

EMBEDDING SOCIAL PROCESS ANALYSIS INTO EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS UNDERSTANDING: THEORETICAL INSIGHTS AND CONCEPTUAL UNDERPINNING.

MS_ARJASS_595351. ABSTRACT

The concept of social process is further explicated in this paper as a route to further understand employment relations system; in its comparative perspectives and analysis. The paper argues that analysis of employment relations needs to focus on context i.e. specifics, and cross national patterns of cultural/social process trajectories, in the explanation of institutional structures and characteristics that influence the dynamics and functions of a variety of employment relations systems. Review of extant literature on employment relations system calls for a re-cast, and embedding of social process into employment relations analysis. Such nuanced perspective seeks to adequately explain national employment relations institutions and their outcomes in historicity and context. Integrating cultural/social process nuances into our understanding, significantly explains all the dimensions embedded in a national employment relations system.

Keywords: employment relations, embeddedness national institutions, social process

INTRODUCTION

Employment relations analysis and understanding, before now, have taken on the tendency of a “global”, “unilinear” analysis; with less emphasis on the salient differences that exist among various national employment relations systems. In the emerging context, problematic to employment relations analysis therefore, is that of, how to account for these “dissimilarities”, and developing an “appropriate integrative approach” that seeks to explain and accommodate various nuances of diverse employment relations systems and practices across various countries. Sorge has argued “for the development of a new dialectical framework that can help synthesis these different approaches”^{*1}. Such an approach, implied in his arguments, should be able to account not only of the influence of diverse national institutional regulations impacting on systems and practices of employment relations such as collective bargaining, trade unions and indeed the human resources management, but also the embedded social processes that often influence these dimensions and practice of employment relations.

In the context of contemporary employment relations systems and practices, there have been a renew interest and focus on the strong capacities and abilities of actors to effect changes in the institutions and process of employment

¹ An important Sociological praxis for researcher is to pay due attention to cultural relativity, and this aligns with A. Sorge, “Actors, Systems, Societal Effects and Culture: Conceptualizing Variations in Cross National Personnel and Organizations”, Paper Presented to the EMOT GROUP, Humbolt University, Berlin 22nd March 1994.ⁿ

relations. Refocusing attention on attitudes and perceptions of the actors is explicated through social process analysis. Indeed, the problematics of labour process, and contentious issues it generates in the social relations of production, are best conceptualized through comparative lens. Therefore, the conceptual remit of comparative analysis continues to instruct researchers to situate and explain specific form of employment relations system within the specific dynamics of social processes in which the system operates. This paper therefore critically examines the conventional approaches to understanding employment relations, their limitations identified, and suggests ways of evolving a more comprehensive framework that incorporate specific social processes in the understandings.

3. WHY COMPARATIVE EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS ANALYSIS?

In the context of “agency–structure” analysis of labour management relations, a “coupling factors” continue to provoke interest in its comparative discourse; one is the concern to critically develop a conceptual framework that captures the varied and comparative labour management practices, and second is the need to evaluate evolving management policy and practices in the light of emerging competitive operating environment of work organizations. From management perspectives, motives for understanding comparative analysis and its utilities, are often rooted in the concern for organizations to seek for best practices.²

Generic to such managerial pragmatism are concepts such as JIT, TQM,

² Best practices in employment relations are exemplified through social process, see J. O'Reilly, 'Theoretical Considerations in Cross National Employment Research Sociological Research online Vo. No. 1 1996 :p.I.

Teamwork and associated new work practices that have become mainstream management practices.³

Nevertheless, weakness in a theoretical and empirical analysis that seeks to generalize had long been noticed in the work of Warwick and Osharson. They argue “variables or relationship once assumed to be universal have been shattered on the proving ground of non-western world”.⁴ Researchers are therefore cautioned to refrain from embracing “grandiose” attitude in theory construction and generalization. Theory constructed for empirical analysis should be able to “stand the test of varying socio-cultural conditions”. In other words, the social milieu from which understanding emanates should be able to complement theory formulation. Consequently, as noted by Nowak “exploratory approach provided through comparative analysis can contribute to resolving some of the current problems in social theory”.⁵ Indeed, comparative analysis becomes valuable when it challenges the “implicit assumptions” inherent in “unilinear” focus, in analysis.

