

Call for Papers

Soziale Bewegungen und industrielle Beziehungen

Schwerpunktheft der Industriellen Beziehungen

Herausgeberinnen: Sabrina Zajak und Britta Rehder

In den industriellen Beziehungen wurden die Gewerkschaften als soziale Bewegungen wiederentdeckt. Die Literatur über gewerkschaftliche Revitalisierung und „social movement unionism“ knüpft bisher allerdings nur sehr lose an die theoretischen Konzepte und empirischen Befunde der Bewegungsforschung an. Dies lässt eine grundlegende und umfassendere Analyse der Beziehungsgeflechte zwischen sozialen Bewegungen und Gewerkschaften auf der einen sowie Versuche der Integration der industriellen Beziehungs- und Bewegungsforschung auf der anderen Seite unberücksichtigt. Zudem werden soziale Bewegungen meist nur in ihren Interaktionsbeziehungen mit den Gewerkschaften untersucht, nicht aber in ihrem Zusammenspiel mit der betrieblichen Arena der Arbeitsbeziehungen. So wissen wir bisher kaum etwas darüber, ob Forderungen sozialer Bewegungen nach mehr Partizipation und Demokratisierung von Unternehmen nicht nur stärken (können), sondern auch dazu beitragen, etablierte Mitbestimmungsstrukturen zu verdrängen bzw. zu ersetzen.

Der Austausch und Dialog zwischen den Forschungsgebieten ist in dem Maße relevant, in dem die Bedeutung sozialer Bewegungen im sozialen und politischen Prozess weltweit (wieder) zu wachsen scheint. Nicht wenige Beobachter/innen sehen Kooperationen zwischen sozialen Bewegungen und Gewerkschaften in Zeiten kontinuierlicher Krisen als Kernelement einer Gegenbewegung und als wichtiges Heilmittel gegen die Auswüchse neoliberaler Globalisierung und deren wirtschaftliche und politische Krisendynamiken. Dabei lassen sich Allianzen in verschiedenen Themenfeldern auch jenseits der Erwerbsregulierung feststellen z.B. in Handels- und Austeritätsprotesten ebenso wie in den Bereichen (globaler) Umweltregulierung, der Energiewende, der Flüchtlingspolitik oder im Kampf gegen Rechtspopulismus- und extremismus. Gleichzeitig ist es nicht selbstverständlich, dass es zu Bündnissen kommt, und wir wissen bisher wenig darüber wie und unter welchen Bedingungen ideologische Differenzen, unterschiedliche historische Entwicklungspfade und Konkurrenzverhältnisse zwischen unterschiedlichen Organisationsformen überwunden werden.

In dem geplanten Schwerpunktheft sollen daher sowohl empirisch als auch konzeptionell-theoretisch angelegte Beiträge zum Thema ‚Industrielle Beziehungen und soziale Bewegungen‘ veröffentlicht werden. Diese können und sollen mit fachlich unterschiedlichen Perspektiven arbeiten (z.B. Soziologie, Politikwissenschaft, Gender Studies, Wirtschaftswissenschaften, Ethnologie, politische Ökonomie, Geschichtswissenschaften, Arbeitsrechtswissenschaft). Auch international bzw. transnational angelegte oder komparative Beiträge sind sehr willkommen. Die Manuskripte könnten beispielsweise die folgenden Themen adressieren und kombinieren:

Theorieintegration

Welche theoretischen Konzepte der Bewegungsforschung sind besonders anschlussfähig und gewinnbringend für die Perspektive der industriellen Beziehungen? Was können beide Bereiche voneinander lernen? In der Bewegungsforschung spielen z.B. Theorieschulen eine große Rolle, die im weitesten Sinne den interpretativen oder konstruktivistischen

Ansätzen nahe stehen (z.B. Framing). Diese werden in der Literatur über industrielle Beziehungen bisher nur sehr zögerlich rezipiert. Wie ist das zu erklären, und lässt sich die Theoriedivergenz in fruchtbarer Weise überwinden?

