

The short overview of the labour process perspective and history of the International Labour Process Conference

Chris Smith School of Management, Royal Holloway, University of London

Background

Over the past 25 years, the International Labour Process Conference has earned its reputation as a cornerstone of insightful empirical research and cutting edge theoretical debate within the labour process and work organization tradition. Indeed it is hard to imagine contemporary radical research which is not influenced by labour process insights.

Every year, the conference brings together academics and policy makers from the sociology of work and employment, business and management studies, human resource management, industrial relations, organizational analysis and a range of other disciplines to discuss and critically assess developments in work organization, present their research and stimulate debate, collaboration and publication.

With so many new faces joining us this year, we thought it would be appropriate to give a bit of background to the conference.

The conference started in the UK, and the first conference was at UMIST (now part of the University of Manchester) in 1983, when 129 participants heard 16 papers, in 2 streams and 2 plenary sessions. At that point, all participants were from UK universities, making the content of the conference a very British affair. However by the 7th conference held again in Manchester in 1989, nearly 50% of the papers were by non-British presenters. Over the years around 30-40% of papers given at the conference were by presenters outside of the UK, with participants coming from the US (13 papers in 1990 being the highest number); the Netherlands, Australia, Sweden, Canada, Italy, France, Brazil, Japan, Hong Kong, India and many other countries. It is possible to say that papers have been presented from all continents and many countries, with the greatest and most consistent representation from Europe, Australia, North America and recently Asia; only papers from South America remain quite rare.

The 16 papers presented in 1983 grew to 52 in 1988, peaking at 71 the following year, before declining to 51 in 1992, and then growing again in the mid 1990s – 80 in 1994 and 1995; 88 in 1997 and 2000, before falling back again to 70 in 2001 and then growing again to 100 plus in 2004. The Dublin Conference in 2008 had the greatest number of papers at 160, indicative of the continued vitality of the conference for critical social science and management research.

Initially the conference moved between the universities of Aston (in Birmingham) and UMIST (in Manchester), and for the first 10 years had the snappy title of “Organisation and Control of the Labour Process Annual UMIST/Aston (or Aston/UMIST) Conference”. From 1992 this was shortened to the Labour Process Conference and in 1993 to the International Labour Process Conference when the venue moved away from Manchester and Birmingham, to other cities in the UK -, Blackpool, Edinburgh, Bristol, London and Glasgow – reflecting mobility of the principal organisers – Hugh Willmott, David Knights, Paul Thompson and Chris Smith. Despite the ‘international’ in the title of the conference, venues remained within the UK. It was not until 2004 at the 22nd conference that the venue finally moved outside the UK to Amsterdam. The city was the venue again to celebrate 25

years of the conference in 2007. 2008's location in Dublin marks the firmly international base of ILPC, as hosting the conference away from the UK is will happen on a regular basis going forward.

Please note that bids for hosting future conferences should be given the conference organisers.

The conference started 9 years after Braverman's *Labor and Monopoly Capital (LMC)* appeared, and was organised in Business and Management Schools, which would have been a surprise to Braverman, given the trenchant critique of American management science in the book. The ILPC adopted a more sociological and industrial relations focus, as opposed to early responses to *LMC* which had been dominated by economists. The business school context reflected peculiarities of the social science labour market in the UK, as sociologists moved into management and business schools as this area expanded throughout the 1980s and 1990s. In fact much critical research on work and employment relations, building on labour process theory, has taken place in management schools in the UK.

To-day there is a growing audience for these debates, adding to the strong collective of researchers who have been associated with the organisation of the conference or developing Labour Process Theory for many years.

It is clear that ILPC has moved a long way from its initial focus on Braverman with some key turns and twists along the way.

