenced the first five day on-campus part of the Certificate of Trade Union Studies at Waikato. A second intake commenced a similar on-campus programme in February 1990. It is accepted that demand will most likely necessitate an increase in the number of intakes occurring, and hence modules offered each year.

The distance education programmes of Massey, Victoria and Waikato, together with the demand of TUEA programmes, are each indicative of the almost limitless demand for industrial relations, labour studies (and related) education for mature age students. In part this reflects a large pool of working individuals who have industrial relations/labour studies education requirements, in part it reflects the dynamic ever-changing nature of components of these studies. Ongoing education is a feature of the field.

The Open Polytechnic, formerly the Technical Correspondence Institute, is the key distance tertiary provider of less than degree programmes generally, and hence of industrial relations and related studies that comprise elements of some of those programmes. The programmes offered by the Open Polytechnic which have industrial relations components are the National Certificate of Business Studies (NCB) the NZ Certificate of Management and the National Diploma in Accounting (NDA). The course content is externally imposed and hence identical with that offered internally at the other polytechnics. The method of delivery is, however, different.

The industrial relations course is a 200 level subject and students are expected (although not necessarily required) to have passed a first year paper Organisation and Management, or an introductory paper in accounting, business law or economics before enrolling in industrial relations. All students are required to satisfactorily complete the correspondence study programme which comprises ten assignment test papers. Students studying for the NCB or NDA must also sit a mid-course and a final examination. Final assessment is a combination of the assignments and examination.

In 1990 one hundred and fourteen students were enrolled for the industrial relations unit, with the majority taking it as a paper towards the NCB. But, given that all of the university distance education programmes in this area of study (at Massey, Victoria and Waikato) are accessible to mature-age students without conventional university entry requirements, the new competitive environment of tertiary education, and the continuing demand for extra-mural, distance delivery, it can only be a matter of time before the polytechnics, including the Open Polytechnic, tap the market further.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS RESEARCH

Young (1971) used the analogy of "...an almost overgrown field" (p.66) when he referred to both teaching and research in industrial relations in New Zealand. "Vigorous cultivation in the 1890s", he continued, "was followed by a long period of ungrazed fallow", and, referring to the analysis by Hare (1946), "a brief period of surveying...". The initial part of the analogy was not intended to refer to a plethora of activity or interest, but the reverse.

Writings in the 1890s and early part of the twentieth century focussed on the social aspects of the labour experiments in New Zealand. The scope of such experimentation encompassed old age pensions, the franchise for women, shop

trading hours, factory regulations and liquor legislation, as well as the industrial conciliation and arbitration statutes. *State Experiments in Australia and New Zealand, Vol I and II* by W. Pember Reeves, first published in 1902, is probably the single best known exposition of these developments. Other scholars, experts, more frequently visitors, examined, analysed and wrote generally, and specifically, about these initiatives. Even though the 1890s labour legislation within New Zealand (and similar developments in Australia) remained unique, interest declined, as time passed, to the point where the analogies referred to above were apposite, in general, and in respect to research and publication in industrial relations, in particular.

The surge and decline of interest is illustrated by the bibliographic references in Wood (1963), *Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration in New Zealand*. This volume was the first detailed review of the operation of the system, and as such became a standard work of reference for many years. Thirteen books are referred to in the bibliography, eight were published before 1914, three after 1945 and two in the intervening years. Nine pamphlets or articles are also referenced; three are dated prior to 1914, four in the first years of the 1960s and two from the intervening years. Some other material was published over this period. For example, reviews of the industrial relations situation in New Zealand appeared from time to time in the *Economic Record*. Scattered articles on economic aspects (wages), employment and legal aspects, appeared in journals appropriate to those disciplines. Even more rarely analyses by overseas scholars for overseas audiences appeared in overseas journals, but, the bibliographic evidence of Woods whilst incomplete, is still indicative of the overall paucity of interest that continued into the late 1960s.

Two key factors facilitating change in this position of research and publication were the establishment of the Industrial Relations Centre at Victoria University in 1971, and the launching of the *New Zealand Journal of Industrial Relations* at the University of Auckland in 1976.

The Industrial Relations Centre published research by the permanent staff of the Centre, studies by experts from other related disciplines, and by overseas scholars writing on New Zealand issues (often with a comparative perspective). It also developed a research project component in the practitioners Certificate/Diploma teaching programme. The Centre developed a Seminar Working Paper series, a series of Monographs, Occasional Papers and a Student Research Paper series. And for a number of years these remained the primary outlet for writing by New Zealand scholars and others, about New Zealand industrial relations issues. These publications were important teaching resources. Fortunately, a wider range of outlets for the publication of research has developed, and the Centre has been able to rationalise its publications to the more conventional role of distributing a working paper series encompassing preliminary results of research.

The introduction of the *New Zealand Journal of Industrial Relations* further encouraged research and facilitated the dissemination of results. It is important in that it provides space for New Zealand authors; it is even more important because it can focus on material where local readers are the sole or dominating audience.

Geare (1990), in his bibliography *New Zealand Industrial Relations Research 1973-1988*, lists 295 journal articles. One hundred and seventeen of these are sourced to the NZJIR. *The Journal of Industrial Relations*, and the *New Zealand Law Journal* are the next most frequent cited sources.

Over the past twenty years there has been a significant increase in the volume and scope of research in industrial relations. Geare correctly asserts: "Industrial relations as an academic field of study in New Zealand, has only very recently come of age" (p.i). The following material describes and analyses the major dimensions of these developments. The Geare bibliography is the key, albeit not the only, source of the data used for this analysis.

1. The subject matter of research has encompassed all aspects of industrial relations. Geare classifies the references into eighteen separate dimensions of the field of study. The category Labour Law dominates, with ninety-four or about one-third, of the 295 journal articles cited. Writing a little earlier, Anderson (1987) refers specifically to the late development of teaching and research in industrial law. In New Zealand in 1970 "...industrial law was a relatively new subject in most law schools in spite of the long history of legislative regulation of the industrial relations system" (Anderson, 1987). But since then the research output of industrial law has expanded considerably, and industrial law has become firmly established in both law schools and commerce faculties. It is the increased rate of activity since approximately 1970 that is reflected in the Geare bibliography. Trade Unions is the next single most frequent category of citation whilst a substantial listing of articles with an economic or labour market focus, illustrates the continuation of the historic links with the labour economics aspects of the economics discipline.

Contributions on labour history, are sparse, although a listing of six "texts, reports and handbooks" and seventeen articles, shows an interest in this field of study, unfortunately not reflected in the formal teaching of that area of study. Labour historians in New Zealand are teaching either on general history courses or contributing to politics or broader industrial relations courses, rather than developing special studies. The most prolific writer of labour history is a University librarian (now retired).

Work in the area of the labour process, the sociology of work and similar areas has been minimal, but is increasing. Most references are from the latter part of the period. With respect to studies of strikes and conflict generally, the opposite is the case; interest is declining, and only three of twenty citations in this category are dated later than 1981.

2. Research has been limited almost exclusively to universities. Polytechnics, under the controlled binary system of tertiary education, have been restricted to sub-degree programmes, and have developed solely as teaching institutions. The Department of Labour has restricted its research effort to keeping up-to-date with operational aspects of the

system, and a minimal monitoring role. From time to time, however, individuals from within the department have contributed descriptive and analytical material to published working papers, monographs and books.

Trade unions were slow to utilise graduate research expertise, with developments first occurring in the late 1970s, and then first in the public sector. Research appointments have increased in both public sector and private sector unions in recent years. This trend will continue as the reorganisation and rationalisation of the union movement into larger and better resourced units continues. The Federation of Labour first appointed research staff in the mid 1980s. However, the successor to the FOL, the New Zealand Council of Trade Unions still makes limited use of such staff; two appointments is the current establishment. The research of NZCTU and other union research officers is clearly dominated by current issues, current problems, especially issues of wage bargaining, redundancy, legislative provisions etc.

There is evidence, however, of both a broadening of effort and a willingness to integrate research undertaken elsewhere (in universities for example) into the policy development and implementation processes of unions. The research programmes and inter-relationships developed by TUEA are an excellent example of both aspects of this type of development. Specifically TUEA has sponsored a series of industry studies, which are then utilised as information sources and training material for seminars, as well as data for progressing both narrow and broad industrial claims. The TUEA-NZVCC standing committee is a formal focus of the inter-change. An example of less formal contact is regular meeting, at the collective level, of national office staff of the TUEA and academic staff of the Industrial Relations Centre at Victoria University. Such meetings supplement an increasing interchange at the individual level.

The New Zealand Employers Federation and the constituent regional associations have tended to define research as developing supporting or rebuttal arguments for current industrial claims. However, consistent use of a survey programme into members needs and views, both in general and on specific issues, has been important for the organisation in developing policy, and for others interested in the views of one group of participants in the system. Over the past five years the Business Roundtable has expanded research output on industrial relations issues. Such research is invariably related to the theme(s) of "labour market flexibility" or "labour market reform" which have been prime items on the policy agenda of that organisation. The Centre for Independent Studies also sought to develop a research agenda to underpin this ideological position, but little of consequence has resulted.

3. Within the universities, the initiation and conduct of research has been at the level of the individual. Where joint or team research has occurred it has been on an infrequent, and ad-hoc basis. Institutional research with

formal co-ordinated programmes has not developed. Such a situation has had benefits and costs. The research agenda has been set by individuals in line with their interests and capabilities, and the benefits of enthusiasm and commitment have been optimised. The worst features of research agendas established by external agencies, particularly those with vested interests, via ready availability of funds, have been avoided. However, a long-term coherence and strategy in research programmes has not been possible. Research has been conducted and results developed at a very low cost, but in turn that low cost has often been a prime determining factor in the choice of project.

On balance, the position is acceptable as part of the evolution of the field of study. However, the point has probably been reached where some change in the balance of research development is needed. It is possible that, in the next phase of evolution the Industrial Relations Centre will need to make a change, or more likely incorporate an additional element, in its research strategy. The Centre for Industrial Relations and Labour Studies, established as a research centre at Otago University in 1987 has such long term objectives. It seeks, inter alia, to encourage research in the broad labour area, especially collaborative projects that might be interdisciplinary, and to accept major contract research that would be beyond the capacity of a single researcher.

4. Although research and publication has expanded dramatically the core of researchers has been and is very limited. Although 287 separate authors are cited in the Geare bibliography, only nineteen of these are listed with six or more citations. Eight of these are current or ex-staff of the Industrial Relations Centre, three others are from Victoria University with links to the Centre, and two are from each of Otago, Massey and Auckland. Research from Auckland has expanded in the most recent years with the reorganisation of industrial relations and additional staff appointments.
5. Only a few individual researchers have sought to develop a coherent thematic approach to, at least part of, their research effort. Industrial conflict/strikes (Turkington), motivation/job satisfaction (Kerr-Inkson), dual labour markets/labour market disadvantage (Brosnan), bargaining structures and outcomes (Harbridge) and historical studies of trade unions (Roth) are examples. But the overwhelming tendency to date, even for researchers with a consistent record of output, has been breadth rather than focus. Industrial relations research has been typified by almost limitless opportunities.
6. The lack of graduate student research is the final specific feature that warrants comment. Geare lists fifty eight dissertations or theses completed in the 1973-1988 period. Initially this is a reasonably impressive list, and certainly, as with other developments, it far outshadows performance in earlier decades. But further analysis detracts from the general impression. Only ten of the theses listed are at the PhD

level, whilst six are MBA projects. The bulk, forty-one in number, are Master's theses. And the dominant groups within the Master's theses are graduate degrees in history or political science. The University of Canterbury, which has not developed a focus on industrial relations teaching, is a major contributor to graduate studies in the historical and political studies aspects of labour. A lesser group are theses on economic topics, with Otago to the fore in this instance. Commerce faculties in general, and management departments in particular, have not been effective generators of post-graduate research either generally, or on specific industrial relations topics. It is the hope that the introduction of course-work masters programmes in commerce at several universities will change the pattern. Post-graduate student development and research go hand-in-hand.

With this proviso it can be asserted that the future for research in industrial relations is indeed bright. The developments of the past two decades are impressive. There are more courses, more students and more teaching of industrial relations at the tertiary level. The base for further development is wider than even five years ago. The number of agencies seeking to promote and use research is expanding. Availability and sources of research funds in the future may limit the choice of a research agenda.

THE FUTURE

The short-term future is not bright for the support of an independent, multi - or inter-disciplinary approach to industrial relations teaching delivery in New Zealand - either in the universities or polytechnics. Human Resource Management is the dominant directional thrust and industrial relations input will be more and more subsumed within this paradigm. Because of the dominant historic link/base of industrial relations within management departments in New Zealand the discipline is in an even weaker position to challenge such thrusts.

Two key contemporary external factors are reinforcing developments. The first is the rapid change in the dominant perspective in government policy in industrial relations. As recently as 1983 an official government position reflected a clear unequivocal pluralist/collective approach:

The premise upon which the industrial relations legislation is based is that there is an inherent conflict of interest between employers (and their representatives) and workers (and their representatives). The legislation seeks to manage this conflict in an orderly fashion by:

Conferring bargaining rights on certain registered/recognised organisations and regulating the activities of these organisations in certain areas; and (ii) specifying various procedures for the settlement of disputes and providing conciliation, mediation and arbitration services to assist in this process. (Department of Labour).

The 1990/91 position, reflected in the revised industrial legislation, the Employment Contracts Act 1991, has an implied unitarist thrust - the philosophical position of emphasising the development of common interests, employer-employee rather than employer-union relationships, and a substantially enhanced role for individual contracts of employment.

The second factor, acting independently as well as reinforcing the change in the policy perspective, is the rapid move to cost recovery and user pays in selected areas of tertiary education. Growth is, more and more, to be limited to self-funding areas of study. Management education is in a much better position to minimise the impact of such policies. Pressure on the nature of the curriculum and delivery methods follow.

Pressure to reduce/eliminate government funding for the Trade Union Education Authority and to repeal the Paid Education Leave Act has developed along with the changes in the ideological balance. Finance, with only a slight reduction in real terms seems assured for 1991-92, but an inquiry has been commenced into the relevance of TUEA, PEL and related matters.

Another aspect of the same philosophical position is appearing in research policy. A recent government report (into Equal Employment Opportunity and related issues) has recommended a change from peer assessment to a panel approach (including business and government nominees) for research fund allocation and control.

The University Grants Committee was abolished in 1990. This is likely to have two distinct but directionally different impacts on the industrial relations teaching and research. The UGC has acted to rationalise and control developments as between universities. Initially this did facilitate developments by focussing funding, but more recently it has inhibited the spread of disciplines across campuses. Positive developments based on local initiatives have become easier, and industrial relations teaching generally has been one of the beneficiaries. Associated with the demise of the UGC has been the up-grading of the polytechnic sector. It is likely that the next significant expansion of industrial relations education will be in the polytechnic sector. Whether it will develop with an institutional identity and independence is less likely. Nevertheless the demise of the UGC does have a down-side. It has fulfilled an important role as an independent adviser to government, acting, generally, in the interests of the university system. A barrier to direct political involvement and control of universities, and a potential counter-balance to the direct market, cost-recovery, user- pays approach to tertiary education, has been removed.

NOTES

1. John Young at Victoria University, Alan Williams and John Howells at Otago were the three key movers in these developments. Young and Howells were members of economics departments, Williams, also an economist, was originally appointed to the extension courses area at

Otago. All were appointed from overseas (Young with experience in Canada and the UK, Howells and Williams from the UK) to New Zealand universities in the early 1960s. Williams shifted to Massey in 1972 and was then part of the earliest developments in industrial relations at that university. All were later to be appointed Professors/Associate Professors at their respective universities. Young retired in 1983 but Williams and Howells are still teaching and researching in the field - clear evidence of the "youthfulness" of the discipline in the New Zealand context.

2. The thematic contributions of Turkington (citations 35, 129, 228-230 and 409-412), Kerr-Inkson (citations 267 - 279), and Roth (citations 13-16, 20-21, 88-89 and 111), had developed during the 1970s and are illustrated by the citations in Geare (1990). The beginnings of a thematic development of the research by Brosnan (citations 283-286) and Harbridge (citations 122-123, 388) are reflected in the bibliography, but the main progress and the substantive development of these thrusts has occurred subsequent to the 1988 cut-off date of that publication.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, G. "A Survey of Industrial Law Research in New Zealand 1970-1986", pp. 101-114 in K. Hince and A. Williams *Contemporary Industrial Relations in Australia and New Zealand: Literature Surveys. Proceedings of the Biennial AIRAANZ Conference*, January 1987 vol 1. pp. vi +232.
- Department of Labour, Internal mimeo, documentation quoted by permission in Industrial Relations Centre, Victoria University of Wellington, "New Zealand System of Industrial Relations", (Wellington: IRC, 1983).
- First Report of the Task Force on Trade Union Education*, Wellington, August 1985 (mimeo, pp.132).
- Geare, A.J. *New Zealand Industrial Relations Research 1973-1988: A Bibliography*, a part of the Industrial Relations Resource Series, (AIRAANZ, 1990).
- Hare, A.E.C. *Industrial Relations in New Zealand* (Wellington: Whitcombe & Tombs Ltd, 1946) pp.375.
- Pember Reeves, W. *State Experiments in Australia and New Zealand*, re-issued with introduction by John Child, (Melbourne: Macmillan, 1968), Vol 1 and Vol 2.
- Report of the Trade Union Education Authority for year ended 30 June 1990, presented to the House of Representatives, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Report of the Working Party on Paid Educational Leave, Wellington, July 1985 (mimeo, pp.73).
- Woods, N.S. *Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration in New Zealand* (Wellington: Government Printer, 1963) pp. 208.
- Young, F.J.L. "Teaching and Research in Industrial Relations in New Zealand," *Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 13, No 1, March 1971, pp.63-75.