Kooperation und Konflikt zwischen Gewerkschaften und sozialen Bewegungen:

Gibt es Themenbereiche, Politikfelder und Kontextbedingungen, die Allianzen wahrscheinlicher machen? Welchen Einfluss hat die nationale und/oder sektorale institutionelle Verfasstheit der Systeme der Arbeitsbeziehungen auf die Entstehung von Konflikt oder Kooperation? Machen ein starker Staat und/oder organisationsmächtige Verbände (bzw. die Abwesenheit dieser Faktoren) einen Unterschied? Welche Institutionalierungsgrade von Kooperation lassen sich feststellen und wie lassen diese sich begründen? Welche Themenhierarchien, ideologischen Diskrepanzen, und (Macht-)Konflikte lassen sich innerhalb von Allianzen beobachten? Gibt es Gewerkschaften oder Bewegungen, die besonders resistent gegenüber Kooperation sind und warum?

Soziale Bewegungen und betriebliche Arbeitsbeziehungen:

Inwiefern tragen soziale Bewegungen zur Schaffung neuer Partizipationsformen am Arbeitsplatz bei? Ergänzen diese die etablierten Mitbestimmungsstrukturen oder stehen sie in Konkurrenz? Welche Rolle spielen Betriebsräte in den und für die Interaktionsbeziehungen zwischen Gewerkschaften und sozialen Bewegungen, z.B. im Fall unternehmenszentrierter Kampagnen? Unter welchen Bedingungen fördern sie die Kooperation der Gewerkschaften mit Bewegungsakteuren, in welchen Fällen treten sie als Bremser auf? Lassen sich Muster feststellen bzgl. verschiedener Betriebsratstypen? Und sind Fragen des Konflikts bzw. der Kooperation auch relevant und ertragreich in Bezug auf die Management- und Arbeitgeberseite? Lassen sich Fälle identifizieren und erklären, in denen Koalitionen mit sozialen Bewegungen und gegen die Arbeitnehmerinteressen geschlossen werden?

Mehrebenendynamiken:

Ist Kooperation zwischen Gewerkschaften und sozialen Bewegungen auf lokaler oder globaler Ebene wahrscheinlicher? Sind Kooperationen besonders dafür geeignet, auf mehreren Ebenen gleichzeitig zu mobilisieren? Welche Rolle spielen supranationale Akteure, z.B. Europäische Betriebsräte oder Dachverbände der Arbeitnehmer- und Arbeitgeberseite, für die Interaktionsbeziehungen?

Zu diesen (und verwandten) Themen erbitten wir bis zum 20.01.2017 zunächst ein Abstract (ca. 1-2 Seiten) mit Arbeitstitel, Fragestellung, methodischer Herangehensweise, evtl. verwendeter Datengrundlage sowie einer kurzen Erläuterung des theoretischen Bezugs des Beitrags als PDF- oder Word-Datei.

Der Zeitplan sieht wie folgt aus:

- 20.01.2017: Einreichung des Abstracts
- 15.02.2017: Mitteilung über (Nicht-)Annahme
- 31.08.2017: Full Papers liegen vor
- 31.10.2017: Gutachten liegen vor
- 31.12.2017: Ggf. Abgabe der Überarbeitung
- 31.01.2018: Ggf. Ergebnis der Nachbegutachtung
- 28.02.2018: Letzte Überarbeitungen liegen vor
- Ca. 15.04.2018: Erscheinen des Heftes

Abstracts bitte an Rainer Hampp Verlag schicken. E-mail: Hampp@RHVerlag.de

Preliminary announcement

Sub-theme for EGOS 2017, 33rd EGOS Colloquium,
Copenhagen Business School (CBS)

Organization studies and industrial relations: Overlapping concerns and new possibilities