Labour Process Theory

Labor and Monopoly Capital cast a long shadow over debates on the nature of work in the late twentieth and early twenty first centuries. From the late 1970s a debate around the issue of the 'labour process' in capitalist society developed in many, but especially English-speaking, countries (Thompson and Smith 2000). The 'labour process' perspective on the ordering of work suggests that managerial action is chiefly motivated by capital-labour relations, by strategies of employers and their agents to try and control and stabilise the 'unruly' element/factor of production, namely living labour. The indeterminacy of labour is due to the fact that the employer buys a mere capacity to work when a worker is hired; an embodied capacity that walks into and out of the workplace, and must be managed with consent. Management must control or manage this capacity, and control is the *raison d'être* of management, the only reason it functions as a separate category of authority representing the global function of capital; otherwise it would just be another category or labour to be hired like other skilled workers.

Labour process analysis carries through inequality from market relations into capital-labour relations in the workplace, and suggests that the dynamic of this unequal social relationship both limit, condition and drive the structuring work. The evolution of management thought, especially around the arrangements of production, is said to follow the evolution of labour organisation, with increasing sophistication, education and expectations of work challenging employers to develop ever more sophisticated control techniques and practices to maintain their power in the employment relationship.

Reactions to *Labor and Monopoly Capital* passed through difference phases, from political/socialist commentary by Marxist writers, to academic engagement by those both sympathetic to Braverman's Marxist epistemology, and those hostile to it and

concerned to narrow the focus of debate to limited areas such as the nature of skill acquisition and disposal. Continued treatment of *LMC* as a 'text', - frozen with Braverman's premature death and consequent inability to respond to critics and develop his argument through debate - was only heightened when labour process analysis in some countries (notably Britain) came under the sway of discourse analysis, and produced highly abstract and rarefied commentaries far removed from Braverman's desire to link the practical experience of those working for capitalism with a grounded political theory of the dynamics of the system. The 'text' has been depoliticised because the author was removed from the field of debate and response, and *Labor and Monopoly Capital* became simultaneously an icon for the faithful to seize and critics to deprecate. Constructive developments within a labour process tradition, which acknowledge Braverman's contribution and seek to develop the methodology or theory, are more than outnumbered by those who pay lip service to situating the text, and codify it into a few clichés and use Braverman as a straw-figure who can't answer back.

Within academic circles *Labor and Monopoly Capital* has influenced a great variety of disciplines, such as labour history, labour economics, economic history, industrial relations, industrial sociology, industrial geography and organisational theory. Within a radical political contest of worker and student protests in the late 1960s and early 1970s, an interest in Marxist writing developed. Braverman was important in using Marx's work, especially *Capital Volume 1*, to shift attention away from regulation, crisis and collapse of capitalism at the systemic level, towards more micro patterns of structural conflict within the workplace itself. Braverman led the way too more sustained theoretical interrogation of Marx's discussion of the capitalist labour process, which French, British and US economists, historians and sociologists developed (see Thompson and Smith 2000).

In the United States initial evaluation was carried by historians and labour economists (see Zimbalist 1979; Edwards, 1979). These writers aimed to recast the evolution of management thought through the prism of labour-capital conflict over control of the labour process. The most significant Marxist sociologist of the labour process - an influential theorist and ethnographic researcher - was Michael Burawoy. *Manufacturing Consent* appeared in 1979 based on his PhD of ethnography of life inside a Chicago machine shop - the same company which the famous industrial sociologist Donald Roy had researched 30 years earlier. Roy had produced an analysis of the rationality of workers shop floor behaviour that buried the patronising view of workers in the Human Relations approach which assumed workers restricted output for emotional or irrational reasons. *Manufacturing Consent* is partly a dialogue with Roy, but principally with Marx, Braverman, and other theorists of labour markets and labour processes. It is in the best traditions of single case studies - theoretically embedded and creative - seeking analytical interrogations of the shortcomings of both Marx's (and Braverman) understanding of life inside the large modern unionised, corporation with strong internal labour markets and a labour process where winning workers consent not managing through coercion was required.