Recognition, and paying distinct attention to differences in national employment relations systems can assist in resolving issues about the “causes and effects” of diverse contemporary social process and social relations, and how they impact

³ Insights from these authors work remain influential in analyzing post-Fordist managerial practices, Hammer and Champy, *Reengineering: A Manifesto for Business Revolution*, London: Nicholas Breadyly Publication, 1983.

⁴ It is therefore instructive to nuance evaluations of variables in context. See, for example, Warwick *et al*, *Comparative Research Methods*, Eaglewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall 1973.

⁵ An important hallmark in social process theorizing is to pay distinct attention to comparativeness in its dimensions, S. Nowak, ‘Comparative studies and social theory’ in Kohn, Lon. (ed) *Cross National Research in Sociology*: London, Sage 1989.

on national institutional arrangements. The instructive implication for adopting a more embedded approach of analysis lies on the fact that “society and social institutions needed to be understood from a more holistic approach”.⁶

To O’Reilly “such an approach is opposed to reducing particular characteristics of a given society to the status of a few independent variables”,⁷ and extrapolating them into other societies. He notes “emphasis should be on showing the relationship and development between different aspects of a given society”,⁸ and how they influence the institutional practices and systems, in context.

Major implications and derivatives of a holistic approach which comparative analysis tends to stress is that attention be given to the impact of “social process” in theory-construction, and empirical analysis. The relevance of social process has become a significant explanatory variable, and as a key concern in cross-national comparative research.⁹ Indeed, social process as a model for analysis, has received quite diverse theoretical treatments, and resonate in the work of several authors; Hofstede (1980), Pot (2000), Goldthorpe (1968), Adesina (1989), Lipset 1961) Gallie (1983).

As heuristic device, the authors had emphasized need for strong attentions are given to social process as analytical tool, and for sociologists of work to

⁶ S. Norwak, *op cit*, 24

⁷ This has been recognized to be a strong praxis in sociological analysis, see for example J. O’Reilly ‘Theoretical consideration in cross-national employment research, ‘Sociological Research online Vol. No. 1 1996: p. 4

⁸ .O’.Roley, *op cit*,4-5

⁹ O’ Roley,*op cit*, 6

incorporate a comparison of the norms and values into their analysis. Also instructive, is for researchers to pay attention to the mechanisms or institutions of social structure and values such as the family, ethos, collectivities, the state, trade unions, educational and training, and nuanced national orientations, in their conceptualization and empirical work.

Again, an important worth of social process analysis is pointed out by Granovetter, “the researcher should pay attention to meso-level (social process) particularities”.¹⁰ In his argument, “the methodological work of a researcher must take cognizance of the actor, and his/her perception of the manipulation of organizational relations in which he finds himself”.¹¹ Granovetter thus makes a case for a theoretical consideration that takes account of “actors” sense-making, in relations to the institutions they are; noting that “actors in a social relations, are engaged in a purposive actions that are embedded in concrete on-going systems of social relations”.¹²

The groundbreaking and scholarly work of Adesina on “Workers construction of social communities”¹³ at workplace, based on case study of Nigeria’s Oil refinery had indicated how significant it is for researchers to pay due recognition to social process at workplace that construct workers own narratives and orientation.

¹⁰ M. Granovettes, “Economics action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness’, the American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 91 No. 3 1985 of O’Reilly 1996

¹¹ M. Granovetter, *op cit*, 5

¹² M. Granovetter, *op cit*, 5-6

¹³ Indeed, workers own sense-making of their location in social relations of production must be understood within the context of the social process, see for instance J. Adesina, ‘The construction of social community in work: The case of a Nigerian factory. Capital and Class 1990: p. 115.

