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Base Factors

Social Unrest:

- Poverty – Economic hardships
- Physical hardships
- Poor health and sanitation – malnutrition / disease
- Inequalities - Limited education
- Labour’s resistance to authoritarian leadership
ROYAL COMMISSION- MOYNE COMMISSION (1938)

- To promote industrial peace
- To regulate relations between workers, trade unions and employers
- To assist and advice trade unions and employers
- To protect the interest of workers
MOYNE COMMISSION AND STATUS OF TRADE UNIONS

It allowed for third party involvement through

a) collaboration
b) negotiation
c) mediation/ conciliation
d) arbitration

Created the basis for the legal establishment of trade unions 1919-1950
– voting rights
TRADE UNION DEVELOPMENT IN BRITAIN

Trade unions originated in Britain during the nineteenth century as organizations of generally skilled craft-workers who sought to use their collective power to maintain control over pay and labour conditions.

Early trade unions in Britain did not represent a workforce that had been increasingly exploited labour under capitalism.

Union organization developed in the 1880’s as a means of maintaining craft control, and of regulating the terms and conditions of the trade - primarily associations of internal contractors.

A major function of these early trade unions was to provide their skilled craft-worker members with ‘friendly benefits’ such as unemployment and sick pay.

These workers aimed to defend and maintain their customary working practices and pay rates - to remove unilateral regulation of their conditions of employment.
From the 1860s onwards, trade unionism began to take root in industries such as coal mining and the railways.

1880s, and 1910s, influential / prominent leaders with a socialist outlook, led to increasing numbers of semi- and unskilled workers became organized.

1880 – 1920 saw major expansion of trade unionism in Britain with the development of ‘general’ unions, in industries such as the docks, transport, and gas.

Trade union membership declined markedly between 1920s and 1930s as a direct result of Economic recession, that led to mass unemployment.

Union power and influence was eroded by assertive anti-unionism characteristic of many employers.
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN IR AND HR

- IR is essentially collectivist and pluralist in outlook - deals with relations between employers and unions, unions / employers / State, which predicates that the outcomes are standardized rules and procedures.

- Central features of an IR system - freedom of association, collective bargaining, right to strike, trade unionism, dispute settlement and worker participation in management through union participation.

- Central features of HRM:
  a) Does not encompass a third party (the State)
  b) Is bipartite - essentially individual focused - selection and recruitment, induction, appraisal, development and training, leadership and motivation, retention of staff through intrinsic and extrinsic rewards.
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN IR AND HR

1. HRM appears to have little to do with industrial relations; rather it is the pursuit of competitive advantage in the market place
   – Provision high quality goods and services
   – Productivity
   – Research and Development

2. HRM policies and practices, would appear to be essentially unitary and individualistic in contrast to the more pluralist and collective values of traditional industrial relations.

3. IR consists of a large component of rules set by the State through laws, by the parties involved through negotiated agreements, or by courts or tribunals.

4. HRM deals less with rules than with policies and practices designed to maximize organizational integration, employee commitment, flexibility and quality of work.
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN IR AND HR

5 HRM is the management of human resources rather than collective relations, and is therefore enterprise focused.

6 HRM involves the individualization of the employment relationship, whereas participation in IR involves unions rather than individuals directly.

- Potential point of conflict between employers and unions and between HRM and IR - is the employee loyalty and commitment

7 The individualization thrust of HRM is more suited to the aspirations of knowledge workers rather than the rule-bound,

- Part-time, home workers, contract workers - do not fit the traditional IR models developed in an age of mass production.
IR considers the mass rather than the individual
In IR pay determination has traditionally been on criteria different to objectives sought to be achieved by HRM
IR seeks to reconcile conflict; HRM to match goals
In IR communication with employees is through unions; in HRM it is not necessarily so.
IR has traditionally promoted standardization, whereas HRM is more concerned with flexibility