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Gregor Murray

The H.D. Woods lecture embodies two fine traditions: one to do with the intellectual legacy of Bus Woods; the other with an opportunity to think about the evolution of work and employment and the way that we study it.

As regards the first tradition, the H.D. Woods lecture offers a splendid opportunity to pay tribute to the legacy of Bus Woods who, for those who do not know of him, was one of the pioneers of the study of industrial relations in Canada. He represents the inspiring example of a progressive public intellectual, concerned by the big analytical questions, yet able to bring relief to the practical problems of working people and their communities. Not only was he an ardent advocate of basic rights for workers, but his pioneering historical work on labour policy demonstrated a firm grasp of the importance of institutions and offered original insight into the construction of a regulatory regime for labour in Canada that ensured a degree of stability and economic prosperity. For a magnificent achievement, you need merely consult one of the editions of his landmark book Labour Policy in Canada (Woods 1973). Just as impressive are the two decades of work around the McGill Industrial Relations Centre. Its conferences under his intellectual leadership from the late 1940s through to the 1970s provide multiple insights into our current regime of work and employment. Indeed, in an era of numerization, it would seem important for our field of study to rescue these documents from their current obscurity.

It is a special honour for me because of my association at my first university job in Canada with Professors Shirley Goldenberg and Frances Bairstow. They provide a direct link to Bus Woods because they worked so closely with him in the Department of Economics at McGill University, then at the McGill IR Centre, of which Frances Bairstow was later director, and the Faculty of Management. It is all to his credit that he ensured the entry of the first two women into the field of IR in Canada. He did so in opposition to some of his male colleagues who seized on their atypical - for men at least - career paths because they were mothers before they were academics. My understanding of the real story is as follows. When McGill University wanted Woods to move from the Economics Department to the new Faculty of Management, he said that he would not go to the new faculty without Bairstow and Goldenberg, who

* It is important to emphasize that this contribution is part of our project “Rethinking Institutions for Work and Employment in a Global Era”, which is an initiative of the Inter-University Research Centre on Globalization and Work (CRIMT – Université de Montréal, Université Laval, HEC Montréal, www.crimt.org) in the context of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada’s programme of major collaborative research initiatives.
then had the lowly status of lecturers despite their academic qualifications. Moreover, he insisted that they could not go unless their status was regularized to that of assistant professors. In the face of his persistence, the University yielded and so we had the first two women in regular academic industrial relations positions posts in Canada. Of course, they both went on to pursue distinguished university careers.

The second fine tradition embodied in the Woods lecture is that of a free lunch with a psychological cost: that of a postprandial captive audience meeting in which, by the norms of etiquette and the exigencies of digestion, CIRA members and their guests are subjected to the rants and ravings of one of their colleagues and are obliged to pretend to listen.

To prepare for this talk, and like others before me, I have examined the recent Woods Lecture contributions. Almost without exception, they put forward their own particular take on the field of industrial relations. It is part rite, part ritual, underlay by a weird academic self-indulgence and existential angst in which it's somehow reassuring to know that we are all very miserable and that our field of study is going to hell in a hand basket. There's nonetheless still some hope for, somewhat miraculously, the speaker has been temporarily granted shaman powers to reveal the future to the captive but generally “tranced”, as in a state of trance, assembly. I see absolutely no reason to deviate from this fine tradition.

Questions about work and employment remain at the very heart of social debates in industrialized and post-industrialized societies. Yet there are quite distinct national traditions in industrial relations research which reflect the way that the field of study has been constituted: its degree of institutionalization, the way in which it is structured in the scientific division of labour, the research questions brought forward, and the theoretical approaches favoured.

Nowhere perhaps is the contrast in research traditions greater than between Europe and North America. In Europe, "industrial relations" is not recognized as a distinct field of study. There is little if any institutionalization; indeed, the term "industrial relations" has only recently come into usage. North America is very much at the other end of the spectrum. Industrial relations is recognized as a distinct field of study. Its institutionalization came very early, though many now believe that it is under threat.