7 Commentary

Suzanne Jamieson

In the course of his paper when discussing research outputs in recent years in New Zealand industrial relations, Kevin Hince drew attention to the decline (also witnessed in Australia) in the study of conflict and individual altercations between the industrial relations parties. After what we have learned of the changes now enacted by law in New Zealand, in respect of individual contracts of employment, I rather wonder if conflict studies may not become something of a growth industry in the land of the long white cloud. We might even see an academic led recovery from recession!

Last week in this very building a similar group of us spent a very useful day discussing and comparing the economic restructuring experiences and their industrial relations consequences in New Zealand and Australia. Again today we see similarities and divergences. No doubt many Australian industrial relations commentators will be watching New Zealand with interest in the coming months. I understand from my New Zealand colleagues that there were massive traffic jams in Wellington last week all caused by Australian politicians.

Apart from the changes to be experienced by the industrial relations players in the field I would be interested to hear what Kevin Hince may say about the effect of these current legislative changes on industrial relations teaching and research in New Zealand in say, two or five years time.

I don't think I can make too many useful comments on Kevin's paper as to what is taught where, but I do find it interesting, and in some contrast to the Australian situation, that so much of New Zealand academic industrial relations is taught from a management school base and that so many of the courses are taught on a service course basis. From the paper it would seem that the management school base also appears to have a direct bearing on the amount of industrial relations-based research that occurs, especially through the avenue of higher degree dissertations. I also find it interesting that distance education seems to satisfy a very strong demand for pure rather than service industrial relations courses at both the University and Polytechnic level. I wonder if this may increase over the coming years as New Zealand enters its Wagner period as Peter Boxall calls it and I wonder if the demand in this sector will reflect the need for what Boxall describes as the need for New Zealand's trade unions to engage in some more

strategic thinking (see Boxall, 1990). Speaking for myself and based upon my experience in the teaching of industrial relations in Australia, I do not feel optimistic that the University sector can respond quickly enough when conditions change at the workplace or at least at the interface between workers and employers and trade unions. I think this is partly because as a group of academics, we are not as closely integrated with professional practice as perhaps one may find in the medical sciences or in law. There is, by and large, very little movement between industrial relations academics and the coal-face.

I don't propose to address the issue of university industrial relations programs and training for management, as I believe industrial relations practitioners representing management have already got adequate access to training.

Picking up the union theme, and Peter Boxall's observation that trade unions have to begin to think more strategically, it will be interesting to see if the New Zealand Trade Union Education Authority (NZTUEA) and the provision of Paid Education Leave, will survive given the current climate and the eagle eye of the National Government in Wellington.

It is interesting to compare the trade union education experience in Australia and New Zealand. It seems from the paper that the New Zealand university sector (especially at the University of Waikato) has done rather more than we have in Australia for the trade union movement. Obviously, the 15 year existence in Australia of the Trade Union Training Authority (TUTA) with very generous levels of ongoing funding, has in effect, deflected the need for our sector to be involved in trade union education. Parenthetically it can also be said that TUTA's existence has meant that many unions don't do much in union education. I believe this is very unfortunate because, while its charter does not limit the nature of its training, TUTA across Australia has largely seen fit to pitch its courses at the level of job delegate. There is with almost no attention to the subsequent development of these people or the very important job of the development of skills in persons above job delegate level. One result may be that people at this higher level level are only further developed by the patronage at more senior officials. In these circles women will almost certainly miss out. In February 1991, at the University of Sydney, ACIRRT, in conjunction with the Labor Council of NSW conducted the first of what we hope will be continuing schools for senior trade union officials. We are still a long way from the position of being able to offer certificated courses to persons at this level, as is the case at Victoria University in Wellington. Here at Sydney, our undergraduate program does not run on part-time mode and entry to our Diploma in Industrial Relations is currently closed to persons without a previous degree. I am also very sceptical as to the likelihood of full-time union officials being physically able to attend university two nights a week after work, even though the Accord has probably made the lot of many full-time officials much less hectic that it was when I left the union movement during the wages free for all of 1981). I am also very concerned that during a period of extraordinary and unprecedented influence by the ACTU in formal policy making so much of the agenda of the current ACTU seems to be informed by rampant anti-intellectualism. This is strange given the high level of university education among the current ACTU leadership. In fact,

Martin Ferguson is a graduate of our own Department! Cynics would perhaps say that this isn't strange at all!

Back to New Zealand. As to the immediate effects of the *Employment Contracts Act* 1991 on New Zealand trade union demands for industrial relations education, it will be interesting to see how quickly the New Zealand university sector reacts to the changes. Peter Boxall talks of the new climate giving rise to both a threat and an opportunity. I can't help thinking that the current developments have obvious parallels in the great strikes of the 1890s over freedom of contract. Perhaps unions can survive and may be metallurgically hardened by this test of fire. I hate to think what would happen if the New Zealand Act were to become law in Australia this week as I believe eight years of happy Accord have reduced the aerobic fitness of many Australian trade unions.

Research in a small discipline in a small country is obviously a very difficult thing to encourage and fund. Here in Australia we find it difficult enough, and certainly increasingly difficult. I suspect questions of critical mass apply and I am particularly aware of this in my own field of Australian industrial law which is so small we could all meet in a telephone box. It means in my field that there are no great on-going research projects and very little collaboration because of physical isolation. I do hope that we may, see a close interdisciplinary involvement of labour lawyers in the future and of course a first step would be to liberate some of the better industrial lawyers from the law schools.

Questions of funding and independence are inextricably linked in my mind. Giving the payer of the piper primacy in dictating the nature of the tune is a major problem in social science research. For many people it simply means there is no funding at all for the things they see as important. I was dismayed to hear of the abolition of the Research Grant Authority in New Zealand. I wonder what will replace it.

Kevin Hince also spoke of the embryonic state of research in New Zealand labour history. Given the editorial policy of our own *Journal of Labour History* and the difficulty of getting anything published in an international journal, I would urge our Kiwi colleagues to establish their own *Journal of Labour History* and watch all the interested people come out of their fox-holes. A focus such as a journal could provide real stimulus.

Kevin Hince also mentioned the possibility of coursework masters programs opening up research in New Zealand. I hope this proves to be the case. I hope New Zealand doesn't suffer the flatfooted and short-sighted destruction of postgraduate education by government policy as we have witnessed over the past twenty years in one of our ASEAN neighbours.

It would seem that across the world our discipline is at the mercy of public policy swings and reversals. New Zealand industrial relations certainly faces an interesting challenge. I wish our colleagues in New Zealand, well.

8 Extending the Boundaries: Industrial Relations and Research and Teaching in Australia

Lyndal Jenkins
Russell Lansbury
Mark Wescottt

INTRODUCTION

There can be little doubt that the past decade has witnessed a significant expansion in industrial relations teaching and research in Australia. This has coincided with a period when the labour movement enjoyed almost unprecedented political power, having gained office in every state and at the federal level at some time between 1983 and 1990. The Accord between the ACTU and the ALP placed industrial relations at centre stage of the political and economic debate. It might well be argued, therefore, that this should have been a period in which much greater resources were devoted to the field of industrial relations education. With the likely decline of the ALP's dominance at both federal and state levels of government in the near future, and the continuing reduction in the proportion of the workforce who are trade union members, the 'golden years' of industrial relations as a field of study could be on the wane. Indeed, in his Presidential address to the AIRAANZ Conference in 1989, David Plowman forecast that the growth period in industrial relations at the tertiary education level may have peaked and 'at best we can expect marginal increases in the number of academics with industrial relations as their major focus of interest and teaching/research' (Plowman, 1989).

Yet such predictions may yet prove to be unduly pessimistic, particularly given the fact that a considerable number of tertiary institutions now have a sufficient critical mass of industrial relations specialists to offer comprehensive programs of study at the undergraduate and graduate levels. This was confirmed by a recent national survey of industrial relations teaching undertaken by the Australian Centre for Industrial Relations Research and Teaching (ACIRRT), which forms part of this paper (see Jenkins, 1991). Furthermore, an update of Blain and Plowman's 1987 review of industrial relations literature reveals a vigorous record of research and publications in the field since the mid 1980s. Finally, industrial

relations academics are making significant contributions to the debate on major public policy issues, such as micro-economic reform, thereby attracting greater attention to the subject area. On the other hand, it must be acknowledged that industrial relations still struggles to gain academic recognition as a field in its own right. The number of independent or fully-fledged departments in universities remains relatively small and there are a number of unresolved academic issues such as the scope of the subject area (e.g. how does it relate to human resources management?) and its disciplinary base (e.g. is it part of the broader fields of economics, business studies or other social sciences?)

TRENDS IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS RESEARCH: 1986 - 1991

Following Peter Cappelli's dictum that 'as in most fields, the teaching of industrial relations has been driven by developments in research', (Cappelli, 1991) this paper will begin with a review of the Australian publications in the field since 1987. Given that it usually takes at least one year for articles or books to be transformed from manuscript to published form, our review covers approximately the past five years. Our review takes as its starting point an extensive survey of the Australian industrial relations literature, 1970-86, undertaken by Blain and Plowman (1987). We utilise a similar framework to that which Blain and Plowman adopted and reassess the conclusions which they reached. The paper also draws on the survey of industrial relations courses in higher education undertaken for ACIRRT and the Commonwealth Department of Industrial Relations by Jenkins (1991). The ACIRRT survey examined industrial relations programs in institutions of higher education which offered one or more courses in this field. Finally, the paper speculates on the likely future directions for industrial relations teaching and research in Australia.

Before embarking on a review of recent Australian industrial relations literature, it is necessary to acknowledge certain limitations in our approach. First, the paper has focussed exclusively on Australian publications. This limits the scope of the review because it excludes contributions by Australian academics in foreign publications. However, it is a necessary device in order to keep the survey at a manageable size. Second, what topics should be included as pertaining to industrial relations? One of the distinguishing features of industrial relations as area of study has been the ongoing dispute over the boundaries of the subject (e.g. Flanders 1968, Laffer 1974, Hyman 1975, Taylor and Bray 1986). Rather than entering the debate about constitutes industrial relations as a field of study, this paper has accepted the definition by Blain and Plowman. Namely, that industrial relations is the 'study of the interactions between and among employees and employers, their respective organizations, and intermediaries, focusing on the regulation of work' (Blain and Plowman, 1987, p296). This is a broader and more inclusive definition than others in the literature, but it allows industrial relations to encompass a wide range of employment-related issues. Finally, we have concentrated primarily on industrial relations in Australia as this is the area with which the majority of the literature is concerned. Some mention will be made, however, of work dealing with international and comparative industrial relations.

The Scope of Publications

It is useful to note the variety of outlets that are available for industrial relations publications in Australia. The rise of specialist industrial relations departments and research centres within institutions of higher education has encouraged the growth of working papers and other industrial relations publications. How this will be affected by recent amalgamations between universities and colleges of advanced education is yet to be seen. Since 1990, the federal government has funded two key centres for industrial relations research. This has further stimulated the growth of industrial relations literature through publications of the National Key Centre of Industrial Relations at Monash University and the Australian Centre for Industrial Relations Research and Teaching (ACIRRT) at the University of Sydney.

There has also been the establishment of several new industrial relations-oriented journals. *Labour and Industry: A Journal of the Social and Economic Relations of Work*, was launched in October 1987. In his introduction to the first edition, Craig Littler declared that the journal was designed as a multi-disciplinary device to bring together scholars from different backgrounds interested in relations at work. Special mention was made of the need to encourage a comparative focus, especially in regard to the Pacific rim and to review restructuring of Australian industry, management and work organisation (Littler, 1987). In addition to *Labour and Industry*, there has been the establishment of specialist journals associated with particular aspects of industrial relations. *The Australian Journal of Labour Law* was launched in May 1988. In Western Australia, a journal entitled *Labour Economics and Productivity* was commenced in 1989 by the Western Australian Labour Market Research Centre. The Institute of Personnel Management Australia (IPMA) revamped and renamed its journal *Asia-Pacific HRM* in 1989. Under its new format and editorial policy, this journal also accepts a wide range of articles dealing with industrial relations and related subjects. The Industrial Relations Research Centre and Centre for Applied Economic Research at the University of NSW jointly established *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*, in June 1990. It is concerned with 'contemporary issues, developments and policy making in the fields of economics and labour relations'. There have also been two recently established union-based journals, which cater for popular but serious articles on industrial relations: *Union Issues* (established in 1988) and *Workplace* (published by the ACTU 1991). These journals provide a wider range of choices for the publication of Australian industrial relations literature.

Blain and Plowman made reference to the number of general industrial relations text books which emerged during the period of their review. Since then there has been a new edition of *Australian Industrial Relations* by Deery and Plowman as well as the addition of a new textbook by Dufty and Fells (1989). It is of interest to note that while Deery and Plowman maintain an 'institutional' approach to the study of industrial relations, Dufty and Fells utilise a 'processes' approach in their text. Another recent textbook, which has been widely used in courses conducted by the Technical and Further Education (TAFE) institutions, is *Understanding Australian Industrial Relations* by Alexander and Lewis (1990). There have also been new editions of edited readings concerning Australian industrial relations,

specifically concerning trade unions (Ford & Plowman, 1989) as well as labour economics (Whitfield, 1989) and industrial relations in general (Ford, Hearn and Lansbury, 1987).

There has been a continuing stream of bibliographies associated with industrial relations. The Association of Industrial Relations Academics of Australia and New Zealand (AIRAANZ) has commissioned and published bibliographies dealing with employer groups (Plowman, 1989) working time (Nyland 1989) and arbitration (Spooner, 1989). In addition, there have been several working papers with major bibliographies attached (e.g. Littler, Quinlan & Kitay, 1989) as well as other specialist bibliographies on the labour process (Brigden, 1987/8) and workplace industrial relations (Zappala, 1988). In addition, *The Australian Journal of Labour Law* has carried a select bibliography in most editions, related not only labour law publications but to industrial relations literature in general. *Labour and Industry* has provided a series of literature reviews on various topics such as labour law (Mitchell 1987), management and labour in Chinese industry (Jackson, 1988), small business (Sutcliffe & Kitay, 1988), the labour process (Bray & Littler, 1988), gender and the labour process (Williams & Lucas, 1988) and domestic labour (Baxter 1990). Finally, there has been the continuation of conferences and conference proceedings dealing with specific industrial relations issues (e.g. foundations of arbitration) and general trends in industrial relations (AIRAANZ 1987, 1990).

Thus, it appears that the output of industrial relations research has continued to grow, as have the opportunities for publications. Arguably this is associated with the growing public policy relevance of industrial relations in Australia. This is supported, among other things by the Australian Workplace Industrial Relations Survey (AWIRS) conducted by the Commonwealth Department of Industrial Relations (see Callus et al, 1991) and attempts by governments to reform industrial relations (particularly in NSW, Queensland, and the Commonwealth). Using a similar framework to Blain and Plowman, the recent literature can be divided as follows: Approaches to the Study of Industrial Relations, Industrial Relations in Australia and International and Comparative Studies. The distinction between these areas is often blurred and any categorisation is necessarily arbitrary. Furthermore, our review is not totally comprehensive. Inevitably, some work will have been overlooked or excluded because of constraints of time and space. However, based on our review of the literature, some trends in industrial relations research may be discerned.

Approaches to the Study of Industrial Relations

There are a number of different approaches to the study of industrial relations adopted by academics. One of the most recent contributions to industrial relations as a field of study has been the work of Kochan et al in the USA with their development of the concept of strategic choice (Kochan, Katz, Cappelli, 1984; Kochan, Katz & McKersie, 1986). The effect of this approach on the Australian literature is beginning to be seen in the work of some scholars in their interpretation of the role of management in Australia (Deery and Purcell, 1989,

Bramble, 1989, Smith 1990). However, this has generally not resulted in greater discussion of industrial relations theory itself. One exception is Fells (1989) who has attempted to link the concepts of management strategy with control, through using the employment relationship as the basis for the study of industrial relations. Fells endeavours to interpret industrial relations phenomena by examining the variables which influence the shape and nature of the employment relationship, introducing the frontier of control as a dynamic in this relationship and relating it to management's strategic choices.

One area, long neglected in Australian industrial relations, which has received considerable attention in recent years has been workplace industrial relations (see Callus and Lansbury, 1989). Furthermore, Littler et al (1989) have reviewed traditional bargaining and control/resistance models of workplace industrial relations. They argue that workplace industrial relations in Australia cannot be interpreted solely by using either of these approaches due to the heavy reliance on conciliation and arbitration for workplace regulation. They develop a typology of possible outcomes depending upon different workplace factors and postulate a framework that could be applied to the study of the workplace. This sparked a vigorous debate between Zappala (1990) and the authors. Callus et al (1991) have also pursued this area and developed a typology based on their interpretation of the results of the Australian Workplace Industrial Relations Survey. This should provoke further discussion about how to conceptualise the workplace in Australia.