Michael Burawoy's other key text on the labour process was from the same era - *The Politics of Production*, published in 1985, but already flagged as forthcoming in his 1979 *Manufacturing Consent* book, and therefore needs to read as coming from the same period of thinking about and researching production relations. *The Politics of Production* looks at the conditions under which consent and coercion are produced. Consent was strong at firms like Geer/Allied (his case study company for *Manufacturing Consent*) because these were unionised factories with strong internal labour markets, collective bargaining and an 'internal state' of consent and

compromise between labour and capital in a wider American economy of dominant monopoly capital. Such conditions created '*hegemonic production politics*' or '*factory regimes*' - evident at Geer, with workers activity producing through shop floor games the conditions for their continued economic oppression. This was contrasted to *despotic regimes* - where welfare, unions, and internal labour markets were absent, thus increasing workers dependence of a wages, which were difficult to stabilise due to competitive labour markets. In broad terms Michael Burawoy open access to comparative labour process research, and the linkages between factory regimes and societal and market conditions. In *The Politics of Production* he could draw from his earlier empirical work in Zambian mining, and in later work he worked on the Shop Floor in Hungary to gain insight into labour processes in a then command economy.

In the UK industrial sociologists in the 1970s and early 1980s, (Nichols and Beynon 1977; Nichols 1980; Thompson 1983; Littler 1982) found theoretical coherence through Braverman's work and the wave of American writing reacting to it. Industrial relations writers in the UK (Kelly 1982; Wood 1982, 1989; Edwards 1986) recast the nature of conflict, the role of skilled labour and other themes through reaction and response to *Labor and Monopoly Capital*. Economists in the UK (for example Friedman 1977, but also Jill Rubery), made connections between labour market, product market and labour process restructuring, which in other countries (notably France) produced theories of capitalist 'regulation' informed by crisis and transition between different labour process 'regimes'. Later, organisational theorists entered and almost monopolised ownership over 'the labour process' debate through the International Labour Process Conference which produced a stream of edited volumes on different aspects of the 'labour process', including, job design, management strategies, gender, technology, white-collar work, skill, quality, theory, Japanisation, and flexible work - see the list below.

In Japan, *Labor and Monopoly Capital* fed critical debates on the nature of work which tended to expose the American base of Braverman's assumptions, and the very different reactions and construction of scientific management and workplace struggles in Japan. Although more recent work has supported the conclusion that scientific management has had a significant impact in Japan (Tsutsui 1998). In continental Europe, German engagement with the work in the early 1980s also quickly amplified its US stereotypes on skill destruction, which made little sense in the strongly institutionalised craft apprenticeship system in German manufacturing (Lane 1989)

Therefore comparatively Braverman's message of 'work degradation' fitted some societies better than others. But even in countries with intrinsic craft apprenticeship systems and an abundance of skilled labour, such as German speaking countries, writers have confirmed parts of Braverman's thesis of 'skill polarisation' or bifurcation, and uncovered within the firm, managers committed to rationalising work through skill substitution as well as skill upgrading (Altmann *et al* 1992).

Nevertheless the lack of a general fit between the degradation of work thesis and particular societies reveals one important limitation of Braverman's thesis, namely coupling to *capitalism* a universal division of labour which is more properly anchored to particular institutions - occupational and training systems. More generally, it can be said that *Labor and Monopoly Capital* undervalued the way the 'labour process' is embedded within socio-cultural contexts which lay out differing ways of putting together the employment relationship. There is one footnote concerning Japan in the work, and writing at a time of unquestioned hegemony of US capitalism, it is not

surprising that Braverman did not give sufficient attention different *national* ways of putting the labour process together.

Post-Braverman continuity

Themes taken up in the post-Braverman debate on the labour process and through the ILPC over the years have been the continuing variety between capitalist societies in the formal systems of skill acquisition and discharge. There continues to be an interrogation into Braverman's understanding of skill, and the underestimation of the role played by 'tacit' skills, which can be necessary for the most formally unskilled activities, and provide workers with some basis of resistance or non-compliance to control the demands of management. Skills can also be tied to workers gender or humanity, in the form of 'emotional labour' - ways of looking, feeling or servicing capital in particular ways which are not necessarily part of a formalised training structure. Writers, such as Hochschild (1983) developed labour process analysis indirectly by focusing on the negative consequences for workers mental health and sense of self in servicing employers in ways which compromise their identity as individuals. Braverman anticipated much of this development in his discussion of the shift towards mass service industries, where household and other activities become subject to disciplinary and rationalising pressures of scientific management and involve subjecting the identity of the worker to prescribed ways of being and performing.