The field of industrial relations emerged as a response to a particular set of circumstances in a few selected countries. The historical assumptions on which it was built now appear increasingly shaky. That has translated into waning influence and some degree of existential angst. This lecture seeks to place this process in context, with a particular focus on the state of Canadian industrial relations, and analyze potential sources of renewal for the study of work and employment. Hence, you will note the suggestively optimistic but still interrogative title: Like a Phoenix? Sources of Renewal in the Organized Study of Work and Employment. The presentation is divided into two parts. First, in focusing on comparative trajectories, path dependencies and the state of the art, we can ask where have we come from and where are we now? Second, a discussion of the challenges and implications for the transdisciplinary study of work gives an opportunity to ask where are we going and
where should we be going?

I. Comparative Trajectories, Path Dependencies and the State of the Art

To an international academic industrial relations audience, Canada (but especially Quebec, with due deference to Toronto and a few other locations) presents an interpretative dilemma.

There are several large industrial relations (IR) schools or departments, with up 1000 students, in university structures in which, if not a discipline like economics or political science, industrial relations is taught as in a professional school (like Social Work) as a fully autonomous social science discipline. There follows a couple (well perhaps one) strong IR centre. Finally, there are several very strong human resource management (HRM) groups with strong industrial relations offerings in business schools.

Is this topography simply a reflection of Canada's and Québec's higher rate of unionization? Or, are we, as Professor Leo Troy would have us believe - generally on his annual archaeological expeditions to the Canadian Industrial Relations Association meetings - a case of arrested if not retarded development and that, sooner or later, but most likely sooner, we will go the way of the doe-doe bird and/or back to the future as in the case of our neighbours to the south of the 49th parallel. Or, is this topography, as I will argue here, a case of a particular path dependency, still be played out and which offers much potential for comparative advantage and disciplinary leverage in the emergence of what are likely to be very different fields of study over the coming decades?

Let's look at the historical development or the construction of work and employment as an object of scientific enquiry) and how this has translated into the current way that we structure industrial relations as a field of study in Canada. Just in case anyone has forgotten or does not have it with them, I refer you to the historical piece that Anthony Giles and I did many year ago on the development of industrial relations theory in Canada (see Giles and Murray 1988). The core insight in this article is not what it tells us about the future but rather the effort to make the linkages between social trends, their historical continuities and discontinuities, and their theoretical underpinnings, and the construction of a field of study in Canada and it is such an approach can provide moorings in the current context.

Here is the potted four-step version of Canadian the history of Canadian industrial relations and the evolution of ideas that have ensued.

Step 1. The Labour Problem. The proliferation of social problems and restiveness associated with the emergence of an urban labour market challenged prevailing classical liberal and conservative theories of natural authority at work and gave rise to the labour question or “problem”, as it was then often referred to. (Indeed, I was delighted to encounter a department at Tokyo University in the early 1990s still known as the “Department of Labor Problems”.) This new public discourse gave rise to a tradition of public policy advocacy around poverty and social issues in Canada,
just as it did with Mayhew and the Webbs in the UK and Commons in the US. Much of this tradition is relevant today.

**Step 2. From the Repression to the Tolerance of Unions.** The move from the outright repression of unions to their tolerance and the development of the early state policies of third-party intervention to accommodate some forms of collective bargaining spawned the *Labour Gazette*. Increasingly, from the late 19th century to the early 1930s, academics and intellectuals were grappling with labour's response to the rise of large-scale industry and to the techniques and processes of production which were thereby set in train. This was also of great interest to the major capitalists, evidence the founding grants by Rockerfeller to study these issues including, at the behest of McKenzie-King, to found an industrial relations centre at Queen’s University.

**Step 3. The Emergence of Industrial Relations as a Field of Study.** By the time of the full affirmation of a right to unionize, universities were expanding and this led to the creation of a first generation of so-called industrial relations scholars, notably Donald Cameron, Gérard Dion, H.D. Woods and Stuart Jaimeson, to name but a few. These academic pioneers created the first departments and sub-groups of industrial relations and, in the case of Abbé Dion at Laval University, founded the first journal “Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations”.

Of course, this sudden blossoming of industrial relations as a field of study took place in a particular context of wartime and post-war militancy and, in many ways, was meant to mark the maturity of a new industrial system in which the collective agreement was described as the “peace treaty” between management and labour.