He notes, “the nature, dynamics and reproduction of collectivities in workplace, manifest in the ways in which people express themselves as active human agency in the concrete social process of workplace relations”.¹⁴ In the context of workplace relations, this implies that workers make attempt to redefine their positions and orientation in relation to production process. According to him, “it is when the character of work relations is seen and interpreted in this way, (as perceived by workers themselves), that the researcher would be able to lay bare the “totality” in workplace relations”. Adesina’s work had indicated how workers enacted their own “alternative morality”, identifying the significance of “lateral” and “vertical” community in workplace (articulation of which is culturally specific) that “shapes the orientation and positions workers perceived of themselves”.¹⁵ Adesina’s arguments corroborates Willis arguments that “non-work (culturally specific nuances) supplies many of the categories and meanings for work, and which can only be understood in relation to work, and is finally shaped by it.”¹⁶

4. EMBEDDING SOCIAL PROCESS INTO INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS OF COMPARATIVE EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS

¹⁴ Insights from this has been shown to be significant in studying workplace relations see for example. Adesina, *op cit*, 119

¹⁵ The implication of this is that the specificities of the workplace imbues its social process and workers-own interpretations, *op cit* 120

¹⁶ P. Willis, ‘Shop-floor culture, masculinity, and the wage form’ in J. Clarke *et al* (eds) Working class culture: studies in history and theory 1980 of J. Adesina 1990

In proposing the concept of social process as a “conceptual remit” to underpin institutional approach, in understanding employment relation, Maurice et al argue that, “we can not examine separate aspects of a given systems without locating it in specific societal context”¹⁷. Impliedly, there is a strong relationship between organisation of work at the micro-level of the firm, and the social structure at the macro-level. The instructive implication of this is that there is a systematic dynamics of social process influencing both the formation of the actor’s experience, and the dimensions of work process. These processes are, at once, the result of specific social relations, and at another end, the cause of the social relations. The import of the social process of relations manifests in the actors enactment of their orientation and perception at work, even in the context of institutional arrangement.

In a more modified approach towards understanding the relationship between the institutional factors and the social process, Whitley maintains that “comparative analysis should endeavour to include the nature of the firm, the way the market is organized, the co-ordination and control systems”¹⁸. Shaping the dynamics of these institutional factors are social processes of kinship trust, folklore, loyalty, collective ethos and solidarity at work. The strength of social process concept has therefore proven to be an illuminating framework for

¹⁷ M. Maurice *et al*, ‘Rules, contexts and actors observations based on a comparison between france and Germany: British Journal of Industrial Relation Vol. 22:3 1984.

¹⁸ R. Whitley, ‘Business systems in East Africa: firms, markets and societies London: Sage, 1992.

understanding the social construction of workers lived experience and attitudes, within the institutional arrangements of employment relations.

Gallie (1983) work however examines the Marxist arguments of the “determination affect” of technology on the social integration of workers in the capitalist’s enterprise, on the structure of managerial power, and on the nature of trade unionism. Drawing empirical evidence from his study of British and French oil refineries, he examines “whether the use of advanced technology leads to integration or alienation of workers?”¹⁹ Locating this within the context of comparative analysis, his study demonstrates how the influence of specific social processes shapes the attitudes and aspirations of workers at the plant level. Based on his case study, Gallie argues “though the market economies tend to impact both the conditions of conflict and contradictions between employers and workers, workers perception of the firm, and how they relate to the firm are conditioned by certain cultural context”.²⁰ He then identifies certain varieties that tend to shape workers aspirations and experience at workplace; where “value of equality is more salient”.²¹ Implicated in this argument is that, though, there could be greater tension between management and workers in capitalist production, this is mediated by the embedded cultural ethos and social relationships.