Another theme of criticism relates to Braverman's treatment of scientific management and Taylorism as though it was the last word in management theories of work organisation. Debates on the nature of work from the early 1980s are particularly associated with the rise of Japanese economy on a international scale, (together with powerful continental European economies, such as the German) and deal in *post-Taylorist* neologisms, such as 'flexible specialisation' or 'innovation-mediated production' or 'lean production' where old craft or new skill structures are forged. Ideologically, these ideas suggest a break from 'deskilling', although empirical evidence of such a move remains less convincing (see Thompson 1989). More recently the ideas of 'creative industries' or the 'knowledge economy' have been suggested as some form of paradigmatic break on old capitalism – for a critique see Thompson et al 2000.

Part of a labour process perspective directly given by Braverman's methodology is to look 'behind' the claims of formal classifications and espoused management paradigms and this still informs contemporary debates about a supposed break from Taylorism.

A major attack on *Labor and Monopoly Capital* relates to the focus in the book on the 'objective' features of skill, class and occupational structures, which neglect the theme of *consciousness*. Braverman justified this in terms of priorities; he thought there needed to be an understanding of the structural operations of the labour market and labour process, prior to understanding collective or class perceptions. His view of 'subjectivity' is through the idea of class consciousness, an historical class acting for itself. Two points of criticism occur: (1) attacking this orthodox Marxist view of class structure preceding class consciousness, and (2) rejecting limiting consciousness to class - as gender, race, occupation or national identity can form significant bases of action. Burawoy (1979) developed a critique of the first by demonstrating how worker's use work as a space for ingenuity, games, forms of resistance which, while not challenging capitalism as a class do offer ways of mediating and modifying managerial controls, while simultaneously reproducing capitalist production values. Inserting social action into labour process would have been welcomed by Braverman,

who sought not to belittle or play down worker's capacity for struggle over their economic returns and dignity in the labour process, but rather highlighted the limited effect such struggles have in preventing capitalism transforming jobs into routine activities.

The rise of the 'labour process' perspective on management and the organisation of work, particularly in English-speaking countries, owes a considerable debt to Harry Braverman. His premature death distorted development of the various hypotheses on the direction of work as, quite simply, the prime mover of the approach was not around to debate and progress his arguments through the normal avenues of active political and intellectual discourse. Too much time was wasted second guessing, speaking for and against *Labor and Monopoly Capital*, and too little on building upon and moving on from the text. The positive feature of continued research within a labour process perspective reflected in papers presented to the ILPC over the years has been to fill in gaps in Braverman's analysis, while retaining much of his critical response to new managerialism.

Themes of the Conference

The ILPC usually has 5-6 streams, and these take the form of standing or regular themes (trade unions, labour process theory, management strategies for example); and new or contingent themes that reflect particular trends and fashions in management and business practice, or special moments, such as the collapse of state socialist regimes across Eastern Europe and Russia or the rise of Japan in the 1980s and diffusion of Japanese labour process systems.

Some conference themes reflect trends in the development of capitalism – such as the expansion of the service sector in Western economies or the emergence of new ways of delivering work processes such as the growth of Call Centres. Other contemporary processes are the movement towards *team-based* forms of working; or the greater stress on management of *quality* in work and labour processes. Standing themes have been streams on gender, trade unions, collectivism, resistance and management strategies in the workplace. Developments in global capitalism – such as the integration of China into the world economy; the collapse of state socialism in Eastern Europe and Russia, the rise of Japan as a rival model of capitalism – with different firm, labour organisation and production regimes – also figured prominently in papers at the Conference in the 1980s and 1990s.