Industrial Relations in Australia

Industrial Conflict

It has been noted by many commentators that industrial conflict is often equated solely with industrial disputes. Scholars have advocated widening the treatment of industrial conflict, but this has generally had little effect on empirical studies. As the most tangible form of industrial conflict, strikes remain the basis of most articles dealing with the subject. While there is discussion of both strike statistics and other forms of industrial conflict in some of the literature (Dabscheck 1987, Frenkel & Pratt, 1988, Moore, 1989, Chapman and Gruen, 1989, Belman, Drago & Wooden, 1990) this is generally incidental rather than of primary concern. There appears to be very little discussion of industrial conflict and industrial disputation as such. Some exceptions are the studies by Creigh (1986) and Beggs and Chapman (1987), who discuss Australia's strike record in an international perspective. These writers advance predominantly economic or business cycle explanations for the strike pattern that has prevailed in Australia. Another exception has been the work of Drago and Wooden (1990) who have examined the determinants of strikes at a micro-level in Australia. They distinguish between work stoppages and work closures and seek to assess the causes of each. They conclude that union power may be influential in affecting work stoppages but that the longer and more damaging work closures usually indicate genuine problems in the employment relationship between unions and management.

Industrial disputation is an area which has received attention in recent past, with writers looking at the causes, details and implications of disputes such as the Mudginberri case (Kitay and Powe, 1987), including legal ramifications (Pittard, 1988), the role of the NSW Industrial Tribunal in the Broken Hill dispute (Flynn, 1988) the roles played by the Federal government and the ACTU in the pilots dispute, and the possible effects of this dispute on the trade union movement (Smith 1990). Discussion of industrial conflict in its broader sense, and not simply strike behaviour, appears to be a growing area of research in Australian industrial relations, although underdeveloped.

Unions

Unions have traditionally been a major focus of study in Australian industrial relations. Blain and Plowman (1987) observed that the literature on unions was distinguished by its voluminous size, general lack of synthesis and cohesiveness. The same comments can be made of the literature on unions since 1986. The lack of synthesis and cohesiveness is evidenced by the breadth of literature dealing with trade unions. This ranges from the survival and reform of the trade union movement (Peetz, 1990, Blandy, Sloan and Wooden, 1989) to female membership of and participation in trade unions (Benson and Griffin, 1988) as well as the historical development of trade unions (Quinlan, 1987), the organisation of unions within the workplace (Benson, 1988), and the relationship between supervisors and shop stewards (Lever-Tracy, 1987). As the approach to the study of trade unions remains eclectic, it is difficult to generalise about distinct trends in the literature. One trend that has emerged, however, concerns reform of the trade union movement (which in itself is linked to a wider debate about the reform of the industrial relations system). This has been initiated, to a considerable degree, by the ACTU's reform strategy which emerged in both *Australia Reconstructed* (1987) and *Future Strategies for the Trade Union Movement* (1987). The debates concerning the reform of the industrial relations system will be addressed below. There have been no major attempts, however, to re-examine or update theories of Australian unionism since the early seminal work of Howard (1977).

Employer Groups and Management

The study of employer groups and the role of management also remains a relatively underdeveloped area of Australian industrial relations. There would appear to be more research concerning the growth, development and role of employer associations than there is concerning the role of management in industrial relations. However, this may be redressed by the growth of human resource management literature. There have been numerous publications tracing the growth of employers' associations in Australia, which examine the role performed by these associations and chart both the change in their roles and structure over time (Plowman, 1987 and 1988) and in specific industries (Rose 1987). There is also a growing literature produced by employer associations presenting their views, particularly on the future of the Australian industrial relations system (Angwin and McLaughlin, 1990; Noakes 1991).

Scholars have also focussed increasingly on the management of labour. Studies vary from historical analyses of the approach of management in the New South Wales railways (Patmore, 1988a and 1988b), to discussion of management styles, the flexibility debate, and the most effective way to create a flexible workforce in the present industrial relations setting (see Horstman, 1988). There has also been discussion of the dissemination and effectiveness of certain management techniques such as the use of quality circles (McGraw and Dunford, 1987), consultative committees (Davis and Lansbury, 1987) and employee stock ownership schemes (Aitken and Wood, 1989). There is growing interest among industrial relations specialists in human resource management (HRM). This is illustrated by the number of papers on the topic prepared and presented at most recent AIRAANZ conference (see Griffin 1990). The emerging preoccupation with HRM may be due to the perceived threat it poses to industrial relations as a field of study. Nevertheless, the growing interest in HRM is helping to redress the previous paucity of literature on the role of management in Australian industrial relations.

Industrial Regulation

The regulation of the Australian industrial relations system has been an area of increasing concern in the recent academic literature. In the last four volumes of the *Journal of Industrial Relations*, approximately seventeen articles have been concerned with the role of governments, industrial legislation, and federal and state tribunals. The *Australian Journal of Labour Law* deals specifically with changes in industrial legislation and interpretation of new legislation. However, the most intense area of debate in the recent past has been over the nature of industrial relations regulation in Australia, particularly the issue of enterprise bargaining. This has been prompted by the moves of the NSW and Queensland governments to introduce an enterprise element to industrial regulation, external to the existing industrial tribunals. There has also been considerable discussion of the report by the Business Council of Australia's (BCA) study commission into industrial relations entitled *Enterprise-Based Bargaining Units* (1989). The attempt to introduce the Enterprise Agreement Amendment Act in NSW, based primarily on the recommendations of the Niland Green paper on industrial relations (Niland 1989), has generated considerable debate of the purpose and effectiveness of the proposed legislation (Rimmer, 1989, Bray, 1989, Lansbury, 1990). A similar situation arose with the introduction of Voluntary Employment Agreements in Queensland. (Goodwin and Maconachie, 1990). There have also been comparison of the approaches taken in each state (Quinlan and Rimmer, 1989; Guille, 1989).

One of the liveliest issues of debate has been the response to the BCA Study Commission's report. This has generated criticism not only of the BCA's recommendations but also of the methodology and conclusions reached in the report (Dabscheck, 1989; Frenkel and Peetz, 1990; Jamieson, 1990). There have been spirited responses from the BCA (Hilmer and McLaughlin, 1990) and *Australian Journal of Labour Law*, 1990). Some commentators have argued that the discussion about enterprise-based bargaining is simply a reincarnation of the

compulsory arbitration versus collective bargaining debate that has occurred in Australia for some years. However, the issue has now moved beyond purely academic debate to major changes in public policy.

The industrial regulation debate is connected with a wider concern about flexibility within the labour market and productivity. Such discussion is often linked to the changes in principles of wage determination. Academics have been exploring the meaning of labour market flexibility (Macdonald, 1988), and the relative flexibility of Australian labour markets (Burgess and Macdonald, 1989) flexibility and management practices (Bramble, 1988) as well as productivity (Metcalf, 1990, Burgess, 1990). Hence, concern with the future of industrial regulation in Australia has been underlying theme in much of the recent literature.

Wage determination

Wage determination has traditionally been a preoccupation in much of Australian industrial relations literature. Blain and Plowman (1987) refer to the discontinuities in wages policy and how this reflected in the literature. They categorise the literature concerning wage determination into five main areas: wage fixation, market versus institutional determinants and outcomes, income policies, wage adjustment mechanisms and the relationship between wage rates and other economic variables. Although recent research has been published in all of these areas, wage fixation and incomes policy have been dominant themes.

Since the introduction of the two-tier wage fixing system in March 1987, much of the literature has attempted to assess its impact. Rimmer and Zappala (1989) examined a number of second tier agreements in different industries and their effects on work organisation. Frenkel and Shaw (1989) studied second tier negotiations in the metal industry with particular attention to the approaches and opinions of both parties. The replacement of the two-tiered system with the structural efficiency principles has led to discussion about the effectiveness and outcomes of award restructuring (see Rimmer and Verevis, 1990). A special issue of *Labour and Industry* was devoted to the topic of restructuring and reform (Vol 2, no 3, 1989). In addition, research has assessed the wage principles themselves (Sloan and Wooden, 1990).

There have also been numerous articles dealing with equal pay as a wage fixing principle and its impact. Bennett (1988) reviewed the failure to establish comparative worth as a wage fixing principle and looked at this in terms of the federal commission's role. Rafferty (1989) examined the success of the Professional Officers' Association in gaining equal pay for its members and argued that the major impediment was not the federal commission but the Commonwealth government.

There has also been a continuing debate concerning the changing nature of wage determination. This has been manifested in discussion of the relative merits of the Accord as an incomes policy. Moore (1989) argued that the Accord had inhibited the natural restructuring of the Australian economy and that the success of the

Accord in stimulating employment growth while reducing industrial disputation was a legacy of world-wide economic recession. Gruen and Chapman (1989) also attempted to assess the value of the Accord. They evaluated the relative arguments and used five different econometric models to assess the impact of the Accord on the Australian economy. They argued that although it was difficult to distinguish the specific effects of the Accord, it had not been harmful to the Australian economy. Lewis and Spears (1990) also attempted to evaluate the Accord and concluded that it had positive results. It is clear that disagreement over the relative merits of the Accord still abound. However, it is also indicative of the strong preoccupation with wages and award determination among writers on Australian industrial relations.

Employment Conditions and Related Issues

There are several areas of growing interest in the literature which can be broadly classified under the heading of employment conditions. These include Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO), Occupational Health and Safety (OHS), Production Systems, and Skills and Training. There has been considerable growth in literature dealing with EEO and gender segmentation in the labour market. Various writers have evaluated the impact of these policies. Kramar (1987) examined the ramifications of Anti-Discrimination and Affirmative Action legislation for employers and their employment policies. Strachan (1987) argued that the effectiveness of anti-discrimination and EEO policies could best be ensured by involving unions in the consultation process. There has also been consideration of Affirmative Action legislation and how this has affected private and public sector employees (Pittard, 1988a). Thus, the growth in public policy importance of EEO and anti-discrimination policies has been reflected in the industrial relations literature. In addition, some writers have evaluated the effect of changing technology on women's jobs in the newspaper industry (Reed, 1987) and the computer industry. (Probert and Wajcman, 1988). Both these studies considered issues of skill and technology associated with occupations dominated by female workers. Ahlburg (1988) discussed desired occupational changes among female workers and concluded that survey material indicated that, given the choice, the majority of female workers would like to have access to occupations in traditionally male areas.

Occupational health and safety has received increasing attention in the industrial relations literature (Deutsch, 1990). Increasing public concern with occupational health and safety issues has stimulated involvement of governments and unions in this area. Various researchers have examined the concepts of occupational health and safety, industrial illness and accidents (Quinlan, 1987). Others have interpreted occupational health and safety using different frameworks (Carson, 1989 and Willis, 1989). The increase in work-related illness has been considered by Spillane and Deves (1987). Discussion of occupational health and safety has also been accompanied by evaluation of legislative attempts to enforce standards of health and safety at the workplace (Brooks, 1988), as well as the involvement of the federal commission in this issue (McDonald, 1989). The growing interest

in this field is reflected the recent publication of a text book dealing with occupational health and safety issues (Quinlan et al, 1991).

There has also been growing interest in new production systems, skills and training of the Australian workforce. Matthews has published a number of articles and books concerning production systems and the restructuring of work (1989, 1990). This also appears to be an area of concern within the industrial sociology literature (see also Bramble, 1988, Lever-Tracy, 1990). Issues of skill and training have also emerged in the literature in associated with award restructuring and multi-skilling. Curtain (1987) has discussed skill formation within the enterprise and highlighted the inadequate levels of skill formation in Australia. Other writers have also considered skill formation within a comparative framework (Smith, 1988).

International and Comparative Studies

Blain and Plowman argued that the Australian industrial relations literature was largely parochial in character. This essentially remains the case. There are still very few explicit comparative studies in the Australian industrial relations literature. However, there is a growing body of work that deals with international studies of industrial relations. (See Clarke and Niland, 1991 and Bamber and Lansbury, 1992). One of the stated objectives of the journal *Labour and Industry* has been to encourage more comparative studies, especially with respect to the Pacific Basin area. Since its inception, there have been articles discussing various aspects of industrial relations in Singapore, Malaysia, Japan, New Zealand, Asean countries and Papua New Guinea. Articles in the *Journal of Industrial Relations* over the same period have also dealt with aspects of industrial relations in New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Canada and the United States. There appears to be a growing concern with industrial relations in the Asia-Pacific region, as illustrated by the publication of the Garnaut report (Garnaut, 1989) and various articles dealing with Asia (Lansbury and Zappala, 1990 and 1991, Littler, 1989). This may inevitably lead to a greater number of comparative studies concerning Australia's place within the region. Blain and Plowman noted the lack of interest in comparative arbitration and conciliation services. This area has not expanded in the period since their review. Most comparative studies have focussed on trade unions and their changing roles.

New Areas of Research and Continuing Gaps in the Literature

During the past few years, the lack of attention to workplace industrial relations has been redressed to a large extent. With the trend in wage determination moving towards the industry and enterprise levels, there has been growing interest in what actually occurs in the workplace. Literature dealing with second-tier wage agreements has attempted to identify the trade-offs made in the workplace and how this has affected the organisation and performance of work. The literature concerning workplace industrial relations has mostly concentrated on manufacturing, in general, and the metal industry, in particular. As noted

previously, a major boost to the study of workplace industrial relations in Australia has been the completion of the first major large survey of Australian workplaces by the Commonwealth Department of Industrial Relations. The Australian Workplace Industrial Survey (AWIRS) has provided extensive data on workplaces in Australia. It has already resulted in the publication of a book charting the general terrain of Australian workplaces (Callus et al, 1991). *Labour and Industry* has dedicated a specific issue to workplace industrial relations (Vol 1 No. 3, 1988) and there will be a special edition on the results of the AWIRS report. The *Journal of Industrial Relations* is also bringing out a special issue on the survey results. Furthermore, the Australian Centre for Industrial Relations Research and Teaching (ACIRRT) has been publishing a Working Paper series on Workplace Industrial Relations, since 1990. There will undoubtedly be an increase in workplace studies in the industrial relations literature in the coming years.

Some of the other areas seen to be underdeveloped by Blain and Plowman have received greater treatment since their review. The influence of foreign management is one example. With the growth in importance of international human resource management there has been heightened interest in this field (see Dowling and Schuler, 1990). Some writers have initiated discussion on the effects of Japanese management systems in Australia (Bamber, Howell and Shadur, 1990) and there would appear to be greater interest in this topic with several major projects in progress. The Key Centre in Quality Management at the Queensland University of Technology is also contributing to new research which links industrial relations and human resource management.

The area of industrial relations theory has remained relatively untouched in recent times. There has been a paucity of any major theoretical work, let alone attempts to come to grips with the problem of general theory applied to industrial relations. This may be indicative of the institutional focus of much of the industrial relations literature, which still neglects and even dismisses the relevance of industrial relations theory.

Public policy is an increasingly important area in industrial relations. Much of the literature reviewed in this paper has had an explicit public policy focus. However, there remain some unanswered questions. Have industrial relations scholars succeeded in shaping public policy or have they merely been responding to changes in the industrial relations agenda? The current debates concerning reform of industrial relations in Australia seem to have emanated from the major protagonists rather than from industrial relations scholars. In this sense industrial relations researchers may still suffer from an inability to significantly effect change in the public policy agenda. In order to influence the direction of public policy debate, industrial relations research will need to achieve a higher profile than it has previously enjoyed in Australia.

In a critical review of the methodologies used in Australian industrial relations research, Gurdon (1978) noted that the dominant approach was the case study mode and that more sophisticated quantitative methods were relatively absent in the literature. It is still the case that most industrial relations research is of a

qualitative nature although quantitative approaches are increasingly applied, particularly by researchers with labour economics background (eg. see Blandy and Brummitt, 1990; Drago and Wooden, 1990). This type of research has been criticised, however, particularly in relation to studies undertaken for the Business Council of Australia by researchers at the National Institute of Labour Studies (see Dabscheck 1989, Frenkel and Peetz, 1990). The recent report on the Australian Workplace Industrial Relations Survey (AWIRS) by Callus et al (1991), however, has demonstrated how quantitative and qualitative approaches to industrial relations can be effectively combined.

The quality of industrial relations research and the type of approaches which are adopted by researchers are inevitably influenced by the nature of industrial relations education which is offered in institutions of higher education. The influence works in two ways in that industrial relations teaching is also affected by the publications which are available in the field. The following section deals with the results of the Review of Industrial Relations Teaching in Higher Education conducted by ACIRRT (Jenkins, 1991).

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS TEACHING AND PROGRAMS OF STUDY: RESULTS OF THE ACIRRT REVIEW, 1990

The ACIRRT review of industrial relations teaching focussed on the scope of courses offered in institutions of higher education, the nature of the curricula, pressures for change and possible future directions for teaching and research in industrial relations and related fields of study (see Jenkins, 1991).

Despite the fact that the concept of industrial relations can be traced back more than a century (see Morris, 1987) there is still considerable debate about whether it constitutes a discipline (see Laffer, 1974, Plowman, 1989). The relatively small number of industrial relations departments (or organisational units, to use a broader term) attests to the marginal position which the field still occupies in many institutions of higher education. Many industrial relations programs emerged from Departments of Economics (indeed, in some cases they are still part of larger Economics Departments or schools) and there continues to be a struggle in many places to establish a separate institutional identity for industrial relations. At the present time, most industrial relations courses are taught management, economics, or business studies programs.

The Teaching of Industrial Relations in Australia

There were 45 organisational units in institutions of higher education across Australia which taught industrial relations programs of study in 1990. They were located in 27 institutions. In every state there was at least one institution offering a program of study in industrial relations in 1990. In the ACT there was only one institution which offered a program of study in industrial relations and this was at postgraduate level. Industrial relations was not taught as a program of study in every higher education institution across Australia, but a majority of the

universities and colleges in each state taught an industrial relations program at either undergraduate or postgraduate level.