Markus Helfen, Freie Universität Berlin
markus.helfen@fu-berlin.de

Andreas Pekarek, The University of Melbourne
Andreas.pekarek@unimelb.edu.au

Rick Delbridge, Cardiff University
DelbridgeR@cardiff.ac.uk

Today's relationship between organization studies and industrial relations research is marked by a strange absence of dialogue. In contrast to earlier periods (Child et al., 1973; Maurice et al., 1980; Streeck, 1981) and in spite of a common theoretical heritage (e.g. Jackson & Müllenborn, 2012), much of the present theorizing in organization studies ignores or obscures the fact that the bulk of organizational activity is undertaken by employees working under formal contracts of employment; hence, labour and employment relations are an important area for theorizing organizations (e.g. Vidal, Adler & Delbridge, 2015). Yet insights from industrial relations research are largely absent from organization studies, and vice versa. In the aftermath of the 2008/2009 crisis, organization scholars have realized anew that organizational practices influence and produce inequality between workers within firms as well as within society, and are themselves affected by societal inequalities (Lawrence et al. 2013; Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013; Stainback et al., 2010). However, there remains an almost complete neglect of the idea that labour's voice through unions, collective bargaining, and workplace representation is a mechanism for reducing inequality that has been undermined by recent trends in corporate strategizing and restructuring.

Equally disturbing, in the field of industrial relations, organization studies' contributions to understanding organizations and organizing are rarely taken into account explicitly, despite considerable interest in related themes such as organizing the unorganized (e.g. Heery, 2009), changes in the organizational forms of unions and employers (e.g. Behrens & Pekarek, 2012), and how industrial relations shape and are shaped by corporate restructuring (e.g. Helfen & Fichter, 2013). *It is our contention that both fields of study are ill-served by this absence of mutual engagement and dialogue.*

The subtheme aims to break this silence by reviving the interdisciplinary exchange between the fields of organization studies and industrial relations. By exploring common theoretical ground as well as divergent insights, we invite contributions that reveal how industrial relations helps in understanding how organizations operate in practice, and to uncover how organisation theory assists in resolving puzzles in contemporary industrial relations. Such a dialogue promises insights in at least three important ways:

(1) Institutions: In as much as organizations are embedded in a wider field of social relations and shaped by the pluralistic context of competition, conflict, coalitions, and creativity among diverse ideas and interests, the question arises over who has a say in negotiating the goals, rules and values of organizations apart from top managers and shareholders. Although the workers' voice within organizations and beyond is rooted in the welfare traditions of "coordinated market capitalism" transforming class struggle into rationalized conflict resolution (e.g. Frege & Godard, 2014), the institutions of industrial relations have seen a considerable decline in much of Western Europe and elsewhere (e.g. Tapia et al., 2015). Paradoxically, this development coincides with organizations' increased efforts to involve workers in their responses to societal demands such as diversity, CSR and sustainability as well as ensuring profitable operations (e.g. Williams et al., 2011). This triggers further questions about the future of institutionalized collective labour relations in a comparative perspective: *What are today's cognitive, normative and regulatory as well as economic underpinnings of labour relations in organizations and beyond? How do processes of institutionalization and deinstitutionalization unfold across multiple levels? Why and how do some institutions show institutional resilience while others erode? Are there any functional equivalents to collective labour relations (e.g. direct forms of worker participation, diversity management, consumer activism)?*

(2) Actors: These institutional tensions pinpoint a host of research questions regarding the actors involved in employment relations today. On the one hand, unions and employers' meta-organizations (Ahrne & Brunsson, 2005) have lost much of their grip on intermediating work-related issues. In a changing business environment, employers often seek to revert back to earlier forms of corporate unilateralism, install new dividing lines between workers and escape collective industrial relations. For its part, organized labour faces the challenge of effectively representing a (shrinking) core workforce while reintegrating workers toiling under precarious and non-standard arrangements (Marchington et al., 2005; Weil, 2014). On the other hand, a vibrant debate is unfolding over the way various forms of institutional entrepreneurship contribute to the development of viable labour relations and support the ongoing quest for 'decent' work (Gahan & Pekarek, 2013; Greer & Hauptmeier, 2008). *Specific questions include: How can unions and other meta-organizations' attempts at revitalizing (e.g. organizing), organiza-*

tional change (e.g. mergers), collaboration and competition (e.g. union networks, rival unionism) draw on insights from organization theory? Do other organizations like civil society organizations, professional associations or intermediary organizations (e.g. private employment agencies) replace or supplement collective labour relations?