The theoretical and methodological focus for this new field of study was decidedly empirical and focused on problem-solving. As it grew in sophistication, there were half-hearted attempts to import functionalist Parsonian explanations, as popularized by Dunlop. Quaintly, some programs even continue to encourage their students to use these heuristics.

There are two interpretations of this period. It is quite right to think, as the left critique contends, that these efforts led to the stabilization of labour regimes in order to ensure capitalist accumulation (read economic growth and prosperity) but did so with a very circumscribed and gendered view of the aspirations of workers in the new productive order. The pluralist interpretation of a clear expansion of worker liberty, however circumscribed, into a new realm of citizenship, à la Marshall, is also correct. Evidence the nostalgia exhibited by many union leaders and industrial relations academics when looking back to this period.

**Step 4. Industrial Relations’ Black Triangle.** Through the 1960s and 1970s, this field of study continued to expand with the growing regime complexity as successive orders of public service, construction, essential services, human rights, were added to the agenda. So too were burgeoning expectations about the management of the workforce as the increasing burden of knowledge management and the need to optimize outcomes in the context of internationalizing markets sparked new
emphasis, first, on personnel management and, then, on human resources management.

There arose then a differentiated academic division of labour between some schools focused exclusively on collective labour relations and others that sought to integrate the teaching of both industrial relations and human resources into a single field.

The emphasis on collective labour relations was referred to by one French observer (Favereau 1996) as the black triangle of industrial relations: unions, strikes and collective bargaining. It was black because it was a black box for which scientific endeavour remained relatively impenetrable to all but the institutional economist; it was a triangle inasmuch as all of these phenomena were interrelated and came, in turn, to constitute the external boundaries of the field as industrial relations specialists rarely ventured beyond them. This narrow focus was obviously problematical in the case of a workforce where increasingly important segments were not unionized and in organizations where many aspects of workforce development were little affected by collective bargaining.

Two consequences flowed from this state of affairs. First, there has been a relative decline in the teaching of industrial relations. For example, CIRA has been characterized by a basic stability but certainly not any expansion. Second, there has been growth of HRM in separate administrative studies units. This growth is far from spectacular and often runs up against its peripheral status within many management programs (an option rather than a requirement) as well as the analytical limits inherent to so many of the “soft” normative management sciences.

This leads to the current configuration of the study of work and employment in Canada into five different models.

Model A. There are a few “Model A” schools characterized by basic autonomy as a field of study, relative to other disciplinary units. This is the case of Laval, Montreal, Hull and, to a lesser degree, Toronto. They are akin to Cornell or Rutgers in the U.S. This model is the exception rather than the rule and the bulwark in Quebec has been characterized by the unusual and sometimes contested integration of labour-management relations, HRM and public labour policies under what is seen as sometimes presented as a single disciplinary umbrella called industrial relations.

Model B. Another group of “Model B” establishments (and I have not done the census) is characterized by basic functional autonomy. There is clearly a specific identification of the field of study, within some larger unit – be it a graduate school, a business school, etc. While the merger of the Queen's IR School into its School of Policy Studies no doubt opens up other opportunities, it certainly represents a further weakening of this “Model B” tradition.

Model C. Another group of “Model C” establishments is made up of functional dependency. In this case, IR becomes a sub-specialization within a larger specialist field and often translates into a few IR courses within an HR or OB specialization. This is the lot of many business schools, especially in locations where the labour
movement is alive and kicking.

**Model D.** The fourth model is one of functional integration in which the name industrial relations disappears altogether and is taught underground using false names and other codes. “Model D” scholars have to go underground. (This is somewhat akin to the way that the Highland Scots used to toast Bonnie Prince Charlie in Scotland, to whom the English kind forbid any reference: “Will you drink to the King, sir?”, “Aye, I can the one you mean sir!”) Some scholars continue to inhabit the paradigms of industrial relations while others are indeed functionally integrated into other areas.

**Model E.** A final model – “Model E” - is the emergent alternative model in which labour studies programs, such as at McMaster, York and Simon Fraser, emerge out of the social sciences and they are often characterized by a normative proximity to labour’s objectives and an effort to sculpt some specific identity out of the competing claims of sociology and political science departments for positions and influence within the university.