At 10 of the 27 institutions, industrial relations was only offered as a program of study at either undergraduate or postgraduate level (see Table 1). At the three institutions, where only a postgraduate program was offered, the organisational unit did offer industrial relations subjects at undergraduate level but in other programs. There were 9 institutions which offered undergraduate industrial relations programs only. However, within these institutions, a program in an associated area, such as human resource management, was often provided.

Organisational units which taught both undergraduate and postgraduate programs in industrial relations are listed as part of Table 1. There were 15 of these institutions in total, 7 of them in New South Wales. In the states of Queensland, Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia, there was at least one institution which offered both an undergraduate and postgraduate coursework programs in industrial relations. However, in the state of Victoria, where there were eleven higher education institutions, at the time of the survey, only two of these offered industrial relations at both undergraduate and postgraduate level.

Programs of Study in Industrial Relations

The Review was principally concerned with identifying programs of study in industrial relations. A program of study was defined as the sequence of subjects which together satisfy the requirements for a course qualification. To become an industrial relations graduate, a student must have completed a program of study in industrial relations.

Programs of study vary not only in terms of their curriculum but also in terms of their structure. There are combined programs, majors, minors and sub-categories of these. The programs of study identified here include all of these types of arrangements.

Undergraduate Teaching Programs

There were 49 undergraduate industrial relations programs of study offered across Australia in 1990 and 14 honours programs. Table 2 lists industrial relations programs of study by state and provides course and program details. New South Wales was the state where most industrial relations programs of study were offered in 1990, with a total of 34 undergraduate and honours programs. In both Queensland and Western Australia, there were 8 undergraduate and honours programs in industrial relations in 1990. In both Victoria and South Australia, there were 6 undergraduate and honours programs available in 1990, while there was also one program of study in industrial relations offered in the state of Tasmania. There were no undergraduate or honours programs in industrial relations in 1990 offered in either the Australian Capital Territory or the Northern

Territory. New South Wales also accounted for the majority of honours programs in industrial relations.

These program numbers must be regarded with caution, however. In essence, these figures were inflated by the fact that within a number of larger institutions, a program of study was offered in more than one course. For example, at the University of Sydney, the same industrial relations sequence of subjects was offered in three different courses, a Bachelor of Arts, Economics and Economics (Social Science). It may be said that each of the 24 institutions offering industrial relations programs at undergraduate level in 1990 generally offered only one set of subjects in industrial relations. Most institutions offered a sequence of industrial relations subjects in only one course.

There are more tertiary institutions in New South Wales than other states so it is not unreasonable to expect most teaching programs to be offered within this state. However, there are a similar number of institutions in Victoria and there are a significantly smaller number of industrial relations programs on offer at undergraduate level in that state. It may be observed that Victoria offered a disproportionately smaller number of programs in industrial relations at undergraduate level. This is surprising given the fact that Victoria is a centre of much industrial relations activity. However, it may be accounted for by the fact that there is more undergraduate teaching in personnel and human resource management in that state.

The industrial relations programs of study offered in 1990 were offered mainly at the bachelor's degree level. Only 4 of the 49 programs were offered at Associate Diploma level. All of these Associate Diploma courses were offered by institutions which have since amalgamated with universities, and the future status of these courses is unknown.

Of the 45 Bachelor degrees with a program in industrial relations, just under 50 per cent (22) of these programs were offered in business or commerce courses. Twenty per cent of these programs (9) were in Arts degrees, followed by 16 per cent (7) in economics courses. The remaining 16 per cent of programs were in either social science courses (7 per cent) or combined degrees (9 per cent). The combined degrees were in the areas of Business and Computer Science, Business and Law, Arts and Law, and Commerce and Law.

Thus the vast majority of students studying an industrial relations program at undergraduate level do so as part of a business, commerce or economics degree. There are a smaller but significant number of students studying industrial relations through an arts entry.

Undergraduate Curricula

The curriculum at undergraduate level varied between Associate Diploma and Bachelors qualifications. The subjects offered within the industrial relations and labour studies programs in Associate Diplomas had a strong practical orientation.

At the previously named Brisbane College of Advanced Education (now part of Queensland University of Technology), four industrial relations skills subjects were offered in the Associate Diploma. Courses at this level included subjects which reviewed legislation affecting the workplace (eg EEO and OH&S as well as the employment contract). In South Australia, where two institutions offer competing Associate Diplomas, one has concentrated more on human resource management and the other on the political economy of work and trade unions.

There is also a great variation in what constitutes a major sequence of study between institutions offering industrial relations programs at bachelor level. Structurally, the number of industrial relations subjects in a major varied from as few as eight half year subjects to as many as twice that number. Subjects for the purposes of this study were defined as a discrete unit of study. They could be full-time or part-time or studied externally. However, the length of the subject had to be equivalent to full time class contact of 2 hours a week over a minimum of 13 weeks (or 26 hours).

Majors in industrial relations at undergraduate level are usually three years in duration. Only one program offered a wide range of optional subjects to be taken within the major, and that was at the UNSW. Most other industrial relations programs comprised compulsory subjects, indicating a lack in staff and resources, in the case of smaller organisational units, and the effects of offering a smaller program within a larger organisational unit with other teaching concerns.

Institutions and organisational units offering industrial relations majors, and combined or double industrial relations majors, are shown in Table 2. When the course type is ignored, there were 28 unique programs offered within Bachelor degrees in 1990. Of these, 8 were minor programs and 20 were major programs. Minor programs of study generally consisted of 6 subjects or less. The common subject areas to these programs were an introductory course on Australian industrial relations institutions, the processes and practice of industrial relations in the workplace, an analysis of broader social theories and industrial conflict. In other ways each minor varied, with some giving more emphasis to industrial law, others to labour economics and still others to personnel management. In one case, at the University of Newcastle, a comparative industrial relations subject was also taught.

Industrial relations minors were generally two years in length. A couple were offered by institutions also teaching industrial relations majors, giving students a choice in terms of depth of study. The minors offered at the University of Newcastle, the University of Technology, Sydney - Kuring-gai, and the Victoria University of Technology (Footscray Institute of Technology) were the only undergraduate industrial relations programs available. However, all of these institutions are in the process of amalgamating with other institutions and the status of these programs may change.

Of the 20 unique industrial relations programs on offer in 1990, 10 were combined majors where industrial relations was mixed with law, economics and personnel management as well as human resource management (HRM). The

most common combined program at undergraduate level was a mix with HRM. Looking at the curriculum for personnel management and HRM programs, it can again be seen that each defined its field in a different way. Human resource management seemed to differ from the personnel management major in the extent to which organisational behaviour and psychology subjects were offered. The HRM programs seemed to give more emphasis to organisational behaviour, with the personnel management strand concentrating more on the functions and policies of the personnel function.

The industrial relations half of the combined programs varied dramatically, with Griffith University offering a diverse range of subjects, including comparative industrial relations, and the University College of Central Queensland essentially offering only two traditional industrial relations subjects, an introduction to the Australian system and a negotiation skills subject. In general, industrial law was favoured for inclusion across these programs, and they all described the Australian industrial relations system and institutions.

There were approximately 300 undergraduate industrial relations subjects identified by this study. The content of undergraduate majors in industrial relations appeared to be influenced by whether or not the program was a combined program or a straight industrial relations sequence.

Judging by subject titles and brief descriptions, no two industrial relations majors in industrial relations are the same. There are certain common elements, however. All but one of the industrial relations majors offered by the institutions listed in Table 2 commenced with an introductory subject which overviewed industrial relations in Australia, examined industrial conflict, and theories and processes in industrial relations. The exception was Edith Cowan University which commenced with a subject in Organisational Behaviour at first year level and then offered an industrial relations subject in the second year.

Six of the majors in industrial relations contained a subject comparing industrial relations across countries. Griffith University and the University of Western Australia developed the comparative approach by offering more than one subject in the area, while CSU-Murray and Queensland University had a mainly Australian focus.

As for the translation of other disciplines into the teaching of industrial relations majors, in all but one institution an industrial or labour law subject was part of the major. At six institutions, law was compulsory as part of the major. In fact, at CSU-Murray and Edith Cowan University, more than one industrial law subject was compulsory in the major. The orientation towards labour economics was not as strong as law. However, many majors included a labour economics subject. Others, however, concentrated only on wage determination, while the previous two institutions did not offer these economics subjects.

Labour history was compulsory in only one major in industrial relations, at the University of Sydney. It was offered in only two other majors. Industrial

sociology subjects took various forms and were on offer in over 50 per cent of majors. Some subjects concentrate on labour process theory only.

Postgraduate Teaching Programs

There were a variety of programs offered in industrial relations at postgraduate level and Table 3 details these by type and level of award and course.

There were 44 postgraduate coursework programs in industrial relations on offer in 1990. These were offered at both Graduate Diploma and Masters level. As shown in Table 4, Graduate Diploma courses in industrial relations were offered by institutions in each state but the Northern Territory. Graduate Diplomas including a program in industrial relations were offered in business courses as well as courses specifically entitled industrial relations and employment relations (60 per cent of all graduate diplomas).

Masters degrees involving course work in a program of industrial relations were more widespread than Graduate Diplomas, with 23 programs identified in all. However, there was no course work program in industrial relations available in the Northern Territory or the Australian Capital Territory in 1990. It is interesting to note that 30 per cent (7) of these programs were offered in Masters of Business Administration and 40 per cent (9) in Masters of Business or Commerce degrees. There were only two Masters of Industrial Relations degrees offered in 1990. One at the University of Sydney and the other by the University of Western Australia. It was possible to access a program of industrial relations at Masters level through the Arts Faculty in two institutions. The predominance of business and commerce courses in industrial relations continues the trend observed at undergraduate level.

Industrial Relations and Human Resource Management (HRM)

The field of HRM appears to be a fast growing area. Undergraduate programs in HRM were offered in 14 institutions compared with 24 which offered undergraduate programs in industrial relations. Similarly only 7 institutions offered graduate studies in HRM compared with 17 which offered graduate studies in industrial relations. Nevertheless, the HRM programs were more recent and expanding more rapidly than industrial relations. Furthermore, the Institute of Personnel Management of Australia (IPMA) accredited institutions which offered a full three year sequence or major in HRM, thereby enabling graduates to gain membership of the IPMA. Hence, the professionalisation of HRM was well advanced by the beginning of the 1990s and encouragement was given to higher educational institutions to expand their programs of study.

Organisational Units and Teaching Programs

As mentioned previously, there were a plethora of institutional identities with different structures, responsible for the teaching of industrial relations programs. For the purposes of this study, we were concerned with identifying the staffing unit within an institution which was directly responsible for teaching a program of study. This was called an organisational unit. Examples of what could be known as an organisational unit included, a Department within a Faculty, a Division, a School within a Faculty and so on. Some interesting observations can be made about the organisational units which offered industrial relations and associated programs in 1990.

There were only six teaching organisational units across Australia which had industrial relations/employment relations or labour studies in their title. As shown in Table 1, three of these were in New South Wales, one in Victoria, one in South Australia and the other in Western Australia. Other Industrial Relations Centres and Institutes were identified in institutions such as the University of Melbourne, New South Wales, Flinders, and Queensland universities as well as Key Centres at Sydney and Monash Universities. However these centres had the primary function of research rather than provision of courses.

Only one of the teaching organisational units had the status of a School, and this was the School of Industrial Relations and Organisational Behaviour at the University of New South Wales. The rest of the industrial relations units were departments. The average size of these units was 8.5 full-time staff, and close to 100 per cent of the staff employed within these units taught industrial relations subjects. These units also relied heavily upon part-time teaching staff, with an average of 3.5 part-time staff being employed per unit.

With only one exception, these organisational units offered industrial relations teaching programs at both undergraduate and postgraduate level. (The exception was the Labour Studies Department at the previous South Australia College of Advanced Education which offered an Associate Diploma in Labour Studies). They were all also involved in teaching service subjects within their institutions.

The second main point to note is that the number of industrial relations organisational units were few, relative to the number of business, commerce and management schools/departments teaching industrial relations programs. It was also more common for a section of a business or management school to teach industrial relations than an economics department. Table 1 lists organisational units teaching industrial relations and associated programs in 1990. These 'business' units were significantly larger than the 'industrial relations' units in terms of the number of full-time staff employed (on average 23) but have a smaller proportion of full-time staff teaching industrial relations (less than 50 per cent on average). These organisational units also tend to employ fewer part-time teachers to teach industrial relations subjects.

In some institutions, an industrial relations program was offered by a number of organisational units. This was the case at the University of Queensland, for

example, where individual subjects offered by the Departments of Government, Commerce, Economics, Law, Psychology and Sociology were recognised as a sequence of study at undergraduate level. A minor in industrial relations was also possible at Monash University (Chisholm Institute of Technology) along similar lines. La Trobe University, which previously did not offer a program of study in industrial relations, has recently constituted a program of study at undergraduate level, through linking subjects on offer by various organisational units within the institution (see Jureidini, 1991).

This type of arrangement, where a number of organisational units combine to teach a program of study in industrial relations, seemed to be the most popular for developing programs in institutions where industrial relations had not been offered before. It is a possible future strategy for institutions such as the University of Tasmania where subjects concerning industrial relations are offered individually within the Politics and Administration, Law, Economics and Sociology disciplines without a formal program being recognised. However, it seems more likely that as the amalgamation process in higher education advances, within each of the smaller number of institutions, there will be an organisational unit which has responsibility for a program of study in industrial relations.

It is perhaps too soon to tell how the process of amalgamations will affect the teaching of industrial relations programs. However, at least in the case of one institution, the Queensland University of Technology which now incorporates the Brisbane College of Advanced Education, amalgamation has caused integration problems between organisational units and teaching programs. In this case, the merger was between two institutions with different ideologies and traditions, with the QUT having a stronger management tradition and BCAE more of an industrial relations perspective (see Sutcliffe, 1991).

While there is currently one primary organisational unit offering industrial relations programs of study in most institutions, there is also some reliance on service teaching by other organisational units. In the majority of cases, this service teaching is in the area of industrial law and the organisational units involved are departments, schools or faculties of law. In fact, at the University of Technology, Sydney and Curtin University of Technology, the industrial relations organisational units and law departments have combined to offer industrial advocacy/law programs. In one or two cases, history, sociology and economics organisational units also service teach within industrial relations programs.

Service Teaching

It is far more common for industrial relations organisational units to service teach within other programs of study than the other way around. As Table 1 indicates, all but a handful of organisational units offering industrial relations programs offered service subjects at either undergraduate or postgraduate level. Service teaching is defined here as the provision of industrial relations subjects by 'industrial relations' organisational units in programs other than those referred to previously as industrial relations programs.

The types of programs where industrial relations service subjects are offered are varied. They range from programs in tourism and physical education to computer science and technology. They include accounting and marketing programs as well as general and specific management programs and engineering. At CSU-Mitchell, industrial relations subjects were offered within a Bachelor of Arts in Criminal Justice. At the University of New South Wales, industrial relations was a substitute for candidates of any degree who are required to undertake a general studies option. Industrial relations subjects were also offered within educational and health service management courses.

While these areas of study may not have much in common, they all seem to be aimed at preparing graduates for a career with some level of managerial responsibility. Where there is a presumption of a management career, there is most likely to be an industrial relations service subject. Industrial relations service subjects were taught in 92 undergraduate and 51 postgraduate programs across Australia in 1990. In fact, most of this service teaching was within a business or management course. Service teaching within a Bachelor of Business or Commerce accounted for over 50 per cent of all service teaching at undergraduate level, while at postgraduate level, over 70 per cent of service teaching was to Masters in Business or Business Administration or Public Administration.

The nature of this service teaching varied in terms of size and curriculum. Single introductory Australian-focussed industrial relations subjects were characteristic of service teaching in engineering, education and computing courses, for example. Subjects more tailored to the particular industry were offered in tourism and health services programs. Subjects comparing industrial relations across countries were offered within International Business majors and so on.

CONCLUSION

Our review of the literature over the past five years has revealed a vigorous output of publications on a wide range of industrial relations topics. Yet many of the conclusions reached by Blain and Plowman in their 1970-86 survey still apply. While the research is diverse and has a strong multi-disciplinary flavour, it tends to be uneven in quality and descriptive rather than analytical in its approach. With a few exceptions, there has been little research which has broken new ground or generated new theories of industrial relations. One project with considerable potential, however, has been the Australian Workplace Industrial Relations Survey (AWIRS). It is the first major national project of its kind which has involved contributions from a wide range of scholars and attempted to answer the fundamental question "what is the nature of industrial relations at the workplace level?"

Further analysis is needed of the AWIRS data and the survey should be repeated on a regular basis in order to analyse changes over time. Yet it has already filled a significant void in our knowledge. Furthermore, there is a growing body of related literature on workplace industrial relations, particularly case studies,

which is building up the stock of applied research. There have also been important attempts to develop new theories of workplace industrial relations in Australia (eg. Littler et al 1989), and this has generated useful debate (Zappala, 1990 and Littler et al, 1990). It is to be hoped that the AWIRS example will help to foster substantial research in other important areas of Australian industrial relations. Certainly AWIRS has demonstrated the value of large-scale research activities. Compared with many other areas of the social sciences, however, industrial relations in Australia has received meagre funding and most of it has been spent on a wide range of small scale research activities. There is a need for groups of scholars to cooperate in developing other major projects which will provide significant advances in the field.