(3) Practices: Examining how managers, workers, unions, associations, state agencies and the courts engage with and shape organizations, the labour process, and the (collective) regulation of work entails delving deeply into social practice (Vaara & Whittington, 2012). This includes the critical examination of how various categories of work – from low paying jobs to professional and self-employed labour – are socially constructed (e.g. Spicer & Böhm, 2007), how their integration and jurisdiction in the labour process is justified and sanctioned (e.g. Delbridge, 2007; Håkansson & Isidorsson, 2012), as well as how meso-level negotiation shapes working conditions (e.g. Helfen, 2015). In particular, not much is known about those management practices that institutionalize substitutes for worker representation in organizations and how this affects organizations as employers. *Specific questions include: To what extent do collective labour relations depend on more permanent work organization designs and labour processes? Which tensions and contradictions arise in organizations and labour relations through networked forms of value creation and fluid organizational forms? How do identities and work cultures shape labour relations and organizations simultaneously? How does management reflexively enact labour relations?*

Based on the above, we invite **short papers that aim to deepen our understanding of the connections between industrial and employment relations and organizations and vice versa**. In particular, we are interested in both empirical and conceptual papers addressing various levels of analysis that engage with comparative institutional examination, various forms of institutional work, and the enactment of labour processes and work organizations as well the management of meta-organizations. To the same extent, we are curious about contributions from areas such as social movement theory, CSR, Marxist organization studies, the sociology of the professions, micropolitics in transnational corporations, labour law and diversity management.

References

- Ahrne, G., & Brunsson, N. (2005). Organizations and meta-organizations. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 21: 429-449.
- Behrens, M., & Pekarek, A. (2012). To merge or not to merge? The impact of union merger decisions on workers' representation in Germany. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 43: 527-547.
- Child, J., Loveridge, R., & Warner, M. (1973). Towards an organizational study of trade unions. *Sociology*, 7: 71-91.
- Delbridge, R. (2007): Explaining conflicted collaboration: A critical realist approach to hegemony. *Organizations Studies*, 28: 1347-1357.