¹⁹ D. Gallie, ‘Social inequality and class radicalism in France and Britain, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1983

²⁰ D. Gallie, *op cit* 34

²¹ D. Gallie, *In search of the new working class: automation and social integration within the capitalist enterprises* Cambridge: Cambridge university press 1978.

Focusing on the differences on the structure of management power and the nature of trade unionism in the oil refineries, Gallie associates paternalistic management style with French Oil companies, compared with semi constitutional strategies that characterized the British patterns.²² Also, while the French managers were more active in reminding the workforce of their discretionary power, British managers played down the potential power of the workforce. On trade unionism, Gallie notes that while the French unions were highly politicized,²³ linking their demands and strategy to a broader long-term societal change, the British unionism maintain a more representative role, and negotiate on a narrow range of issues that relate to shop floor work relations.²⁴ Gallie's work therefore seeks to show clearly the relationship between social processes, institutions and the attitudes of the people who occupy these spaces in relations to their work place community.

This analysis resonates with Black's²⁵ work which also underscores the significance of social process as an explanatory variable in comparative analysis of employment relation. In his work, while trying to explain cross-national patterns of employment relations institutions, it regresses this on social process indices, as earlier enunciated by Hofstede (1980)

²² D. Gallie, *op cit*, 41

²³ See for example, D. Gallie, 'Social inequality and class radicalism in France and Britain, Cambridge: Cambridge press 1983.

²⁴ D. Gallie, *op cit* 23

²⁵ His work resonates with earlier authors in providing explanatory tool to understand social process in comparative analysis B. Black, 'National Culture and industrial relations and pay structure, Labour Vol. 15:2 2001.

In the work of Bamber and Lansbury (1988), a case is made for studying comparative employment relations; to understand the relative significance of various factors; not only technology, but also economic policies, laws and culture as variables determining the type and character of employment relations systems. As noted by Strauss, “if an industrial relation theory is to be developed, it has to be on a comparative basis.”²⁶ To Poole “cross-national methodologies” in industrial relations analysis must invariably take on board, cultural influences.²⁷ Similar strands of argument run through the authors’ contributions; that significant changes and patterns of employment relations could also be accounted for through “cultural varieties”.²⁸

5. Connecting Employment Relations Analysis to “Varieties of Capitalism” (VoC)

The “material changes” in an increasingly globalised capitalism, and changes in the capitalist mode of production are replicated in the employment relations dimensions; making the world of work a vital arena for embedding social process analysis. However, as noted by Thompson et al (1989) the historical dimensions of capitalism are not experienced in the same manner across capitalist economies; because of varieties and diversities of forms of institutions in the nations-states. In other words, the historical specificities of a particular

²⁶ See for example, G. Strauss, ‘Industrial relations as an academic field: what’s wrong with it’ in Barbash J. and Barbash B. (eds) *Theories and concept in comparative industrial relations*, Colombia, University of South Carolina press 1989, of B Black 2001.

²⁷ M. Poole, *Industrial relations: origins and patterns of national Diversity*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul 1986.

²⁸ M.Poole, *op cit*, 51

employment relations system, which also reflects the forms of institutions, are shaped by the specific patterns of embedded social process. This equally reverberates upon the work process, production process, and managerial practices. The inevitabilities of “Varieties of Capitalism” (Thompson et al 1989; Kelly et al 2008) have equally brought in the problematic and challenges of “varieties of employment relations”, with diverse modes of how to craft-in, the ensuing social process, in explaining the specific dimensions of the employment relations.