Another feature of the past five years has been a heightened interest in industrial relations reform exhibited by governments, business and trade unions. This has placed industrial relations at the centre stage of political and economic debate. There have been major reports by the ACTU and the BCA, as well as inquiries into the state systems of industrial relations in NSW and Queensland. Academics have been involved as major contributors to most of these reports. Yet it has been the policy-makers rather than academic researchers who have generally set the agenda and direction to be followed. This is hardly surprising, but it does raise questions about the importance of the role of academic researchers in influencing the direction of change in industrial relations. In the past, Gurdon (1978) has criticized Australian industrial relations research for following too much in the wake of public policy. There continues to be a danger that academic researchers will be seduced by the benefits of serving particular interest groups rather than pursuing their own independent research agenda.

The ACIRRT review has shown that courses in industrial relations and related areas have been expanding. Yet while some new departments of industrial relations have emerged and several new chairs have been created during the past five years, most academics who teach in the field are still located in other departments or organisational units such as economics or business studies. Industrial relations continues to struggle to establish a separate and distinct identity as an interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary field of study. Furthermore, there remains considerable debate about what subject matter should be covered in an academic program of industrial relations.

Concern has been expressed about the rise of Human Resource Management (HRM) and the challenge which it poses to areas hitherto covered by industrial relations specialists. While the 'unitarist perspective' of HRM has been criticised and doubt cast upon its usefulness as a teaching framework (eg. Haworth, 1989), HRM has continued to make significant progress in establishing its academic credentials. It is now common for students to combine studies of industrial relations with HRM. Currently there are fewer programs of study in HRM at both the undergraduate and graduate levels than there are in industrial relations, but this situation is likely to change as HRM continues to expand.

There are many parallels between the fields of industrial relations and HRM as each seeks to establish new theoretical frameworks and to achieve a balance

between 'pure' and 'applied' aspects of its subject area. Some commentators have urged that industrial relations scholars should seek to pre-empt the advance of HRM by widening the coverage of their research and teaching, while HRM specialists have portrayed industrial relations as merely a subset of their field. However, although there are some topics which fall clearly within the mainstream areas of either industrial relations or HRM, other topics may be classified as belonging to both fields. Rather than seeking to defend the boundaries of each subject, there are advantages in encouraging greater cooperation so that the insights from both industrial relations and HRM can be brought to bear on particular issues. Workplace industrial relations is one area in which there are numerous issues, such as work organisation and job design, which can gain from both HRM and industrial relations' perspectives. However, many industrial relations scholars will need to broaden their range of understanding of such issues if they are to make a useful contribution to the wider subject area. This does not mean that it is necessary to become an HRM specialist, but rather to appreciate that there is an important knowledge base in HRM which can be complementary to an industrial relations approach. Hence, it is possible that through establishing both a greater understanding and strategic alliances with other related subjects, such as HRM and Organisational Behaviour, the boundaries of industrial relations may be extended and its relevance enhanced.

REFERENCES

- ACTU / TDC, *Australia Reconstructed*, (Canberra: AGPS, 1987)
- ACTU, *Future Strategies for the Australian Trade Union Movement*, (Melbourne: ACTU, 1987).
- Ahlburg, D. "Desired Occupational Change Among Working Women", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 30 (1) 1988.
- Aitken, M. & Wood, R. "Employee Stock Ownership Plans: Issues and Evidence", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 31 (2), 1989.
- Alexander, R and Lewis, J. *Understanding Australian Industrial Relations* (Sydney: Harcourt Brace, 1990).
- Angwin, M. & McLaughlin, P. "Enterprise Bargaining: The Business Council of Australia's Reform Agenda", *Labour & Industry*, 3 (1) 1990.
- Badham, R. & Mathews, J. "The New Production Systems Debate", *Labour & Industry*, 2 (2) 1989.
- Bamber, G.J., Howell, F. and Shadur, M. "To What Degree are Japanese Management Styles Transferable to Australia?" in Griffin, G. (ed) *Current Research in Industrial Relations: Proceedings of the Fifth AIRAANZ Conference*, (Sydney: AIRAANZ, 1990).
- Bamber, G.J. and Lansbury, R.D. (eds) *International and Comparative Industrial Relations* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 2nd edition forthcoming 1991).
- Baxter, J. "Domestic Labour: Issues and Studies", *Labour & Industry*, 3 (1) 1990.
- Beggs, J. & Chapman, B. "Australian Strike Activity in an International Context: 1964 - 1985", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 29 (2) 1987.
- Belman, D., Drago, R. & Wooden, M. "Workgroups, Efficiency Wages and Work Effort", National Institute of Labour Studies, *Working Paper* No 111, June 1990.

- Bennett, L. "Equal Pay and Comparable Worth and the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 30 (4) 1988.
- Benson, J. "Workplace Union Organisation in Australia" *Labour & Industry*, 1 (3) 1988.
- Benson, J. & Griffin, G. "Gender Differences in Unions Attitudes, Participation and Priorities", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 30 (2) 1988.
- Blain, N. & Plowman, D. "The Australian Industrial Relations Literature, 1970-1986", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 29 (2) 1987, pp 295 - 320.
- Blandy, R. and Brummitt, W. *Labour Productivity and Living Standards*, (Sydney: Allan & Unwin, 1990).
- Blandy, R., Sloan, J. & Wooden, M. "Reforming the Trade Union Structure in Australia", *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, 15 (5) 1989.
- Bramble, T. "The Flexibility Debate: Industrial Relations and New Management Production Practices", *Labour & Industry*, 1 (2) 1988.
- Bramble, T. "Political Economy and Management Strategy in the Metal and Engineering Industry" *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 31 (1) 1989.
- Bray, M. "Modernising Industrial Relations in New South Wales?", *Current Affairs Bulletin*, Nov. 1989.
- Bray, M. & Kelly, D. (eds) *Issues and Trends in Australasian Industrial Relations*, (Melbourne: AIRAANZ, 1989).
- Bray, M. & Littler, C. "The Labour Process and Industrial Relations: Review of the Literature", *Labour & Industry*, 1 (3) 1988.
- Bray, M. & Taylor, V. *Managing Labour? Essays in the Political Economy of Australian Industrial Relations*, (Sydney: McGraw - Hill, 1986)
- Brigden, C. The Labour Process: A Selected Bibliography, LSP, University of Melbourne, *Resource Document*, No 1.
- Brooks, A. "Rethinking Occupational Health & Safety Legislation", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 30 (3) 1988.
- Burgess, J. "Another Productivity Paradox? The Accord and Recent Productivity Trends in Australian Manufacturing" *ACIRRT Working Paper No 3*, (University of Sydney), 1990.
- Burgess, J. & Macdonald, D. "The Emerging Labour Flexibility Imperative: The Political Economy of Labour Market Reform in Australia", Department of Economics, University of Newcastle, *Occasional Paper No 168*, Sept. 1989.
- Burgess, J. & Macdonald, D. "Productivity, Restructuring and the Trade Union Role", *Labour & Industry*, 3 (1) 1990.
- Business Council of Australia, *Enterprise Based Bargaining Units, A Better Way of Working*, (Melbourne: BCA, 1989)
- Callus, R. and Lansbury, R.D., "Workplace Industrial Relations", *Labour and Industry* 1 (2) 1988.
- Callus, R., Moorehead, A., Cully, M. & Buchanan, J. *Industrial Relations at Work. The Australian Workplace Industrial Relations Survey*, (Canberra: AGPS, 1991).
- Cappelli, P. "Is There a Future for the Field of Industrial Relations in the U.S.?" *Proceedings of a Conference on Industrial Relations Teachings and Research: International Trends*, ACIRRT, University of Sydney, 17 May, 1991.

- Carson, W.G. "Occupational Health & Safety: A Political Economy Perspective", *Labour & Industry*, 2 (2) 1989.
- Chapman, B. & Gruen, F. "An Analysis of the Australian Consensual Incomes Policy: The Prices and Incomes Accord" Centre for Economic Policy Research, *ANU Discussion Papers*, No 221, Jan. 1990.
- Clarke, O. and Niland, J. *Agenda For Change: An International Analysis of Industrial Relations in Transition* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1991).
- Creigh, S. "Australia's Strike Record: The International Perspective" In Blandy & Niland (eds) *Alternatives to Arbitration*, (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1986).
- Curtain, R. "Skill Formation and the Enterprise", *Labour & Industry*, 1 (1) 1987.
- Curtain, R. & Mathews, J. "Two Models of Award Restructuring for Australia", *Labour & Industry*, 3 (1) 1990.
- Dabscheck, B. "New Right or Old Wrong? Ideology and Industrial Relations" *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 29 (4) 1987.
- Dabscheck, B. "Industrial Relations and the Irresistible Magic Wand: The BCA's Plan to Americanise Australian Industrial Relations", *Working Paper 76*, School of Industrial Relations and Organisational Behaviour, UNSW 1990.
- Davis, E. & Lansbury, R. "Consultative Councils in Qantas and Telecom: A Comparative Study", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 30, (4), 1988.
- Deery, S. & Plowman, D. *Australian Industrial Relations*, 3rd Edition (Sydney: McGraw Hill, 1991)
- Deery, S. & Purcell, J. "Strategic Choices in Industrial Relations Management in Large Organisation", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 31 (4) 1989.
- Deutsch, S. "Occupational Health and Safety: Challenges for Industrial Relations", *ACIRRT Working Paper No. 7*, 1990.
- Dowling, P.J. and Schuler, R.S. *International Dimensions of Human Resource Management* (Boston: PWS - Kent Publishing Company, 1990)
- Dowrick, S. "Explaining the Labour Productivity Slowdown of the 1980's", *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, 16 (3) 1990.
- Drago, R. & Wooden, M. "The Determinants of Strikes in Australia", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 32 (1) 1990.
- Dufty, N. & Fells, R. *The Dynamics of Industrial Relations in Australia*, (Sydney: Prentice Hall, 1989).
- Fells, R. "The Employment Relationship, Control and Strategic Choice in the Study of Industrial Relations" *Labour & Industry*, 2 (3) 1989.
- Flanders, A. "What is Wrong with the System" in *Management and Unions*, (London: Faber, 1968.).
- Flynn, B. "Trade Unions and the Law: The Broken Hill Dispute", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 30 (1) 1988.
- Ford, G.W. & Plowman, D.(eds) *Australian Unions*, 2nd Edition, (Melbourne: Macmillan, 1989).
- Frenkel, S. & Peetz, D. "Enterprise Bargaining: The BCA's Report on Industrial Relations Reform", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 32 (1) 1990.
- Frenkel, S. & Pratt, G. "Workplace Industrial Relations in the Metal Industry: Some Pointers from Survey Research", *CIRRUS & LSP Working Paper* (University of Sydney) No 5, August 1988.

- Frenkel, S. & Shaw, M. "No Tears for the Second Tier: Productivity bargaining in the Australian Metal Industry", *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, 15 (2) 1989.
- Garnaut, R. *Australia and the Northeast Asian Ascendancy*, (Canberra: AGPS, 1989).
- Geare, A.J. "New Zealand Industrial Relations Research 1973-1988. A Bibliography", *AIRAANZ Industrial Relations Resource Series* (Melbourne: AIRAANZ, 1989).
- Goodwin, M. & Maconachie, G. "Voluntary Employment Agreements: Labour Flexibility in Queensland", *Labour & Industry*, 3 (1) 1990.
- Griffin, G. & Benson, J. "Barriers to Female Membership Participation in Trade Union Activities", *Labour & Industry*, 2 (1) 1989.
- Guille, H. "A Tale of Two States: The Hanger & Niland Reports", *Labour & Industry*, 2 (3) 1989.
- Gurdon, M. "Patterns of Industrial Relations Research in Australia", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 20(4), 1978.
- Haworth, N. "HRM: A Unitarist Renaissance" in Bray M. and Kelly, D. (eds) *Issues and Trends in Australasian Industrial Relations* (AIRAANZ, 1989).
- Hilmer, F. & McLaughlin, P. "The BCA Report: A Response to Frenkel & Peetz (1)", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 32 (3) 1990.
- Hilmer, F. & McLaughlin, P. "Enterprise Bargaining - The Approach of the BCA - A Reply", *Australian Journal of Labour Law*, 3 (3) 1990.
- Hince, K. & Williams, A. (eds) *Industrial Relations: Research Themes*, (AIRAANZ & Industrial Relations Centre, Victoria University, 1987).
- Horstman, B. "Labour Flexibility Strategies & Management Style", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 30 (3) 1988.
- Howard, W.A. "Australian Trade Unions in the Context of Union Theory" *Journal of Industrial Relations* 19 (3) 1977.
- Hyman, R. *Industrial Relations, A Marxist Introduction*. (London: Macmillan, 1975).
- Jackson, S. "Management and Labour in Chinese Industry: A Review of the Literature" *Labour & Industry*, 1 (2) 1988.
- Jamieson, S. "Enterprise Bargaining - The Approach of the Business Council of Australia", *Australian Journal of Labour Law*, 3 (1) 1990.
- Jenkins, L. (ed) *Industrial Relations Studies in Australia 1990-91*, AGPS, Canberra, 1991.
- Jureidini, R., "Industrial Relations at La Trobe University" in Jenkins (ed.) *Industrial Relations Studies in Australia 1990-91*, AGPS, Canberra, 1991.
- Kitay, J. & Powe, R. "Exploitation at \$1000 per Week? The Mudginberri Dispute", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 29 (3) 1987.
- Kochan, T., Katz, H. & Cappelli, P. "Strategic Choice & Industrial Relations Theory", *Industrial Relations*, Winter 1984.
- Kochan, T., Katz, H. & McKersie, R. *The Transformation of American Industrial Relations*, (New York,: Basic Books, 1986)
- Kramar, R. "Affirmative Action: A Challenge to Australian Employers and Trade Unions", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 29 (2) 1987.
- Laffer, K. "Is Industrial Relations an Academic Discipline?" *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 16 (1) 1974.

- Lansbury, R.D. "The New Industrial Relations" in Easson, M. (ed) *Transforming Industrial Relations* (Sydney: Pluto Press, 1990)
- Lansbury, R. & Zappala, J. "Korean Industrial Relations in Transition: The Relevance of Australian Experience", Department of Industrial Relations, University of Sydney, *Working Paper No 13*, 1990.
- Lansbury, R.D. and Zappala, J. *Recent Developments in Industrial Relations: General Perspectives for Korea with Special Reference to Australia* (Seoul: Korea Labor Institute, 1990).
- Lever-Tracy, C. "The Supervisor and the Militant Shop Steward: Evidence from the Australian Motor Industry", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 29 (3) 1987.
- Lever-Tracy, C. "Fordism Transformed? Employee Involvement and Workplace Industrial Relations at Ford"; *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 32 (2) 1990.
- Lewis, P.E.T. & Spiers, D. "Six Years of the Accord: An Assessment", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 32 (1) 1990.
- Littler, C. "Editorial Introduction" *Labour and Industry* 1 (1) 1987.
- Littler, C., Quinlan, M. & Kitay, J. "Australian Workplace Industrial Relations: Towards a Conceptual Framework" *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 31 (4) 1989.
- Littler, C., Quinlan, M. and Kitay, J. "Australian Workplace Industrial Relations: A Rejoinder to Zappala" *Journal of Industrial Relations* 32 (4) 1990.
- Macdonald, D. "Labour Flexibility, Industrial Relations and Productivity", *CIRRUS & LSP Working Paper* (University of Sydney), No 2, 1988.
- McDonald, M. "The Vehicle Industry Occupational Health and Safety Award, 1986", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 31 (1) 1989.
- McEvoy, K. & Owens, R. "The Flight of Icarus. Legal Aspects of the Pilots Dispute", *Australian Journal of Labour Law*, 3 (2) 1990.
- McGraw, P. & Dunford, R. "The Strategic Use of Quality Circles in Australian Industrial Relations", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 29 (2), 1987.
- Mathews, J. *Age of Democracy: The Politics of Post - Fordism*, (Melbourne: OUP, 1989a).
- Mathews, J. "New Production Concepts", Department of Industrial Relations, University of Sydney, *Working Paper No 9*, 1989b.
- Mathews, J. *Tools of Change: New Technology and the Democratisation of Work*, (Sydney: Pluto Press, 1989c).
- Metcalf, D. "Industrial Relations and the 'Productivity Miracle' in British Manufacturing Industry in the 1980's", *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, 16 (2) 1990.
- Mitchell, R. "Labour Law Research in Australia: A Review of the Literature, 1975-1985", *Labour & Industry*, 1 (1) 1987.
- Moore, D. "Industrial Relations and the Failure of the Accord: What Should be Done" *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, 15 (3) 1989.
- Morris, R. "The Early Uses of the Industrial Relations Concept", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 29 (4) 1987.
- Niland, J. *Transforming Industrial Relations in New South Wales*, Green Paper, Vol 1, (Sydney, NSW Government Printer, 1989)
- Noakes, B. "Decentralizing Wage Negotiations - The CAI Position", *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, 17 (1) 1991.