- Frege, C., & Godard, J. (2014). Varieties of capitalism and job quality. The attainment of Civic principles at Work in the United States and Germany. *American Sociological Review*, 79: 942-965.
- Gahan, P., & Pekarek, A. (2013). Social Movement Theory, Collective Action Frames and Union Theory: A Critique and Extension. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 51: 754-776.
- Gray, B., & Kish-Gephart, J. J. (2013). Encountering social class differences at work: How "class work" perpetuates inequality. *Academy of Management Review*, 38: 670-699.
- Greer, I., & Hauptmeier, M. (2008). Political Entrepreneurship and Co-Managers: Labour transnationalism at four multinational auto companies. *British Journal of Industrial relations*, 46: 76-97.
- Håkansson, K., & Isidorsson, T. (2012). Work organizational outcomes of the use of temporary agency workers. *Organization Studies*, 33: 487-505.
- Heery, E. (2009). Trade unions and contingent labour: scale and method. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 2: 429-442.
- Helfen, M. (2015). Institutionalizing precariousness? The politics of boundary work in legalizing agency work in Germany, 1949–2004. *Organization Studies*, 36: 1387-1422.
- Helfen, M. & Fichter, M. (2013). Building transnational union networks across global production networks: Conceptualising a new arena of labour-management relations. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 51(3): 553-576.
- Jackson, G., & Müllenborn, T. (2012). Understanding the role of institutions in Industrial Relations: Perspectives from Classical Sociological Theory. *Industrial relations*, 51: 472-500.
- Lawrence, T. B., Leca, B., & Zilber, T.A. (2013). Institutional work: Current research, new directions and overlooked issues. *Organization Studies*, 34: 1023-1033.
- Marchington, M., Grimshaw, D., Rubery, J., & Willmott, H. (2005). *Fragmenting Work. Blurring Organizational Boundaries and Disordering Hierarchies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maurice, M., Sorge, A. & Warner, M. (1980). Societal differences in organizing manufacturing units: A comparison of France, West Germany, and Great Britain. *Organization Studies*, 1: 59-86.
- Stainback, K., Tomaskovic, D., & Skaggs, S. (2010). Organizational approaches to inequality: Inertia, relative power, and environments. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36: 225-247.
- Streeck, W. (1981). Competition and monopoly in interest representation: A comparative analysis of trade union structure in the railway industries of Great Britain and Germany. *Organization Studies*, 2: 307-330.
- Spicer, A., & Böhm, S. (2007). Moving management: Theorizing struggles against the hegemony of management. *Organization Studies*, 28, 1667-1698.
- Tapia, M., Ibsen, C.L. & Kochan, T.A. (2015). Mapping the frontier of theory in industrial relations. The contested role of worker representation. *Socio-Economic Review*, 13: 157-184.
- Vaara, E., & Whittington, R. (2012). Strategy-as-practice: Taking social practices seriously. *Academy of Management Annals*, 6: 285-336.
- Vidal, M., Adler, P., & Delbridge, R (2015). When Organization Studies Turns to Societal Problems: The Contribution of Marxist Grand Theory. *Organization Studies* 36: 405-422.
- Weil, D. (2014): *The fissured workplace. Why work became so bad for so many and what can be done to improve it*. Harvard: Cambridge.
- Williams, S., Abbott, B., & Heery, E. (2011). Civil regulations and HRM. The impact of civil society organizations on the policies and practices of employers. *Human Resource Management*, 21: 45-59.

Further inquiries: markus.helfen@fu-berlin.de and andreas.pekarek@unimelb.edu.au.
 For information about EGOS: http://www.egosnet.org/2017_copenhagen/

Call for Papers

Echoes of an Era -- A Century of Organisational Studies

Hundred years ago, Henri Fayols “Administration Industrielle et Générale”, a milestone in the history of organizational thought, was published. This centenary motivates the editors of the *management revue* to launch a stream on the history of sciences of the organisation. In the forthcoming volumes, and rather on an infrequent basis, we would like to publish contributions which not only introduce the reader to one or several, interrelated seminal works of organizational theory, but also provide accompanying commentaries and an analysis of their history of effects.

The reason for this format is, given our discipline’s forgetfulness of history, to provide orientation, which not only serves teaching and young management scholars. While reference to classic thought contributes to scientific advancement in other fields of the social sciences, in our field some research issues are being addressed over and over again – without putting the associated arguments and findings in an adequate historical context. In this respect, addressing the history of thought should be understood as a contribution to the advancement of management research.

We would like to avoid a strict delimitation of the era being addressed. Contributions on contemporaries of Fayol like Frederik Winston Taylor, Frank B. and Lillian Gilbreth or Henry L. Gantt und Karol Adamiecki are as welcome as contributions are on Fayol’s predecessors or successors. By no means we are exclusively committed to the “engineers of the organisation”; economists, legal scholars and particularly the labour science community and psychologists should also be given due attention. A temporal upper boundary shall nevertheless be the 1970s, when, most notably induced by Alfred D. Chandler, strategic management and the reflection on it started to thrive.

This stream will open to submissions until the end of 2017 in the first place. It will be maintained and edited by Wenzel Matiaske (HSU/Hamburg). Submissions may accord with the formatting guidelines of the *management revue* and may be uploaded to our submission system.

Looking forward to your contribution.

Wenzel Matiaske

matiaske@hsu-hh.de