New technologies, especially ICTs have created new ways of intensifying work, and have figured in streams at the conference. New (and in many cases old) ways of contracting between labour and capital – shorter term contracts with differing temporal attachments – have developed over the last decade or so and generated debates around contingent or flexible labour or the disintegration of the bureaucratic firm which have been prominent in conference papers. Areas of work previously the preserve of fee-based autonomous professionals or petty employers – such as the work of accountants or engineers – have been transformed and seen occupations in these areas pulled into more concentrated labour processes through the dynamic of capitalist concentration, rationalisation and expansion. This has created new categories of waged or salaried labour, and featured in papers over the last two decades, as has the *embodied* nature of labour power, and emotions, fun and gaming that takes place within the workplace.

Papers to the conference have been overwhelmingly empirically based, with case study methods more heavily used compared with surveys or other quantitative approaches. The single or multiple case study methodology has been a fruitful

research vehicle to uncover the dynamics within capital-labour relations within the workplace. Whereas Braverman relied on secondary sources and survey data, as well as reflexively interrogating his direct and varied work experience and knowledge of occupational and technological change, papers to the conference have been more narrowly empirically based and embedded within the case study method. The danger of this methodology are the usual ones of generalisability of cases; the neglect of wider political economic forces that externally shape work outside the case at hand and the absence of bridges between production relations and exchange, circulation and realisation. The strengths of the approach, on the other hand are in getting inside labour processes and seeing work in capitalism through the perspectives of actors producing real work relations.

The conference has chosen to publish selections of papers through themed edited volumes and there have been 19 books published from papers presented at the conference over the last two decades. Many papers have found their way into journals (especially *Work, Employment and Society*), with some in special issues, but the majority of conference papers have appeared through the normal course of journal production. In this way the conference has provided a continuous stream of publications disseminating labour process ideas and research and strengthening the value of the paradigm for understanding the nature of work today.

Labour Process Book Series

Nineteen volumes of papers produced from or inspired by the conference. It has never been the practice to simply collect together the best papers and publish them, but rather to organise volumes by theme.

The series has been characterised by a number of phases and arrangements with a number of publishers:

Phase 1: 1985-8, Gower

Series Title: Studies in the Labour Process.

General Editors: David Knights and Hugh Willmott

D. Knights, H. Willmott and D. Collinson, (eds, 1985) **Job Redesign: Critical Perspectives on the Labour Process.**

D. Knights and H. Willmott (eds, 1986) **Gender and the Labour Process.**

D. Knights and H. Willmott (eds, 1986) **Managing the Labour Process.**

Phase 2: 1988-91, Macmillan

Series Title: Studies in the Labour Process.

General Editors: David Knights and Hugh Willmott

D. Knights and H. Willmott (eds, 1988) **New Technology and the Labour Process.**

D. Knights and H. Willmott (eds, 1989) **Labour Process Theory.**

C. Smith, D. Knights and H. Willmott (eds, 1991) **White Collar Work: The Non-Manual Labour Process.**

Phase 3: 1992- 7, Routledge

Series Title: Critical Perspectives on Work and Organization.

General Editors: David Knights, Chris Smith, Paul Thompson and Hugh Willmott

C Smith and P. Thompson (eds, 1992) **Labour in Transition**.
A. Sturdy, D. Knights, H. Willmott (eds, 1992) **Skill and Consent**.
J. Jermier., W. Nord and D. Knights (eds, 1994) **Resistance and Power in the Workplace**.
T. Elger and C. Smith (eds. 1994) **Global Japanisation**.
A. Wilkinson and H. Willmott (eds, 1994) **Making Quality Critical**.
P. Ackers, C. Smith and P. Smith (eds, 1996) **The New Workplace and Trade Unionism**.

Phase 4: 1998-current, Macmillan/Palgrave
Series Title: Critical Perspectives on Work and Organization.
General Editors: David Knights, Chris Smith, Paul Thompson and Hugh Willmott

P. Thompson and C. Warhurst (eds,1998) **Workplaces of the Future**, London, Macmillan.
A. Felstead and N. Jewson (eds, 1999) **Global Trends in Flexible Labour**.
C. Prichard, R. Hull, M. Chumer and H. Willmott (eds, 2000) **Managing Knowledge: Critical Investigations of Work and Learning**, London, Macmillan.
A. Sturdy, I. Grugulis and H. Willmott (eds. 2001) **Customer Service: Empowerment and Entrapment**, London: Palgrave.
C. Warhurst, E. Keep, and I. Grugulis (eds. 2004) **The Skills That Matter**, London: Palgrave.
B. Harley, J. Hyman and P. Thompson and (eds. 2005) **Participation and Democracy at Work: Essays in Honour of Harvie Ramsay**, London: Palgrave.