- Nyland, C. "Work Time and Rationalisation: A Select Bibliography", *AIRAANZ Industrial Relations Resource Series*, (Melbourne: AIRAANZ, 1990).
- Patmore, G. "Arbitration & Bureaucracy: The New South Wales Railway Commissioners, 1892-1914", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 30 (4) 1988.
- Patmore, G. "Systematic Management and Bureaucracy: The NSW Railways Prior to 1932", *Labour & Industry*, 1 (2) 1988.
- Peetz, D. "Declining Union Density", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 32 (2) 1990.
- Pittard, M. "Affirmative Action Programs for Private & Public Sector Employees", *Australian Journal of Labour Law*, 1 (1) 1988a.
- Pittard, M.J. "Trade Practices and the Mudginberri Dispute", *Australian Journal of Labour Law*, 1 (1) 1988b.
- Plowman, D. "Models of National Employer Co-ordination 1890-1980", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 29 (4) 1987.
- Plowman, D. "Employer Associations and Industrial Reactivity", *Labour & Industry*, 1 (2) 1988.
- Plowman, D. *Holding the Line: Compulsory Arbitration and National Employer Co-ordination in Australia*, (Melbourne: CUP, 1989).
- Plowman, D. "Industrial Relations Teaching and Research: Trends, Pressures, Strategies" Presidential Address to the Fourth Biennial AIRAANZ Conference in Bray, M. and Kelly, D. (eds) *Issues and Trends in Australasian Industrial Relations* (Sydney: AIRAANZ, 1989) pp 1-12.
- Probert, B. & Wajcman, J. "Technological Change and the Future of Work", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 30 (3) 1988.
- Quinlan, M. "Early Trade Union Organisation in Australia. Three Australian Colonies, 1829-1850", *Labour & Industry*, 1 (1) 1987.
- Quinlan, M. "Occupational Illness, Industrial Conflict & State Regulation: Establishing the Linkages" in Ford, G.W., Hearn, J.M. and Lansbury, R.D. (eds) *Labour Relations Readings*, 4th Edition, (Sydney: Macmillan, 1987).
- Quinlan, M & Rimmer, M. "Workplace Industrial Reform and Legislative Change: Hancock, Hanger, Niland & The Business Council of Australia", *Labour & Industry*, 2 (3) 1989.
- Quinlan, M. & Bohle, P. *Managing Occupational Health & Safety in Australia. A Multidisciplinary Approach*. (Melbourne: Macmillan, 1991).
- Rafferty, F. "Equal Pay - Past Experience, Future Directions: A Practitioners Perspective", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 31 (4) 1989.
- Reed, R. "Making Newspapers Pay: Employment of Women's Skills in Newspaper Production", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 29 (1) 1987.
- Rimmer, M. "Transforming Industrial Relations in New South Wales - A Green Paper", *Australian Journal of Labour Law*, 2 (2) 1989.
- Rimmer, M. & Verevis, C. *Award Restructuring: Progress at the Workplace*, IRREC Monograph, 1990.
- Rimmer, M. & Zappala, J. "Labour Market Flexibility and the Second Tier", *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, 14 (3) 1988.
- Rose, J. "Multi-Employer Cohesion in Australian Construction", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 29 (4) 1987.
- Sloan, J. & Wooden, M. "The Structural Efficiency Principle in Action - Management Views", *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, 16 (3) 1990.

- Smith, G. "Union - Employer Bargaining and Product Market Developments: The Black Coal Industry" *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 32 (1) 1990.
- Smith, G. "From Consensus to Coercion: The Australian Air Pilots Dispute", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 32 (2) 1990.
- Smith, W.A. "Skill Formation in Comparative Perspective: Malaysia & Japan", *Labour & Industry*, 1 (3) 1988.
- Somers, G. *Essays in Industrial Relations Theory*, (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1969).
- Spillane, R. & Deves, L. "RSI: Pain, Pretence or Patienthood?", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 29 (1) 1987.
- Strachan, G. "Equal Employment Opportunity and Industrial Relations" *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 29 (2) 1987.
- Sutcliffe, P. "Industrial Relations at the Queensland University of Technology", in L. Jenkins *Op cit*, 1991, p 13.
- Sutcliffe, P. & Kitay, J. "Small Business and Employment Relations" *Labour & Industry*, 1 (3) 1988.
- Whitfield, K. *Contemporary Issues in Labour Economics*, (Sydney: Harper Row, 1989).
- Williams, C. & Lucas, J. "Gender and the Labour Process: Review of the Recent Literature", *Labour & Industry*, 2 (1) 1989.
- Willis, E. "The Industrial Relations of Occupational Health & Safety: A Labour Process Approach", *Labour & Industry*, 2 (2) 1989.
- Zappala, J. *Workplace Industrial Relations in Australia*. An Annotated and Selected Bibliography 1970-1988, CIRRU/BCA 1988.
- Zappala, J. "Australian Workplace Industrial Relations: Towards a Conceptual Framework - A Comment", *Journal of Industrial Relations* 32 (4) 1990.
- Zappala, J. and Lansbury, R.D. "Industrial Relations Trends in Korea", *Labour and Industry*, 4 (2) 1991.

TABLE 1

PROGRAMS OF STUDY IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS AND HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT, 1990

STATE	INSTITUTION	ORGANISATIONAL UNIT	UNDERGRADUATE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS	UNDERGRADUATE HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	GRADUATE DIPLOMA INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS	GRADUATE DIPLOMA HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	MASTERS INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS	MASTERS HUMAN RESOURCE MGMT
ACT	University of Canberra	Faculty of Management			X			
NSW	Charles Sturt University - Mitchell	School of Business & Public Administration	X			X		
	Charles Sturt University - Murray	Department of Business	X		X			
	Charles Sturt University - Riverina	Department of Administration		X				X
	University of New South Wales	School of Industrial Relations and Organisational Behaviour	X				X	X
	University of Newcastle	Department of Economics	X		X			
	University of Sydney	Department of Industrial Relations	X		X		X	
	University of Technology Sydney	School of Business and Public Administration	X		X		X	
	University of Technology Sydney, Kuring-Gai	Department of A, S & P Studies	X					
	University of Western Sydney - Nepean	Department of Employment Relations	X		X		X	
	University of Wollongong	Department of Economics	X				X	
QLD	Bond University	School of Business		X				X

STATE	INSTITUTION	ORGANISATIONAL UNIT	UNDERGRADUATE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS	UNDERGRADUATE HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	GRADUATE DIPLOMA INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS	GRADUATE DIPLOMA HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	MASTERS INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS	MASTERS HUMAN RESOURCE MGMT
	Griffith University	Division of Commerce and Administration	X	X	X		X	X
	Griffith University (Gold Coast CAE)	Faculty of Business		X				
	Queensland University of Technology	School of Management	X					
	Queensland University of Technology (Brisbane CAE)	School of Business	X		X			
	University College of Central, Queensland	School of Business	X	X				
	University College of Southern Queensland	School of Management		X				X
	University of Queensland	Across Departments - Undergraduate Graduate School Post Graduate	X					X
SA	University of Adelaide (SACAE - City)	Department of Labour Studies	X					
	University of South Australia (SAIT)	Elton Mayo School of Management	X	X	X		X	
TAS	University of Tasmania (TSIT)	School of Business	X					
VIC	Monash University	Faculty of Economics, Commerce and Management					X	

STATE	INSTITUTION	ORGANISATIONAL UNIT	UNDERGRADUATE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS	UNDERGRADUATE HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	GRADUATE DIPLOMA INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS	GRADUATE DIPLOMA HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	MASTERS INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS	MASTERS HUMAN RESOURCE MGMT
	Monash University (Chisholm)	Across Departments School of Management	X	X		X		
	Monash University College Gippsland	School of Business			X			
	Phillip Institute of Technology	Department of Applied Economics and Industrial Relations	X		X			
	University of Melbourne	Department of Economics	X		X		X	
	Swinburne Institute of Technology	Department of Marketing and Organisational Behaviour		X		X		X
	Victoria College	Department of Management		X		X		
	Victorian University of Technology (Footscray)	Department of Applied Economics	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Victorian University of Technology (RMIT)	Department of Administrative Studies		X				
WA	Curtin University of Technology	School of Management	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Edith Cowan University	Department of Management and Law	X	X		X		
	University of Western Australia	Department of Industrial Relations	X				X	

TABLE 2

INSTITUTIONS OFFERING UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS AND RELATED SUBJECTS, 1990

STATE	INSTITUTION	COURSE NAME	PROGRAM NAME	PROGRAM STATUS	ORGANISATIONAL UNIT
NSW	CSU - Mitchell	Bachelor of Arts (Criminal Justice) BSocSci (App Soc Sci); BSocSci (Welfare St)	Industrial Relations	Minor	School of Business and Public Administration
		Bachelor of Arts (Communications)	Personnel Management and Industrial Relations	Major	School of Business and Public Administration
	CSU - Murray	Bachelor of Business (Management)	Industrial Relations	Major	Department of Business
	University of New South Wales	Bachelor of Arts Bachelor of Commerce Bachelor of Social Science	Industrial Relations	Major	School of Industrial Relations and Organisational Behaviour
		BCom/LLB, BACCB	Law and Industrial Relations	Major	School of Industrial Relations and Organisational Behavior
		BEc	Economics and	Major	School of Industrial Relations and Organisational Behaviour
	University of Newcastle	Bachelor of Arts Bachelor of Economics Bachelor of Commerce	Industrial Relations	Minor	Department of Economics

**INSTITUTIONS OFFERING UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
AND RELATED SUBJECTS, 1990 (continued)**

STATE	INSTITUTION	COURSE NAME	PROGRAM NAME	PROGRAM STATUS	ORGANISATIONAL UNIT
	University of Sydney	Bachelor of Arts Bachelor of Economics Bachelor of Economics (Social Science)	Industrial Relations	Major	Department of Industrial Relations
	University of Technology, Sydney	Bachelor of Business Bachelor of Business/ Computer Science Bachelor of Business/Law	Employment Relations	Major	School of Business and Public Administration
	University of Technology, Sydney - Kuring-gal	Bachelor of Business	Employee Relations	Minor	Department of Administrative, Social and Political Studies
	UWS - Noopean	Bachelor of Commerce	Personnel Management and Industrial Relations	Major	Department of Employment Relations
	University of Wollongong	Bachelor of Arts Bachelor of Commerce	Industrial Relations	Major	Department of Economics
QLD	Griffith University	Bachelor of Commerce	Industrial Relations	Major	Division of Commerce and Administration
		Bachelor of Commerce	Industrial Relations and Human Resource Management	Major	Division of Commerce and Administration
	Queensland University of Technology	Bachelor of Business (Management)	Industrial Relations	Minor	School of Management
	Queensland University of Technology (Brisbane CAE)	Associate Diploma Business	Industrial Relations	Major	School of Business

**INSTITUTIONS OFFERING UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
AND RELATED SUBJECTS, 1990 (continued)**

STATE	INSTITUTION	COURSE NAME	PROGRAM NAME	PROGRAM STATUS	ORGANISATIONAL UNIT
	UCCQ	Bachelor of Business	Personnel Management and Industrial Relations	Major	School of Business
	University of QLD	Bachelor of Arts Bachelor of Commerce Bachelor of Economics	Industrial Relations	Major	Departments of Commerce Economics, Government, Psychology, Sociology
SA	University of Adelaide (SACAE - city)	Associate Diploma Labour Studies Associate Diploma Liberal Studies	Labour Studies	Major	Department of Labour Studies
	University of South Australia (SAIT)	Associate Diploma of Industrial Relations	Industrial Relations	Major	Elton Mayo School of Management
		Bachelor of Business	Industrial Relations and Human Resources Management	Major	Elton Mayo School of Management
			Industrial Relations	Minor	Elton Mayo School Management
TAS	University of Tasmania (TSIT)	Bachelor of Business	Personnel Management and Industrial Relations	Major	School of Business
VIC	Monash University (Chisholm)	Bachelor of Arts Bachelor of Business	Labour Studies	Minor	Departments of Anthropology/Sociology, Applied Psychology, Politics
	Phillip Institute of Technology	Bachelor of Business	Personnel and Industrial Relations	Major	Department of Applied Economics and Industrial Relations

**INSTITUTIONS OFFERING UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
AND RELATED SUBJECTS, 1990 (continued)**

STATE	INSTITUTION	COURSE NAME	PROGRAM NAME	PROGRAM STATUS	ORGANISATIONAL UNIT
	University of Melbourne	Bachelor of Economics	Industrial Relations	Minor	Department of Economics
	Victorian University of Technology (Footscray)	Bachelor of Business	Industrial Relations	Minor	Department of Applied Economics
WA	Curtin University of Technology	Bachelor of Business	Industrial Advocacy	Major	School of Management
	Edith Cowan	Bachelor of Business	Human Resources Management and Industrial Relations	Major	Department of Management and Law.
	Edith Cowan	Bachelor of Business	Industrial Relations	Major	Department of Management and Law.
	University of Western Australia	Bachelor of Arts Bachelor of Economics Bachelor of Commerce	Industrial Relations	Major	Department of Industrial Relations

TABLE 3

INSTITUTIONS OFFERING COURSEWORK MASTERS IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS 1990

STATE	INSTITUTION	COURSE NAME	PROGRAM NAME	PROGRAM STATUS	ORGANISATIONAL UNIT
NSW	University of New South Wales	MCom	Economics and Industrial Relations	Major	School of Industrial Relations and Organisational Behaviour
			Industrial Relations	Major	School of Industrial Relations and Organisational Behaviour
			Industrial Relations and Organisational Behaviour	Major	School of Industrial Relations and Organisational Behaviour
	University of Sydney	MEc, MIR	Industrial Relations	Major	Department of Industrial Relations
	University of Technology, Sydney	MBA	Employment Relations	Major	School of Business and Public Administration
	University of Western Sydney - Nepean	MCom	Employee Relations	Major	Department of Employment Relations
	University of Wollongong	MA, MCOM	Industrial Relations	Major	Department of Economics
QLD	Griffith University	MAdmin	Industrial Relations	Major	Division of Commerce and Administration
			Industrial Relations and Human Resource Management	Major	Division of Commerce and Administration
SA	University of South Australia (SAIT)	MBA	Industrial Relations	Minor	Elton Mayo School of Management
VIC	Monash University	MBA, MBA (Int Bus)	Labour Relations	Major	Faculty of Economics, Commerce and Management
	University of Melbourne	MCom, MA	Industrial Relations	Major	Department of Economics

INSTITUTIONS OFFERING POSTGRADUATE DIPLOMAS IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS 1990 (continued)

STATE	INSTITUTION	COURSE NAME	PROGRAM NAME	PROGRAM STATUS	ORGANISATIONAL UNIT
SA	University of South Australia (SAIT)	Graduate Diploma Industrial Relations	Industrial Relations	Major	Elton Mayo School of Management
VIC	Monash University College Gippsland	Graduate Diploma Business	Labour/Management Relations	Major	School of Business
	University of Melbourne	Post Graduate Diploma Industrial Relations	Industrial Relations	Major	Department of Economics
	Victoria University of Technology (Footscray IT)	Graduate Diploma Business	Industrial Relations	Major	Department of Applied Economics
WA	Curtin University of Technology	Post Graduate Diploma Business	Industrial Relations	Minor	School of Management

TABLE 4

INSTITUTIONS OFFERING POSTGRADUATE DIPLOMAS IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS 1990

STATE	INSTITUTION	COURSE NAME	PROGRAM NAME	PROGRAM STATUS	ORGANISATIONAL UNIT
ACT	University of Canberra	Graduate Diploma Industrial Relations	Industrial Relations	Major	Faculty of Management
NSW	CSU - Murray	Graduate Diploma Business	Industrial Relations	Major	Department of Business
	University of Newcastle	Diploma Industrial Relations	Industrial Relations	Major	Department of Economics
	University of Sydney	Graduate Diploma Industrial Relations	Industrial Relations	Major	Department of Industrial Relations
		Diploma Labour Relations & Law	Industrial Relations & Law	Major	Department of Industrial Relations Faculty of Law
	University of Technology, Sydney	Graduate Diploma Employee Relations	Employment Relations	Major	School of Business and
			Industrial Law	Major	Public Administration
	University Western Sydney - Nepean	Graduate Diploma Employment Relations	Employee Relations	Major	Department of Employment Relations
QLD	Griffith University	Graduate Diploma Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations	Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations	Major	Division of Commerce and Administration
	OUT (Brisbane CAE)	Graduate Diploma Business	Industrial Relations	Major	School of Business

INSTITUTIONS OFFERING COURSEWORK MASTERS IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS 1990 (continued)

STATE	INSTITUTION	COURSE NAME	PROGRAM NAME	PROGRAM STATUS	ORGANISATIONAL UNIT
	Victoria University of Technology (Footscray IT)	MBus	Industrial Relations	Minor	Department of Applied Economics
WA	Curtin University of Technology	MBus, MBA (Ed Admin)	Industrial Relations	Minor	School of Management
	University of Western Australia	MIR, MA, MEc	Industrial Relations	Major	Department of Industrial Relations

9 Overview

David H. Plowman

INTRODUCTION

There has been a growing recognition that comparative studies in industrial relations can offer great insights and understanding. Such studies help identify common trends, divergent approaches, and the way in which industrialised societies apply their cultural and historical heritage to the creation of machinery designed to ameliorate the excesses of open industrial warfare. Most comparative studies to date have examined the operations of national industrial relations systems, industry sectors, or approaches to common problems such as industry restructuring and unemployment. This four-country study on teaching and research breaks new ground. ACIRRT is to be commended for initiating and sponsoring the project. The country studies offer plenty of scope for commentary. It would not be possible to do justice to all the themes capable of being analysed. This review has limited itself to seven of these: the differing research and teaching environments in each of the countries; the differing bases for comparisons; the relationship between teaching and research; resource focus and resources; the need for common definitions in comparative work; theoretical considerations; and the human resource management interface.