As a rule, Quebec has the largest number of Model A units characterized by total autonomy. With one partial exception (Toronto), English Canada has seen the virtual disappearance of this model and, with a couple of exceptions (McMaster), that of functional autonomy. In their place, as in the U.S., we see the Model C functional dependency and Model D complete functional integration as well as the development of the Model E labour studies programs, which we do not see in Quebec, probably because of the vitality of Model A. Some IR scholars are fighting a rearguard action for Model B functional autonomy or Model C functional dependency. Increasingly, many others just do not really care.

In other words, with the exception of Quebec, the older autonomous model has just about disappeared in Canada (and in the US). When we published a collective volume on the state of industrial relations in North America and France (Murray, Morin and DaCosta, 1996), this led Michael Piore (1996), an always prescient observer, to ruminate, as one would do at a funeral, about the industrial relations heritage. His advice, by the way, was twofold: first, keep the values, namely the normative bias towards social justice; second, cultivate the strong empirical bias, which provides a sound methodological grounding for understanding social change.

So, do we have an historic opportunity at the annual general meeting to fold up the tent, disband CIRA and follow our natural proclivities to be a sub-field of the administrative sciences? Or, since industrial relations does not exist as a distinct field of study in most countries and the study of work and employment still gets done and, in many ways is expanding rapidly, does any of this really matter?

In the second part of this essay, I will argue that we need to use our historical comparative advantage of having constituted these traditions in order to leverage our understanding in the emergence of what is likely to be quite a different field of study.
II. Like a Phoenix? The Challenge of Constructing a Transdisciplinary Study of Work and Employment

What we currently see is an increasing "disconnect" between the prevailing institutional framework for work and employment, which in many ways harkens back to a previous industrial age, and current changes sweeping the world of work.

This is akin to the well rehearsed arguments that we expect any of our PhD students to be able to reproduce on a comprehensive exam. Like a sonnet from Shakespeare or a Greek poem, there are currently multiple factors of change affecting traditional collective industrial relations: new information and communications technologies; a revolution in the management of production and work organization; the increasing internationalization of the production of goods and services; and new social and professional identities in and beyond the workplace.

Moreover, increasingly, in at least some of the leading edge workplaces, we can now identify key features of a so-called "high-performance" workplace (HPW): increased flexibility, greater application of skills and knowledge; more self-regulation, more learning; increased commitment but also increased insecurity. Such workplaces are certainly more productive, yet these principles often seem difficult to operationalize and their diffusion remains limited. (There’s also debate about whether to espouse HPW workplaces as a paradigmatic and normative objective but I think that that’s beside the point for all but the most arcane of debates because it’s the degree of change that breaks with the past.)

This highlights three core research problems:

First, workplaces operate on the basis of certain shared norms or institutionalized understandings about who does what and why and under what circumstances? These understandings generally suppose a certain balance between efficiency and equity outcomes for all concerned and this balance can be achieved in particular workplace or in society as a whole.

This also raises the question of the link between the larger institutional framework and the new productive models. In an increasingly fractured labour market, there is much evidence of the inability to find the appropriate mesh between public policy, the enhancement and delivery of skills to workers and firms, and the economic well-being of citizens. There then arises the question as to whether and how particular institutional frameworks, both internal to workplaces and with regard to particular industries, business systems and national contexts, can improve the outcomes for both organizations and workers? (e.g. Belgium v. Canada, Mexico v. Philippines)

I think that it is safe to say that such understandings have yet to emerge for the new workplace and that leads to the identification of a first core research theme: understanding institutions for work in the new production models. There’s an immediate empirical challenge: what’s going on? There’s also a normative challenge: what do we do about it; is it possible to promote a better conciliation between organizational efficiency and worker well-being? Finally, there’s a theoretical
challenge: how to construct a new interdisciplinary understanding of work?

A second core research problem concerns the permeability of national regimes in a global era. The old institutions were national but the globalization of production and services is leading to the emergence of transnational actors and processes of regulation. The notion of a national system of employment relations – the core operational variable in our field for the last 150 years – is increasingly open to challenge. This does not suggest that the national is an irrelevant category but it does highlight the need for a broad-ranging empirical and theoretical enquiry on the interaction between local, national and international sources of work regulation.