Chris Warhurst, Doris Ruth Eikhof and Axel Haunschild (eds. 2008) **Work Less, Live More**, London: Palgrave.

Under the current relationship with Palgrave, the goal is to publish a minimum of one themed volume a year, to be drawn predominantly from papers or authors connected to the conference, and to be launched at and with the resource support of the conference. Additional volumes may be published with a less direct relationship to the conference.

New books for 2009 are:

A. McKinlay and C. Smith (eds.) **Creative Labour: Working in Creative Industries**

Sharon C. Bolton & Maeve Houlihan (eds.) **Work Matters: Critical Reflections on Contemporary Work**

Annotated references

Altmann, N., Kohler, C. and Meil, P. (eds.) (1992) *Technology and Work in German Industry*, London: Routledge. (A useful account of the theoretical and practical critique of Taylorism from one branch of German industrial sociology. Revealing for

its more pragmatic and theoretically broader engagement with work relative to US and British academic interventions).

Burawoy, M. (1979) *Manufacturing Consent*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Participant observation study on piece working on the shop floor, building on classical studies of piece working culture and patterns of managerial indulgence towards workplace informality. It examines the construction of consent through the use of games, misbehaviour and informal rules of workers 'making out' to gain autonomy. Rich in detail and interpretation, an influential 'inside' account of male shop floor culture).

Burawoy, M. (1985) *The Politics of Production*, London: Verso (Extending his sympathetic critique of Braverman on the different role of ideology, politics and subjective experiences at in production relations, Burawoy continues within the *Manufacturing Consent* theoretical framework, but expands the idea of political regimes within production, and illustrates different forms of political regimes, from early competitive capitalism, to monopoly capitalism, state socialism and post-colonial states. The book remains a key reference for interrogating the interactions between society and labour processes.]

Edwards, R. (1979) *Contested Terrain: The Transformation of the Workplace in the Twentieth Century*, London: Heinemann. (A useful integration of labour process and labour market theory, which overviews the evolution of different management control techniques - personal, bureaucratic and technical - in US industry in the twentieth century. Stresses the manner in which control evolves through contradiction brought about by worker resistance.)

Edwards, P. (1986) *Conflict at Work*, Oxford: Blackwell. (Theoretically rewarding, Edwards develops a materialist non-Marxist interpretation of conflict within the workplace, with interesting discussion on the institutional structuring of work, and the comparative formation of work cultures and their impact on labour process struggles).

Friedman, A. F. (1977) *Industry and Labour*, London: Macmillan. (Early and influential elaboration of labour process theory based on economic histories of two industrial sectors in Britain, hosiery and cars. He suggests that through the expansion of internal labour markets, job tenure and trade union organisation amongst unskilled workers in large scale industry, management were forced to develop more normative or consensual control strategies around what Friedman terms 'responsible autonomy').

Hochschild, A. R. (1983) *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*, Berkeley: University of California Press. (A path breaking account of the development and consequence of the intervention of systematic management for the prescription of workers' behaviour and action in service sector employment)

Jurgens, U., Malsch, T. and K. Dohse (1993) *Breaking from Taylorism: Changing Forms of Work in the Automobile Industry*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (An in-depth analysis of the country, company and plant effects on the organisation of work in the auto industry under new conditions of competition created by Japanese car producers, especially Toyota. A nuanced account of the evolution of work under the influences of national and international pressures)

Kelly, J. (1982) *Scientific Management, Job Design and Work Performance*, London: Academic Press (A sophisticated analysis of the influences of product and

labour markets on the redesign of work, suggesting that the labour process should not be privileged as an explanatory force, rather changes in production reflect the diverse effects of the interaction of products markets, labour markets and production processes.)