THE DIFFERING ENVIRONMENTS

In each of the countries the teaching and research of industrial relations is conditioned by public policy and the academic environment. The public policy and environment may be supportive and facilitative. They may also place barriers to the development of industrial relations teaching and research.

Peter Cappelli's paper suggests that the golden age for industrial relations teaching and research in the USA spanned the 1950s and 1960s. These were the decades in which academia adjusted to the collective bargaining relationships established through the *Wagner Act*, the *Taft-Hartley Act* and the expediencies of war. They were decades in which a number of major institutes or centres were established by state government funding. That golden era is long since gone. Established centres such as that at Berkeley are mere shadows of their former glory and often bereft of full-time industrial relations appointments. Industrial relations is not

seen by young academics as having promising career prospects. The academic survival of the discipline has had more to do with the positioning of senior industrial relations academics in their organisations and their political and administrative skills than with student, business and/or public demand. In the USA the 1990s represent a decade in which survival is the major priority. Two major journals devoted to industrial relations continue to be produced *Industrial Relations* (Berkeley) and *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* (Cornell). In addition there are a number of other journals in related fields of study.

The golden period in the United Kingdom was during the 1970s. A number of university departments were established during this period, new Chairs were created and the Industrial Relations Research Unit established at Warwick. This Unit became something of a Mecca for industrial relations academics in the English speaking world. There was a profusion of literature, much of it directed at workplace industrial relations. The UK golden era has also come to an end under the impact of Thatcherism. Though industrial relations teaching and research are still very much to the fore, public policy has been less than enthusiastic, if not hostile. Winchester refers to the current situation as one of operating in a cold climate. The Unit at Warwick was the subject of a major public review regarding its alleged pro-union bias. It has since been incorporated into the regular teaching administrative structure to afford it greater protection. There are two major academic journals, *The British Journal of Industrial Relations* (LSE) and *Industrial Relations Journal* (Blackwell).

If USA and UK industrial relations academics are bemoaning past golden ages, the New Zealand experience is one of still panning for gold. Industrial relations is taught, for the most part, out of business and management schools. In most cases this means that there is not the critical mass of industrial relations specialists at the various institutions which teach in the area. The major exception to this is the Industrial Relations Centre at Victoria University of Wellington. This Centre was established in 1971. Hince points to a large number of industrial relations subjects and programs which are taught in that country. The lack of critical mass is reflected, perhaps, in the absence of a similar research capacity. Citing Geare's bibliography of New Zealand industrial relations research for the period 1973 to 1988, Hince notes that only 19 separate authors are cited as having six or more entries. In 1976 the *New Zealand Journal of Industrial Relations* was launched. Originally located at Auckland University, the editorship and control is now vested with the Industrial Relations Centre. Hince considers industrial relations, as an area of teaching and research, to be on the defensive. 'The short-term future,' he writes, 'is not bright for the support of an independent, multi- or interdisciplinary approach to industrial relations'. The major concern is the inroads, or potential inroads, of human resource management into the area of industrial relations.

Jenkins et al. indicate that Australia is in something of a golden age, a view which received some qualification during the oral presentation. They consider that my own view expressed in the AIRAANZ Presidential Address of 1989 and in which I considered that the discipline had peaked in terms of appointments and other criteria, is unduly pessimistic. A number of post 1989 developments support a

more optimistic viewpoint. Since my Presidential address two key centres, one at Monash University and the other at Sydney University, have been established. Industrial relations academics are an integral part of three other key centres (at Curtin University, the Queensland University of Technology, and the Australian Graduate School of Management). These key centres augment the longer-standing Industrial Relations Research Centre at the University of New South Wales and the Labour Studies Centre at the University of Melbourne.

It is also possible to point to the creation of a number of new Chairs in industrial relations since my doomsday address - at UNSW, Macquarie, Melbourne, Monash and most recently at Griffith. At Melbourne there is the potential for a Department of Industrial Relations to be created. On the debit side, however, the previously strong Department at North Brisbane College of Advanced Education has been fragmented as a part of recent college mergers.

Jenkins et al. also point to the large range of courses in industrial relations which are taught. Further, by extending the 1970-1986 literature survey undertaken by Blain and myself, they suggest a vigorous research output in the last half decade. They point to six new journals in the area which have come into being since the original survey was undertaken.

This is not the place to enter into a debate regarding whether or not the teaching and research of industrial relations has entered a golden age in Australia. Clearly, relative to its state of being in earlier decades, it is better off. Whether or not this betterment constitutes a golden age is debatable and some tempering of optimism is advisable on a number of scores.

The first of these is that, despite the authors' claims to the contrary, there are only three Departments/Schools of Industrial Relations to be found in Australia. Collectively these account for only 22 full-time academic staff. In an age of institutional reorganisation in which the 'big is beautiful' syndrome is at work, there is no guarantee that these departments will remain separate entities. Further, the key centres are at the mercy of political whims. Changes in government priorities (or changes in government) could see the funding directed elsewhere.

On the research front there has been a continued growth in both the quality and quantity of industrial relations, and industrial relations related, research. It is well to point out, however, that nearly half of the references cited by Jenkins et al. are from researchers who do not belong to industrial relations departments and who do not teach industrial relations. A possible inference is that there is no (or reduced) need for industrial relations 'cohorts' for a continuance of industrial relations research. This is already the case for much of the industrial relations teaching which emanates from management and business schools.

I would suggest that what the profusion of industrial relations research demonstrates is the discipline's capacity to generate publication outlets, its capacity to attract academic interest, its eclectic theoretical base, its interdisciplinary nature, and its methodological shortcomings (particularly in the area of statistical methodology). It further demonstrates that industrial relations

policy research is not dependent upon the industrial relations specialisation, and that the 'allied' disciplines are in competition for scarce resources.

The large number of courses taught provides no assurance of long-term well-being. In the Presidential address cited, I made comparisons with home economics courses which were once popular and numerous. These have all but disappeared with changes in social values and educational philosophies. Three of the papers highlight the inroads which human resource management has made into the industrial relations domain. Though in many cases this represents little more than name changes, in other cases it does represent the displacement of industrial relations by a genuinely competing paradigm. The Byzantine industrial relations institutional arrangements in Australia may be expected to give a greater measure of security than in other countries. The New Zealand experience, in which compulsory arbitration has been displaced by the *Employment Contracts Act*, suggests that the institutional arrangements themselves are subject to changes. Similar legislative changes in Australia will reduce interest in industrial relations courses unless they are also capable of handling the non-institutional, non-conflictual and non-collective elements of employment relations.

While both the teaching and research of industrial relations in Australia are in a state of well-being relative to past decades, one would hope that the golden age still awaits us.

Bases of Comparison

There are major differences in the size and organisation of the industrial relations academic communities in each of the countries under review. The relative effects of similar changes impacting upon these communities will vary from country to country.

With the exception of Britain, where David Winchester considers there are between 300 and 400 industrial relations academics in universities and polytechnics, and where it would appear that there are five or six major industrial relations centres operating, the papers do not give a clear picture on this score.

Peter Cappelli refers to some 45 or so industrial relations institutes in the United States. Assessment on this score is made difficult, however, because some institutes do not have dedicated industrial relations faculty lines. In these cases no appointments are made directly to industrial relations. Rather, the institutes bring together scholars from a range of disciplines such as labour economics, industrial psychology and industrial law with an interest in industrial relations issues. In other institutes there are direct industrial relations faculty lines (i.e. direct appointments to industrial relations) which complement other disciplinary specialists. My understanding, from discussions with Cappelli, is that there may be about 2,000 academics with an interest in industrial relations. This figure would include non-industrial relations specialists who are attached to institutes. Cappelli considers that the number of industrial relations specialists at Sydney University (ten) would be considered a large cohort in the United States context.

In Australia, as already mentioned, there are only three autonomous academic teaching departments and one nascent department (Melbourne). There are three other conglomerate departments with an industrial relations interest or focus: the SACAE/Adelaide University (Department of Labour Studies), Phillip Institute (Department of Economics and Industrial Relations) and the University of Western Sydney, Nepean (Department of Employment Relations). There are research centres located at Melbourne, Monash, Sydney, New South Wales, with two other centres (Curtin and Queensland University of Technology) having strong industrial relations interests. The Association of Industrial Relations Academics of Australia and New Zealand (AIRAANZ) has about 90 Australian members, a figure which is probably higher than those who have appointments in universities to industrial relations positions. To these should be added a number of Trade Union Training Authority and Technical and Further Education lecturers.

Hince's paper would suggest that there is one Centre and two independent teaching units at New Zealand universities. In reply to questions he estimated that there were between 10 and 20 industrial relations specialists at universities. To this figure could be added industrial relations lecturers at polytechnics.

In addition to university and polytechnic/CAE teaching three of the papers mention the role of trade union and labour programs. Though not mentioned, this is also the case in Australia by way of the Australian Trade Union Training Authority (ATUTA).

Unlike the experiences recorded in the other countries, in Australia the development of trade union education has virtually by-passed academia. Some like Hince, Ford and Yerbury, were actively involved in teaching ATUTA courses in its formative period. The capacity of academia to forge links with ATUTA (and vice-versa), however, has been minimal.

Hince further makes two points which have direct counterparts in Australia, firstly the industrial relations teaching undertaken at colleges of Technical and Further Education; secondly, distance education. TAFE is an important provider of industrial relations courses at the non-degree level in all Australian states. A number of industrial relations degree programs are offered by distance learning (for example, Charles Sturt University and University College of Southern Queensland).

The Relationship Between Teaching and Research

Cappelli intimates that research is the well-spring of teaching, a view with which Jenkins et al. concur. Experience would indicate the strong links between research and teaching. However, two observations may be in order. Firstly, there can be an opposite stream of causation. In my own case, for example, my research into employer associations was motivated by the lack of teaching resources in the area. Those whose teaching spans the pre-text book days when

we had to rely upon books of readings will recall that Isaac and Ford's popular book of readings did not include any readings on employer associations - they claimed not to have been able to find any readings!

The second observation is that if teaching does, for the most part, follow research then the four papers would suggest that research, in turn, is directed by policy preoccupations and shifts. Public policy debates have been major boosts to the development of industrial relations as a field of studies. This is true of the USA institutes which, as noted earlier, followed the *Wagner* and *Taft-Hartley Acts*. It is also true of the British situation following the Donovan Commission. It is perhaps indicative of our curious approach to social engineering that the development of compulsory arbitration in the antipodean countries did not result in similar public research interest for over six decades. Though both the Hancock and Niland Inquiries were conducted by academics, there was a marked absence of commissioned research compared with comparable inquiries overseas (for example, the Donovan and Woodward Commissions).

A number of commentators, including Niland in his review of Cappelli's paper, have argued that this policy oriented research is a strength rather than a weakness. He suggested that we should not continue to be concerned with attempts at formulating grand theory. A particular strength of policy oriented research, in this view, is that it generates a relevance which is lacking in the sterile search for grand theories.

I remain iconoclastic on this point and continue to believe that the area's long term interest is best served by the development of a general theory or framework and integrating theory. Policy driven research can lead to a dangerous narrowing down of the scope of the area. Further, the discipline can become dependent upon policy driven research. As noted in the preceding section, if industrial relations problems are seen as less pressing and urgent, the field's reason for existence is less clear. Industrial relations would need a unique set of policy topics to give it legitimacy - something which is not particularly apposite given its multi-disciplinary nature.

In my view, although policy-driven research should form a part of industrial relations, this should not be to the exclusion of our continuing quest for integrating theories or the search for a general framework. The lack of general or integrating theory forces us to rely upon social theory from other disciplines. This results in a loss of identity as an independent discipline. Further, as Cappelli notes, other disciplines can do a much better job of utilising their own theories than industrial relations specialists can. Over time we could be written out by those disciplines whose theoretical base we rely upon. There continues to be the need for policy and theory driven research and for an appropriate balance between the two.

Research Focus and Resources

A difference in research focus is observable in the different countries. Perhaps this is, in great measure, the result of the public policy orientation in much research. In general, research in the United States and Britain has been much more workplace oriented. Recurrent themes have been collective bargaining developments and outcomes, wage diffusion, grievance handling and trade union organisation. The workplace focus has not been a primary feature of Australian research. Here national and industry level research has predominated. The New Zealand experience is closer to that of Australia.

In both Australia and New Zealand it is to be expected that there will be an interest in workplace research. In the case of New Zealand the recent *Employment Contracts Act* is likely to result in more decentralised bargaining arrangements and may necessitate greater consideration of workplace accommodative processes. In the Australian context there have been major developments in a similar direction. New South Wales legislation has sought to provide for enterprise bargaining. The publication of the *Australian Workplace Industrial Relations Survey (AWIRS)* and of the Business Council's report on enterprise-based bargaining (*Enterprise-Based Bargaining Units: A Better Way of Working*), have heightened interest in workplace industrial relations. The Department of Industrial Relations has commissioned a number of follow up studies to AWIRS.

Following a theme borne out in all papers, this new interest (and the finance flowing to it) is policy driven. As John Niland noted in his commentary, the second tier national wage decision of March 1987 was a major watershed in industrial relations and has had a major impact on the industrial relations focus, policy, and, as a result, research. I agree with this analysis but would suggest that the 25 per cent tariff reduction of 1974 may be the more appropriate watershed for analysing industrial relations changes in this country.

An important precondition for the growth in research and teaching in each country has been the public funding of research and the expansion of higher education. Industrial relations initially did well in the resources allocated in recent expansions. Both the USA and UK papers note a drying up of private sector and public sector research funds. Cappelli notes that in the past the Department of Labor, through the Bureau of Labor Management Relations, was the major source of funds for industrial relations research. That source of funds virtually dried up in the 1980s. Writing of the UK experience, Winchester notes that 'public policy pre-occupations and the organisation of funding of higher education have shaped the agenda, style, and orientation of academic industrial relations'. In the Australian context private sector funding has not been a major consideration. Public funding has been important both in determining the level of funding and projects to which funding is used.

Under the Hawke administrations, the centralised Department of Employment and Education (DEET) control of university research funds has reached Soviet proportions, and this has occurred in three ways - through key centre funding,

through Australian Research Council Grants funding and through allocations to Universities.

It is DEET which defines national research priorities, much to the dismay of the Humanities disciplines. It dictates to which areas key centres will be assigned, and where such centres will be located. Supposedly, key centres are in the nature of gold medals for proven achievement. In practice their location has been determined as much by political considerations as by considerations of merit. The major public source of individual funding, the ARC Grants, are subject to DEET guidelines and priorities. In addition, the discretionary research funding previously allocated to universities for internal allocation is also the subject of DEET purview and regulations.

To date industrial relations specialists have done well since their area has been designated a national priority area. A major cause for concern, however, is the potential effects of a change in government. It is unlikely that a non-Labor administration will direct funding to areas which the present government has sponsored.

Another important influence of DEET is that it replicates the public accountability wave identified in the UK and USA papers. Greater accountability has resulted in greater scrutiny of resource allocation within universities and, as John Niland points out, to EFTSUs (Effective Full-Time Student Units). Put in its most elementary way, industrial relations specialisations will survive on the basis of their ability to attract students. Industrial relations will increasingly compete with kindred disciplines (including human resource management) for those students.

Definitional Problems

Comparative studies are assisted by some common definition of the area under review. Definitions as to what constitutes industrial relations is not irrelevant to a consideration of the human resource management interface.

Definitions are not well canvassed in the papers. Cappelli makes the best attempt and indicates the way in which USA academics have delineated between industrial relations, labor relations and personnel. Industrial relations encompasses 'all employment issues in industry and includes all issues associated with employment'. Labor relations are considered to be union management relations. Personnel is seen to relate to employment issues in non-union operations.

Two observations may be made in this context. Firstly, having defined industrial relations very broadly, in practice it has been applied very narrowly. If this were not so there would not be the need for the other two definitions. Secondly, the definition of personnel has effectively come to define human resource management in the United States - employment in non-union operations. The relevance of such a definition to the Australian context, where often human

resource practices are super-imposed upon institutional arrangements, is questionable.

Jenkins et al. are the only other authors to refer to any definition. They accept the 'regulatory' approach adopted by Blain and Plowman in their literature review already referred to. As noted the definition is broad enough to include much of the substance what has come to be regarded as human resource management.

An examination of various definitions employed by industrial relations scholars suggests a broad and encompassing arena of interest. To Dunlop the subject was the 'complex of interrelations among managers, workers, and agencies of government' (Dunlop 1958, p. v). For the British author Alan Flanders, the 'subject [deals] with certain regulated or institutionalized relationships in industry' and 'the study of industrial relations may therefore be described as a study of the institutions of job regulation' (Flanders 1965, p. 10). Kochan et al. use the term industrial relations system to refer to the premises, values, laws, institutions and practices that govern employment relationships' (Kochan et al. 1986, p. 7). For Craig industrial relations connote 'a complex of private and public activities, operating in an environment which is concerned with the allocation of rewards to employees for their services, and the conditions under which services are rendered' (Craig 1975, p. 8). Walker considers the study of industrial relations to be the 'systematic study of various relations existing between managers and workers in industry, using the term industry widely to refer to any group of people engaged in the production of goods and services normally exchangeable on a market' (Walker 1964, p. 3). For Bain and Clegg the study of industrial relations consists of 'the study of all aspects of job regulation - the making and administering of the rules which regulate employment relationships, regardless of whether these are seen as being formal or informal, structured or unstructured' (Bain and Clegg (1974, p. 95) For Jones, industrial relations 'is the relationship between people (both as individuals and members of a group) and organisations in the work environment. It includes the relationship between and among governments and their agents, employees, trade unions, managers, employers and employer associations and the legislative, regulatory, social and economic environment in which the relationships occur' (Jones 1988, p. ix). Laffer defines the subject as the 'bargaining explicit and implicit between and among employers and employees' (Laffer 1974, p. 72), and Heneman considers that 'industrial relations is concerned with employment relationships in an industrial economy ... Its central characteristic or focus is employment in all its aspects (micro and macro, individual and group), labor marketing, labor relations, personnel management and the like' (Heneman 1969, p. 4). From a Marxist perspective Hyman argues that the study of industrial relations is 'the study of the processes of control over work relations; and among these processes, those involving collective worker organisation and action are of particular concern' (Hyman, 1975, p. 12).