6. RETHINKING INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS ANALYSIS

The exponential contribution of Dunlop’s Industrial Relations System remains the foundational conceptual threshold towards understanding industrial relations system. Needless to rehash the industrial relations variables as enumerated by Dunlop, relevance to this paper is his emphasis on ideology or set of beliefs/ideas that bind the actors at the workplace.²⁹ This “shared understanding” as referred to by Kerr et al “defines the role of each actor, and defines the ideas held by each actor towards the workplace”.³⁰ For the purpose of our analysis in this paper, the implication of this, as drawn from Dunlop’s argument is that “ideology” creates stable employment relations systems, implying a “congruence” or compatibility amongst the views held by the actors,

²⁹ J. T. Dunlop. *Industrial Relations systems*, Carbondale and Edwardsville, southern Illinois University Press (1971 edition)

³⁰ Kerr *et al*, ‘Industrialism and Industrial Man’ *International labour review*. Vol: 82:3 18 1960

and of the systems. For Dunlop, ideology is the locus and distribution of power within the wider society and which structures the industrial relations system itself.³¹

In extending Dunlop's line of argument to understand differences in national systems of employment relations, Flanders argue that these differences have to be located in certain underlying principles, expressed in "value judgments" which are broadly accepted through out the nation.³² This "normative principle" referred to as "values" thus play a more active role in Flanders analysis as against Dunlop's "common ideology" and Kerr et al "shared understanding".

"System Analysis" as enunciated by Dunlop and in a similar way by Flanders (1965) was re-echoed through the work of Ban and Clegg, (1974) Kerr et al (1962) and Melt (1993). Running through the classic stream of their analysis is the emphasis on the primacy of "stability of the system" and "congruence of interest" amongst the actors. The conclusion drawn, in part, is the significance of social process as category, influencing the patterns of employment relations systems.

Hyman's (1975) critique of systems analysis has however brought to fore "the dynamic nature of social relations of production, and the need for an analysis to take on the historical dimensions as point of reference. According to Hyman, employment relations systems, far from being a stable and an integrated whole,

³¹ J. T. Dunlop, *Industrial Relations systems*, Carbondale and Edwardsville, southern Illinois University Press (1971 edition)

³² A. Flanders, *Management and unions*, London. Faber and Faber 1965 of B. Black 2001b

are full of contradictions amongst the actors.³³ To Hyman, to discuss industrial relations as a study of a “System” (Dunlop 1971) or as the study of the “Institutions of job regulations” (Flanders 1965) was to narrowly focus on “conflict containment” and regulation, “rather than on the process through which disagreements and disputes are generated.”³⁴ For instance, on union’s behaviour in the context of employment relations analysis, Hyman situates the explanation on the political economic dynamics such as the intensified global competition, the restructuring of capital and work process, as factors influencing unions’ adversarial orientations and behaviors within the context of employment relations. Thus, the institutional arrangements of a particular employment relations system reflect the dynamics of the political economy, and therefore, these institutions should be seen and interpreted as intervening variables in comparative analysis. In other words, an adequate conceptualization must be rooted in the larger political economy. Extending this line of argument, Shalev also notes that “institutions are symptoms, and not causes with institutional structures reflecting power distributions and its outcome vibrating into the systems of industrial relations.”³⁵

7. INTEGRATING CULTURAL INDICES INTO UNDERSTANDING EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS.

³³ R. Hyman, *Industrial Relations: A Marxist introduction*, Basingstoke, Macmillian 1975.

³⁴ R. Hyman, *op cit* 34

³⁵ M. Shalev, ‘Industrial Relations: Theory and the comparative study of industrial relations conflict’ *British Journal of industrial relations* Vol. 18:1 1980

Even though, Lipset's work (1961) remains classic among the first effort to offer a cultural explanation in accounting for differences in behaviour and attitudes of actors in employment relations,³⁶ the basic tenet of his argument was later extended by Gallie (1978), in stressing the importance of "national culture" in explaining the relation of workers to workplace management practices, in particular the degree of social integration that emerged from this.³⁷ According to Gallie, "national cultural values are reflect not only, in the aspirations and frame of reference of workers, but also in the prevailing institutional arrangements of managerial power, and trade unionism in the enterprise."³⁸ This implies that an institutional arrangements mediated through national cultural traits embody the strategies adopted by the actors towards seeking and obtaining their goals.