Lane, C. (1989) *Management and Labour in Europe*, Edward Elgar: Aldershot. (A useful overview of the different employment and training systems in Britain, France and Germany, and how these mediate and differentiate the nature and experience of capitalist rationalisation)

Littler, C. R. (1982) *The Development of the Labour Process in Capitalist Societies*, London: Heinemann. (Useful for advancing labour process theory, especially by separating the procedures and processes around the systematisation of the recruitment and selection of labour and its bureaucratic organisation in production; and in highlighting the national peculiarities to the evolution of managerial regimes in the US, Britain and Japan.)

Marx, K (1867) *Capital*, vol. 1, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976 (Marx's theory of the labour process is explained here in specific chapters. It is also embedded in others which explore the structure of social relations in modern industry, the role of machinery and struggles between workers and employers over the length of the working day.)

Nichols, T. and H. Beynon (1977) *Living with Capitalism*, London: Routledge. (A Marxist account of work relations and experience inside a chemical company which drew considerable inspiration from LMC)

Nichols, T. (ed.) (1980) *Capital and Labour: Studies in the Capitalist Labour Process*, London: Fontana (A largely pessimistic collection of essays on the oppression of workers under different forms of capitalism from the first wave of reaction to LMC in Britain, linked by excellent introductions from the editor)

Thompson, P. (1983, 1989, 2nd Edition) *The Nature of Work: An Introduction to Debates on the Labour Process*, London: Macmillan. (Thompson examines key themes which Braverman neglected or under-stated, such as resistance at work, consent in the employment relationship and gender relations. The 2nd edition also evaluates post-Taylorist debates that hinge around the idea of flexible manufacturing and working.)

Thompson, P. and Warhurst C. (eds) (1998) *Workplaces of the Future*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Business. (Good application of labour process theory to critique new trends, such as the 'knowledge economy'.)

Thompson, P. and Smith, C. (2000/01) 'Follow the Redbrick Road: Reflections on Pathways in and out of the Labour Process Debate' *International Studies in Management and Organisation* 2001, 30, 4: 40–67. (Assesses the theoretical disputes within the UK labour process debates between materialist/realist and post-structuralist positions.)

Thompson, P., Warhurst, C., & Callaghan, G. (2000) 'Human capital or capitalising on humanity? Knowledge, skills and competencies in interactive service work' in Pritchard, C., Hull, R., Chumer, M., & Willmott, H. Eds *Managing Knowledge: Critical Investigations of Work and Learning*. Macmillan. (Good critique of the 'knowledge economy' concept)

Tsutsui, W. M. (1998) *Manufacturing Ideology: Scientific Management in Twentieth-Century Japan*, Princeton: University of Princeton Press. (Marshalls historical evidence to show that the alleged opposition between Japanese-style management and Taylorism is incorrect, rather Japanese firms borrowed heavily from the US, while making minor adaptations within a strongly Taylorite agenda in which work organisation was controlled by management not labour with limited opposition to the spread of this ideology.)

Wood, S. (ed.) (1982) *The Degradation of Work? Skill, Deskilling and the Labour Process*, London: Hutchinson. (An early British critical reaction to Braverman, with useful chapters on gender, consent, skill (several) and managerial strategies.)

Wood, S. (ed.) (1989) *The Transformation of Work? Skill, Flexibility and the Labour Process*, London: Unwin Hyman. (Ostensibly a new edition of Wood's earlier collection, this reader indicates the pace of change within the debate, revealing more attention to diverse internationalisation projects, through attention to Japan and Sweden, and the new theme of flexibility which emerged in the mid-1980s).

Zimbalist, A. (ed.) (1979) *Case Studies on the Labor Process*, New York: Monthly Review Press. (An early American example of a case study reader, with a strong labour history bent. Worth reading for the seminal chapter by David Noble, which, using a detailed history of the development of numerical controlled machine tools, argues the case for managerial control rather than cost or efficiency as the motive force behind technological innovation.)