Finally, a third core research problem concerns the place of the individual worker in this new workplace? Our previous institutional model – call it industrial citizenship in the traditions of Marshall (1965) and also of Harry Arthurs (1967) – was predicated on a number of assumptions about workers: their sex, their types of jobs, and the permanency of those jobs, their aspirations, their identifications with larger groups of workers, their impulse to collectivize solutions and, indeed, the inevitable role of unions as a conduit to industrial citizenship. Our institutional framework by and large reproduced these assumptions. Yet, the new workplace is characterized by a continuing debate about the individual and the group (or the collective) as it contends with stronger and more numerous social identities including generations, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation and profession. There then arises important questions about the scope for a new citizenship at work. What is the right paradigm for work? For example, can we do away with the notion of subordination at work? I do not happen to think so, but the debate is certainly open about the kinds of rights that are grounded in assumptions of subordination rather than some other vision of the work relationship. What is the scope for notions of citizenship at work and social citizenship, notably notions that transcend national boundaries? Current International Labour Organization initiatives around the concept of decent work can be seen as an effort to highlight the social dimension of globalization. Similarly, it is possible to imagine a society where work has been largely flexibilized against a backdrop of firm social rights that enhance social capital through a vastly expanded range of rights concerning societal guarantees about access to education and health care. It is also important to ask whether there are particular organizational and institutional configurations that give better expression to various notions of citizenship at work?

The reorganization of production and services, the globalization of economic and social relations, and the multiplication and fragmentation of individual and collective social identities are driving a range of challenges and changes to prevailing institutional understandings in the world of work and employment. The overriding question then is how to achieve both organizational efficiency and economic well-being for workers in an increasingly international age?

In order to answer this general question, we need to ask three separate questions. First, what kind of institutions and institutionalization need to be put in place for the new workplace outlined above? Second, what is the impact of globalization on national and local institutions for work and employment? Third, is there/can there be
a citizenship at work in the new workplace and how should it be achieved? Simply put, we face a big challenge of how to rethink our institutions for work and employment and this will compel a restructuring of our field of study.

There is, therefore, a compelling need to understand the dynamics of institutional renewal: how these new factors are reshaping our institutional understandings of work and employment but, also, how different institutional configurations and understandings can affect the direction and outcomes of these factors and, in the process, the societal choices available to us.

Our collective conceit here is that the answers are unlikely to be the simple derivative of a neo-liberal artifice – an intellectual construction bearing faint resemblance to what is happening on the ground. The challenge will be to understand institutional reconfiguration as the dynamic between the contradictions of global capitalist development and the efforts of new and old groups of social actors to leverage these contradictions into new forms of institutional construction likely to improve lives and liberties, all of which will have to be conjugated by planetary resource and environmental constraints likely to transform models of both production and consumption.

What does the academic division of labour tell us about how we are positioned to do this? And how might we respond to these challenges?

The beauty of industrial relations, and this is the compelling historical continuity, is that it was born out of exactly such a challenge a century ago – the incapacity of prevailing paradigms and disciplinary boundaries to contend with epochal social change. Our collective tragedy would be to not take up this challenge or to do so in ways that do not fit the circumstances.

In what ways are we likely to move? I think that it can be argued that there is a need to move from the “inters” to the “trans”.

From comparative to international to transnational, because in the context of globalization it is only through comparative and transnational enquiry that we can understand emerging patterns and the role of different institutional configurations.

From interdisciplinary to transdisciplinary, because these are problems that require multiple lenses and without a doubt the emergence of new theoretical and disciplinary frameworks. And the likely form that this research will take will be matrix like with over-arching research themes of the kinds that I have outlined cross-cutting more traditional sub-sets or proximate clusters of subjects such as state policies or workplaces and HR or collective representation about work.

From monomethodological to intermethodological to transmethodological, classic positivist constructions will increasingly have to be supplemented or replaced by multi-and trans- methodologies (here’s a dig for any establishments, if there are any, that claim that you focus on just one methodological approach) because our state of theory construction will have to respond to different imperatives (in particular, see
Flyvberg 2001 but also Godard 1994).