However, Shalev, has been critical of taking "values" as an independent variable. He warns against seeing social process as essentially characterized in normative terms; where social action of actors is "normative-based". Rather, dominant value-systems are symptomatic of social (class) structural features of the society,³⁹ and therefore can not offer a deeper explanation of conflictual social relations amongst the classes. Central to Shalev's argument is that cultural values should be treated analytically as mediating variable between

³⁶ S. Lipset, 'Trade unions and social structure' industrial relations, Vol. 1961.

³⁷ D. Gallie, 'Social inequality and class radicalism in France and Britain, Cambridge: Cambridge press 1983

³⁸ D. Gallie *op cit* 25

³⁹ M. Shalev, 'Industrial relations: Theory and the comparative study of industrial relations and industrial relations conflict' British Journal of industrial relations Vol. 18:1 1980.

social process and behaviour. In other words, cultural value should be conceptualized in its politically mediating agentic-role in the social relationship at the workplace. Implicated in this conceptualization; following Shalev work is that differences in national systems of employment relations can best be explained by the strategic choice of the actors; with “values” influencing the choices, and are, in turn impacted upon by the institutional arrangements.

The explanatory strength of cultural values in comparative employment relations analysis is therefore located in its “proxies” for accounting for underlying social process and dimensions of employment relations. The “legitimacy” of cultural indices “should not be seen as standing alone in analyzing the relations between management and the workers.”⁴⁰ To Shalev, “values”, in its generic understanding; link, mediate, facilitate and may even moderate the impact of historically specific structures on institutions and practices of employment relations.⁴¹ Thus, in a strict Marxian interpretation of labour-management relations, and even within the Dunlop’s system analysis, values maintain a strictly mediating role, not diminishing the objective context that underlies power relations between labour and capital.

As demonstrated through the above analysis, and in the attempt to further refine our understanding of cultural indices within the context of comparative employment relations,, a working definition of culture and its specifications within the context of this paper may need to suffice. For Kroeber and Parsons,

⁴⁰ M. Shaley, *op cit* 14

⁴¹ M. Shalley, *op cit* 15

culture refers to created and transmitted content and patterns of values, ideas and other symbolic meaningful systems, as factors in the shaping of human behaviour.⁴² Hofstede defines culture as the “collective programming of the mind that distinguishes one group or category of people from another”.⁴³ Adapting the definition given by Kroeber et al, Poole⁴⁴ relates culture to employment relations and managerial practices in diverse national contexts. Conceptually, therefore it is possible to relate cultural value orientation to both organizational and employment relations characteristics. On this, Pot proposes a conceptual framework that is national “work-related”,⁴⁵ and culture based. Drawing on Giddens’ structuration theory, Pot notes that the impact of national culture on employment relationship could be conceptualized through a cluster of national work related institutions. Such national work related institutions include, educational and industrial relations systems as well as corporate employment practices. These are mediated through the dynamics of internal institutions such as norms and value patterns. According to Pot, actors draw on these resources to reproduce social actions exemplified in their lived-work experiences within the employment relationship.⁴⁶

⁴² Kroeber *et al*, ‘Culture: a critical review of concepts and definitions, Cambridge, Mass, Harvard University 1952.

⁴³ See for example, G. Hofstede, *Culture’s consequences*, Beverly Hills, sage 1984

⁴⁴ M. Poole, ‘Industrial relations: origins and patterns of national diversity, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul 1986

⁴⁵ F. Pot, *Employment relations and national culture* Cheltenham, Elgar 2000.