It is evident that these are broad brush definitions. It is also evident from some of the papers that there has been a limiting application of these or other definitions. Cappelli suggests that in the USA this narrowing has not occurred by default or accident, nor by virtue of the enormosity of the canvass upon which industrial

relations specialists were expected to paint. Rather, in that context, it has occurred because of intolerance of models other than the union model, thus resulting in a selective narrowing of the paradigm. The paradigm has been essentially reduced to a number of discrete topics such as collective bargaining, grievance handling, labor history, labour economics and manpower policy.

One of the paper givers argued in discussion that the vagueness and vastness of the definitions necessarily lead to some reduction of the scope through topics. Two points may be made in this regard.

Firstly it is not intuitively obvious why the subject has to be reduced. One does not define economics to consist of the study of scarcity and then selectively remove areas of scarcity which will not be studied. Areas may not be studied because of limited resources or lack of interest, but they are not simply set adrift.

Secondly, objection may be taken at the method of reduction. The vastness of the subject as defined might well lead to areas not being researched (and included in teaching). This approach leaves open the possibility of such inclusion when, through one reason or another, resources or interest make such research possible or opportune.

It is possible that the area has been made limiting in an attempt to maintain the 'purity' of the pluralist model. This presupposes that the other areas are not capable of a pluralist approach. It is interesting to speculate how the Marxist or radical approach could be maintained in such a schema.

It may be argued that the narrowing of the subject to a number of topics forms the basis of the survival problem and, in part, the anxiety with human resource management. If the paradigm is essentially reduced to a set number of topics, then shifts in the public policy relevance of those topics will have an abnormal bearing on the perceived relevance of the discipline in itself. Cappelli quotes Feuille to the effect that as many industrial relations problems have become less urgent, the field's reason for existence has become less clear.

Further, the selective narrowing has made the discipline ill-placed to counter the challenges of alternate paradigms such as the human resource paradigm. This is paradoxical given that manpower policy has been an established part of the industrial relations repertoire in the USA. Manpower policy has been concerned with regulating labour demand and supply at the macro level. In its basic form human resource management is concerned with similar concerns at the micro level. By vacating this avenue, the industrial relations specialists left a vacuum which has been filled by competing paradigms. Similarly, by concentrating solely on collective relations, industrial relations academics have allowed behavioural scientists to lay greater claims to areas which industrial relations could regard as part of its terrain.

The United States experience is not exceptional. It could be argued that in all countries reviewed industrial relations research and teaching have essentially focussed on collective relations, conflictual activities, and accommodative or

institutional arrangements. This has been as true of the voluntaristic system in the United Kingdom as of the highly regulated Australian system. The exclusion of other aspects of the employment relations creates the potential for other disciplines and competing paradigms to displace our own. A different strategy would suggest capturing the field and imbuing it with our own paradigm, but more of that later.

THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

It has already been asserted that, to the extent that industrial relations research and teaching rely upon social theories derived from other disciplines, its identity and independence as a discipline is reduced. Also noted is Cappelli's observation that social scientists in the home disciplines can be expected to apply their theories better than industrial relations users. This could result in a loss of policy directed research and in the other disciplines having a low esteem for industrial relations researchers.

The papers do suggest that in the USA (and perhaps in the UK) industrial relations is giving way to other disciplines purporting to be able to explain employment relations. In Australia (and probably New Zealand) industrial relations scholars are competing to explain employment relations. A distinctive advantage for industrial relations scholars in these countries is the complex institutional arrangements which require a degree of specialisation. Industrial relations scholars must be careful, however, that they do not become merely the adders of the institutional and legal elements to economic or other social theories.

Another consideration is the role of inductive and deductive reasoning in the study of industrial relations. Cappelli notes that theories and explanations generated inductively and focussed at the organisational level have given way to deductive explanations generated from the social sciences and focussed on individual behaviour.

The methods and techniques of social science research are heavily influenced by what is called the scientific method. The scientific method is an approach which utilises inductive thinking processes and which reduces the role of deductive thinking. Deductive thinking starts from a particular generalised premise and applies this to particular situations. Inductive thinking attempts to establish general laws - premises - on the basis of testable observations. Its begins, not with a premise, but rather with observation.

In the physical sciences this approach has given birth to the experimental method, a system of repeated experimentation under controlled conditions to establish general laws relating to physical properties. It is this approach which the scientific method seeks to replicate. This has resulted in a major preoccupation with developing and applying statistical techniques, notwithstanding that two of the important elements of the pure science research are absent, namely the ability to control the environment and the ability to measure certain variables.

The capacity to test many of the fundamental issues in employment relations is not amenable to the scientific method. Take, for example, the testing of the relationship between union power and the incidence of strikes. In such a test a major problem is finding a measure for union power. This has been attempted by using proxies (for example union membership and the rate of growth of unions). This is not a particularly compelling measure and observation suggests that many small unions in critical areas exercise a deal more power than many large unions in areas of relative unimportance. Another difficulty for this exercise is controlling for the two variables of union power and strikes. In the real world context a number of other variables intrude - government policy, legislation, economic conditions, union leadership and so on. The usual way of handling these variables (that is, factors which can have changing characteristics or measures) is to assume that they are constant. Thus, the laboratory control conditions are approximated by contrivance.

The application of the scientific method to the social sciences necessitates the use of deductive reasoning. This is because the social scientist does not have the ability to control the complex and multiple relationships which exist in real life. The controls are usually instituted by a set of simplifying set of assumptions. For example, in trying to explain the workings of the complex economic system, economists often start off by assuming perfect competition. This assumption reduces the number of variables which can influence outcomes, and also determines the nature of interaction. Thus, the assumption precludes trade union activities or government intervention. It also ensures that buyers have perfect knowledge and therefore will be able to buy at competitive prices. Economists also use the *ceteris paribus* device to ensure that only select variables under consideration are allowed to alter for the purposes of analysis. Under such conditions economists are able to show the primacy of market forces. This primacy, however, has something of the flat earth ring to it. It is not the product of the scientific method, but rather of the assumptions chosen to control scientific enquiry.

The relevance of the foregoing is to indicate the potential methodological disadvantage of traditional industrial relations research. The relevance of the scientific method to their study of collective activity is dubious and largely shunned. The study of individual behaviour has greater applicability to the scientific method. Such studies can therefore take on greater academic pretensions irrespective of the relevance or usefulness of outcomes.

The Human Resource Management Interface

All papers express some concern with the inroads which human resource management is making, or has made, into traditional industrial relations. This inroad has been starkest in the USA where union-management relations have diminished. Winchester suggests that in the UK the initial threat of human resource management has subsided, and some *modus vivendi* has been worked out. The greatest potential of human resource management to displace industrial relations is in New Zealand. There, Hince points out, most industrial relations is

taught in business or management schools and there 'human resource management is the dominant directional thrust'. He adds, 'because of the dominant historic link/base of industrial relations within management departments in New Zealand the discipline is in an even weaker position to challenge such thrusts'. Australia enjoys the same time lag in terms of teaching trends as New Zealand. It does have, however, a more substantial industrial relations base with which to resist an human resource management thrust. On the basis of the overseas experience, what should be the Australian approach to human resource management?

At the outset it is again worth reminding ourselves of definitional problems. If human resource management is defined to be a system of promoting unitarist philosophy and managerialist control of employees then there are going to be insuperable problems for any accommodation between human resource management and orthodox industrial relations. Human resource management, however, has a variety of meanings. As Cappelli notes that 'the discussion about industrial relations and human resource courses is often a discussion about changes in form rather than substance ... many programs and courses have dropped the words "industrial relations" and replaced them with "human resources" yet it is not clear whether the actual material in them has changed'. Clearly Cappelli does not think that there is an intractable opposition between human resource management and industrial relations. Indeed, he sees the survival of industrial relations as dependent upon some accommodating between the two, upon human resource management elements becoming industrial relations topics. 'Whether IR in the US has a bright future', he writes, 'depends largely on whether it can capture some of the interest and resources associated with the development of the growing human resource field'. Such a strategy, it might be noted, would require a return to a broader definition of industrial relations than that of labor-management relations.

Winchester notes that in the UK the last decade has been characterised by a period of cold climate in which research and teaching have been fragmented into two broad tendencies: one rooted in an explicitly managerialist conception of 'human resource management; and the other located in different experience of a more radical conception of the 'political economy of industrial relations'. Yet Winchester himself acknowledges that the term 'human resource management' has been associated with 'a bewildering variety of meanings in academic and personnel journals'. He distinguishes between hard and soft human resource management, and between restricted and extended human resource management. He supports Guest's view that 'if HRM is rooted firmly in unitarist and individualistic values and the pursuit of strategic integration, employee commitment, flexibility and quality as its central policy goals, it offers a fairly direct challenge to the pluralist values of industrial relations and personnel managers'. This is, however, only one interpretation from a 'bewildering variety of meanings'.

The New Zealand contingent was the most opposed to any accommodation with human resource management. In view of the potential of management schools to transform industrial relations into some other paradigm this is not surprising. Again, however, there is the need to make clear precisely which brand of HRM is

being opposed. The evidence would suggest that some of what could come under the mantle of human resource management has been accommodated with relatively little angst. Hince notes that in New Zealand 'diversity, albeit within some elements of commonality, is the norm'. He further notes that 'the range of core units offered at Massey and the substance of course content are similar, although not identical, to the position at each of the major providers'. One of the core units offered at Massey is industrial relations management and administration. The subject description suggests that the subject could equally have been titled Personnel Management or Human Resource Management. HRM subjects are taught by name at the other main providers - Otago, Victoria and Auckland, as well as at Canterbury, and Lincoln. Hince's apprehensions are understandable given that, therefore, only two non-management sources of industrial relations teaching in New Zealand (the Industrial Relations Centre at Victoria and the Centre for Labour and Trade Union Studies at Waikato).

In Australia we have something of an advantage in terms of the time lag before academic and managerial fashions are assimilated. This has meant that the Northern European experience is one which we have some time to prepare for and devise strategies. While there is much talk of human resource management in Australian companies, and not a little bit of name changing of personnel and industrial relations departments, to date this has not signified any commitment to a particular philosophy or approach. The industrial relations community has some capacity to steer human resource management away from its unitarist propensities and to get it to take account of competing interests and values. Based on the overseas experience and the capacity for industrial relations academics to influence which of 'the bewildering varieties' comes to dominate the area, three strategies may be followed: a) ignoring the problem in the hope that it will not pose too great a threat; b) taking the offensive and resisting the introduction of human resource management courses; c) attempting to capture the area.

The first approach, the ostrich approach, has little to commend it. Whether we like it or not there will be pressure on academic institutions to offer courses in the area. Though our peculiar institutional arrangements may afford greater protection for industrial relations than in some other countries, the drop in the proportion of the workforce unionised, and the relatively greater rate of growth of non-union sectors, will mean that industrial relations will have to prove its relevance to all sectors if it is not to be replaced or complemented by a competing approach to explaining employment relations.

The second approach, that of taking the offensive, presupposes that industrial relations academics have both the power to oppose the development of human resource management and/or the academic moral ground for doing so. On neither of these scores would a counter offensive appear successful, particularly since so much industrial relations teaching is done through business and management schools/departments.

The third approach, that of capturing the field, is the one I find most attractive. The teaching of human resource management is in such an elementary stage in Australia that it is possible for many groups - organisational behaviour, industrial

psychology, industrial relations - to claim the field. I believe this to be the best way of protecting ourselves from the HRM thrust, of broadening the survival scope of industrial relations, of ensuring that HRM does not take a managerialist approach, and of instilling a critical conceptual base in the teaching of the subject. I believe this makes sense not merely as an organisational survival strategy, but also because it will help provide a necessary bridge between the macro concerns, which have been the dominant preoccupation of industrial relations specialists, with the micro concerns which will increasingly become an area of research and teaching interest.

Subsuming the area also takes account of the fact that in the Australian context the divide between the IR and HRM is not the union non-union boundary. In many Australian plants HRM techniques are superimposed upon the institutional and legal obligations of firms. Employment relations, in other words, requires attention to both the contractual and non-contractual employment conditions.

An intriguing phenomenon in Australia has been the schizophrenic division of functions between personnel management and industrial relations. It could be argued that division has its origins in the external nature of industrial relations for most companies. Industrial relations has had to do with award matters, dealing with unions, negotiations and arbitral proceedings. Little of that was conducted at the plant. Most awards were multi-employer awards, and most bargaining was delegated to employer associations. Awards were imposed upon respondent employers almost as externalities. They had little to do with the individual circumstances of particular plants, but rather with the general power relationships which operated within the industry. Personnel management had to do with the internalising of awards, with the administration of salary and other conditions arising out of awards, and with recruiting, promotion, transfer and discharge.

The evidence suggests that the above dichotomy is disappearing. Today fifty-five per cent of federal awards are single employer awards. There is, therefore, a greater capacity to make award conditions relevant to the firm, and to internalise the previous external industrial relations activities. There is a need for teaching and research to take account of this, and other, changing patterns of employment relations. That does not have to be done under the mantle of human resource management, but it would appear that strategically there is much to recommend such an approach.

By attempting to subsume the area of human resource management we would have the capacity to tar it with an industrial relations brush. This, I take to be the essence of Cappelli's survival strategy for the teaching and research of industrial relations in the USA. We should be able to achieve this in Australia before industrial relations being placed on the list of endangered subjects.

The evidence also suggests that there has been a high degree of implicit integration of human resource management within industrial relations teaching and research. One discussant, a labour historian by training, claimed that we have been teaching human resource management in our courses for years. It is also noticeable that management strategy and the management of industrial relations is

becoming more common in industrial relations courses. This has led a number of industrial relations researchers to publish in management journals and in human resource management journals (for example, *Asia Pacific HRM*). Two recent books of readings, one in the area of personnel management, the other in the area of organisational behaviour, have industrial relations scholars as the major contributors. There has been a noticeable sea change in the thesis topics of students. A decade ago these were concerned mainly with union related issues. Today a significant proportion are concerned with management issues. The approach advocated here is to make the links (and our authority in the area) more explicit.

CONCLUSION

This paper has sought to highlight the differences which exist in the four countries under review in terms of the context within which industrial relations academics operate, their basis of organisation, their resources and public support. It has also reviewed the relationships between research and teaching. The paper has argued the need for agreed definitions for comparative studies and suggests that the broad way in which industrial relations is generally defined has not been mirrored in the way it is taught or researched. It is suggested that the narrowing of industrial relations to a set number of topics makes the discipline vulnerable to sorties by other disciplines. The paper highlights the need for the continued search for grand theory and a sound methodological research base. Finally, the paper confronts the challenge of human resource management. It suggests that in the Australian context industrial relations scholars are well placed to subsume human resource management as a subset of their own broad area of interest and research.

REFERENCES

- Bain, G. S. and Clegg, H. A. (1974) 'A strategy for industrial relations research in Great Britain', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 12(1).
- Craig, A. W. T. (1975) 'A framework for the analysis of industrial relations systems' in B. Barret, E. Rhodes and J. Beishon (eds) *Industrial Relations and the Wider Society*, Open University and Collier Macmillan, London.
- Dunlop, J. T. (1958) *Industrial Relations Systems*, Holt, New York.
- Flanders, A. (1965) *Industrial Relations - What is Wrong with the System? An Essay on its Theory and Future*, Faber, London.
- Heneman, H. G. (1969) 'Towards a general conceptual system of industrial relations: How do we get there?', in G. G. Somers (ed) *Essays in Industrial Relations Theory*, Iowa State University Press.
- Hyman, R. (1975) *Industrial Relations: A Marxist Introduction*, Macmillan, London.
- Jones, G. P. *A Guide to Sources on Information on Australian Industrial Relations*, Pergamon, Sydney.
- Kochan, T., Katz, H. and McKersie, R. (1986) *The Transformation of American Industrial Relations*, Basic Books, New York.
- Laffer, K. (1974) 'Is industrial relations an academic discipline?' *The Journal of Industrial Relations*, 16(1),
- Walker, K. F. (1964) *Research Needs in Industrial Relations*, Cheshire, Melbourne.

ACIRRT

The Australian Centre for Industrial Relations Research and Teaching (ACIRRT) at the University of Sydney was established as a Key Centre of Teaching and Research in 1989 through a grant from the Commonwealth Department of Employment, Education and Training. The Centre is closely linked with the University's Department of Industrial Relations, which has a long and distinguished history of teaching and research in this area.

ACIRRT's main brief is to improve the quality of industrial relations teaching and research in Australia. This goal is being pursued through a range of activities including seminars and research projects conducted by members of ACIRRT and scholars from other institutions, secondments of staff, and publications.