The argument then is that if we can take up these challenges then we will be well positioned as a field of study to transform the academic division of labour. Moreover, I do not think that we can predict in advance exactly what its shape will be. Although you might find this position less than satisfying, the strategy is to focus on core research problems and from that will emerge new forms of disciplinary glue.

Moreover, the argument is that industrial relations is particularly well positioned to do this because we have much more interdisciplinary experience, already have a long tradition of empirical research focused on social problems and have boundary spanning abilities that are not always easy to construct in other areas.

In other words, we are faced with a unique historic opportunity and the actual structure of our field and the institutions that do exist give us a comparative advantage from which to leverage such a strategy. Put simply, rather than lamenting our fate, we need to get out and do the hard graft associated with understanding the changing dynamics of work and employment.

Already, it is apparent that universities and research granting agencies are open to this and even seek to encourage it. The theoreticians of university systems are certainly convinced that radical changes are about to take place. Indeed, some of the most innovative research that is going on seeks to cross boundaries and the recent (2004-2005) self-evaluation exercise of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), which met the natural scepticism of entrenched institutional interests, is further testimony to this trend.

It is worthwhile citing a few examples of change that is taking place on the ground and the way that researchers are responding to these challenges. There are a number of centres of excellence and clusters for regional innovation emerging. York University's Centre for Work and Society's has also sought to provide interdisciplinary models, first in its initiative on training and now in a second new economy project. The Canadian Policy Research Networks have also provided an innovative organizational model for problem-driven social policy thinking, notably in the areas of work and social policy. The emergence of SSHRC financed CURAs or Community-University Research Alliances also provide a mechanism for linking researchers and communities around a variety of problems. Undoubtedly one of the most innovative projects in the country is that developed by Leah Vosko’s team at York University to study a wide range of dimensions of precarious work. Similarly, CRISES in Quebec is a research centre that has pursued a long-standing enquiry into social models for work and social innovation. Such models are also in evidence beyond our borders. In particular, the Economic and Social Research Council’s (ESRC) Future of Work programme in the United Kingdom offers a wide-ranging effort to grapple with the new workplace.

Last, but not least, is that of the Centre de recherché interuniversitaire sur la mondialisation et le travail (CRIMT), of which I am the director and, quite
fortuitously, whose scientific program encapsulated in its Major Collaborative Research Initiatives program grant under the auspices of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada just happens to correspond to some of the ideas that I have sought to outline in the second part of this essay. Indeed, I would be remiss in not recognizing the contribution of many of my CRIMT colleagues at Université de Montréal, Université Laval and HEC Montréal as well as in other institutions in Canada and beyond in helping to shape the research agenda outlined above.

There is much experiential learning to be done from these experiences. One of the keys will be how to make the spillover effects into education/training and spawning new programs for which there will be much demand and which our universities will be open to create. Moreover, these new models invariably span and are likely to transform Model A – Model B boundaries. We are well positioned in industrial relations to take the leadership on these issues.

There are also significant implications for the way that we train our doctoral students and the methodological keys that we give them. Although I do not have time to develop this line of argument here, I think that it is an important subject to be discussed at CIRA and other international forums. Suffice it to say that our models are incredibly conservative and tend to replicate the motto: if I had to do it, they bloody well will have to do it too!

I shall conclude with two guarantees. First, the problem of our institutional understanding of work and employment will remain a core social problem for the next many years. Second, many of the traditions that we have developed in industrial relations, whatever the academic organization of the field of study or what we call it, will remain entirely relevant if we seize the opportunity to leverage this understanding into new forms, structures and theoretical traditions for the study of work and employment.

To cite a 1977 Bus Woods contribution on The Course of Labour Policy in Canada: “because industrialism is constantly undergoing change, the employment relationship is always being disturbed by expansions, contractions, layoffs, job obsolescence, promotions, quits and dismissals. In other word, the social problems of industrialism are constantly being renewed, and are calling for solution…” (1977:2)

The captive audience segment of this year’s CIRA meetings is now complete. I can only thank you for your slightly glazed tolerance.
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