⁴⁶ F. Pot, *op cit* 22

Building on Goldthorpe *et al* “orientation to work”,⁴⁷ Glover *et al* encouraged researchers for the integration of non-work relationships in accounting for the factors that influence behaviour at the workplace.⁴⁸ Through a case study, Glover *et al* illustrate how deeper understandings of shop floor responses to management initiatives are shaped by both work and non-work factors. They therefore urge researchers to go beyond the conceptual remit of a “unilinear” analysis, in explaining workers attitude at the workplace. While pointing out that the emerging challenges of institutional and business requirements continues to compel management to evolve new work practices in gaining the loyalty and commitment of the workforce; researchers are to broaden the “disciplined-workers thesis”⁴⁹ into other context, outside the workplace, from which employee responses and “sense-making” are also situated.

8. Conclusion

In this review of literature on social process as a conceptual tool in understanding diverse forms of employment relations, attempts have been made not just to reconnect the diverse strands of the concept, but also to emphasize the need for researchers to continue to pay attentions to distinct and specific forms of social relations in employment relations. Evaluations of the conceptual and methodological remits of social process in employment relations analysis

⁴⁷ Goldthorpe *et al* ‘The affluent workers: industrial attitudes and behaviour, Cambridge; Cambridge University Press 1968.

⁴⁸ Glover *et al*, ‘Shop-floor workers responses to quality management initiatives; broadening the discipline workers thesis’, *Work, Employment and Society* Vol. 19 2005.

⁴⁹ Edwards *et al*, ‘The determinants of employee responses to total quality management: six case studies’, *organisation studies* Vol. 19 1998.

indicate that “context matters” in researcher’s analysis. As Poole notes “a theory of industrial relations needs historical or temporal dimensions”.⁵⁰ This must be combined with context-specific of a particular environment in which a nation’s work-related values influence the industrial relations patterns. Kelly’s “long wave and mobilization” thesis also plays a significant role in explaining cycles in industrial relations.⁵¹ Unions’ activities and practices within the employment relations system may also be accounted for, by their mobilizations strategies as influenced by the context of social processes; shaping the orientation of unions leadership. While Harzing and Hofstede’s work demonstrate how national cultures influence the way people relate in the context of social institutions and structures, integration of cultural indices analysis in social relationships in the workplace are further given strong emphasis through case studies that were reviewed.⁵² Literatures on “Varieties of Capitalism” Voc, (Thompson et al 1989; Kelly and Hamman 2008) have been very valuable in offering rigorous, systematic and insightful accounts of national capitalisms and patterns of employment relations. Its analytical remit, however, in the context of the dynamics of employment relations remains innovative and resilience in embedding it with specific dimensions of formal and informal social processes in the workplace.

⁵⁰ M. Poole, ‘Industrial relations: origins and patterns of national diversity, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul:64 1986

⁵¹ J. Kelly, ‘Long waves in industrial relations; mobilizations and counter mobilization in historical perspectives’ historical studies in industrial relations Vol. 4:p 3-36 1997

⁵² J. Adesina, The Construction of Social Communities in Work: The Case of a Nigerian Factory, Capital and Class 1990.

Reference

1. Sorge, A.1994 “Actors, Systems, Societal Effects and Culture: Conceptualizing Variations in Cross National Personnel and Organizations”, Paper Presented to the EMOT GROUP, Humbolt University, Berlin

10 Granovettes,M 1996 “Economics action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness’, *the American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 91.3

11 Granovetter, M.op cit,5

12 .Granovetter, M.op cit,5-6

13 Adesina, J. 1990 ‘The construction of social community in work: The case of a Nigerian factory. *Capital and Class* 1990: p. 115.

14 Adesina, op cit,119

15 Adesina ,op cit 120

16 Willis, P 1980 ‘Shop-floor culture, masculinity, and the wage form’ in J. Clarke *et al* (eds) *Working class culture: studies in history and theory* .

17 Maurice , M. *et al*, ‘Rules, contexts and actors observations based on a comparison between france and Germany: *British Journal of Industrial Relation* Vol. 22:3 1984.

18 Whitley, R. 1992 ‘Business systems in East Africa: firms, markets and societies London: Sage,

19 Gallie, D. 1983 ‘Social inequality and class radicalism in France and Britain, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

20 Gallie, D.op cit 34

20 O’Reilly, J. 1996 ‘Theoretical Considerations in Cross National Employment Research *Sociological Research online* Vo. No. 1:p.4.

21O’Roley ,J op cit,4-5

O’ Roley, J.op cit, 6

22 Gallie, D. 1978 *In search of the new working class: automation and social integration within the capitalist enterprises* : Cambridge: Cambridge university press 1978.

23. D. Gallee, D. op cit, 41
24. D.Gallie, D. op cit 23
- 25 Black, B. 2001 'National Culture and industrial relations and pay structure, *Labour* Vol. 15:2
26. Strauss, G. 1989 'Industrial relations as an academic field: what's wrong with it' in Barbash J. and Barbash B. (eds) *Theories and concept in comparative industrial relations*, Colombia, University of South Carolina press ..
27. Poole, M. 1986 *Industrial relations: origins and patterns of national Diversity*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul
28. Poole, M. op cit, 51
- 29 Dunlop, J 1971 *Industrial Relations systems*, Carbondale and Edwardsville, southern Illinois University Press
- 30 Hammer and Champy, 1983 *Reengineering: A Manifesto for Business Revolution*, London: Nicholas Breadyly Publication.
- 31 Kerr et al, 1960 'Industrialism and Industrial Man' *International labour review*. Vol: 82:3: 18
- 32 Flanders, A. *Management and Unions*, London.
- 33 Hyman, R. 1975. *Industrial Relations: A Marxist introduction*, Basingstoke, Macmillian.
- 34 Hyman, R. op cit 34
- 35 Shalev, M. 1980 'Industrial Relations: Theory and the comparative study of industrial relations conflict' *British Journal of industrial relations* Vol. 18:1
- 36 Lipset, S. 1961 'Trade unions and social structure' *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 1
37. Gallie,D. 1983 'Social inequality and class radicalism in France and Britain, Cambridge: Cambridge press 1983
38. Gallie, D op cit 25
39. Shalev, M. 1980 'Industrial relations: Theory and the comparative study of industrial relations and industrial relations conflict' *British Journal of industrial relations* Vol. 18:1 1980.
40. Warwick *et al*, *Comparative Research Methods*, Eaglewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall 1973.
- 41 . Shaley, M.op cit 14
42. Shalley, M.op cit 15

43. Kroeber *et al*, 1952. 'Culture: a critical review of concepts and definitions, Cambridge, Mass, Harvard University.
44. Hofstede, G. 1984 Culture's consequences, Beverly Hills, sage
45. Poole, M. 1986 'Industrial relations: origins and patterns of national diversity, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul
46. Pot, F. 2000 Employment relations and national culture Cheltenham, Elgar 2000.
47. Pot , F.op cit 22
48. Goldthorpe *et al* 1968' The affluent workers: industrial attitudes and behaviour, Cambridge; Cambridge University Press
49. Glover *et al*, 2005. 'Shop-floor workers responses to quality management initiatives; broadening the discipline workers theses, *Work, Employment and Society* Vol. 19
50. Edwards *et al*, 1998 'The determinants of employee responses to total quality management: six case studies', *Organisation Studies* Vol. 19
51. Nowak, S. 1989 'Comparative studies and social theory' in Kohn, Lon. (ed) Cross National Research in Sociology: London, Sage 1989.
52. Poole, M 1986 'Industrial relations: origins and patterns of national diversity, London, Routhledge and Kegan Paul:64
52. Kelly, J. 1997 'Long waves in industrial relations; mobilizations and counter mobilization in historical perspectives' *Historical Studies in Industrial Relations* Vol. 4:p 3-36 1997
53. Adesina, J. 1990 The Construction of Social Communities in Work: The Case of a Nigerian Factory, *Capital and Class*.