Despite the growing internationalization of economies, there remains substantial cross-national variation in the environment and practice of industrial relations and human resource management (IR&HRM). This course is designed to provide students with: (1) a general understanding of and sensitivity to this variation, primarily as it applies to IR&HRM, but also as it applies to the business systems in which IR&HRM are embedded, (2) a working knowledge of the IR&HRM institutions, policies, and processes specific to selected individual countries, (3) a familiarity with current developments in IR&HRM as they vary across nations, and (4) a deeper understanding of IR&HRM as a set of practices with strategic implications for both firms and nations. The course proceeds in three main stages, although the third stage may be skipped if time is short:

(1) an introduction to various themes and debates pertaining to comparative IR/HRM and national business systems.

(2) an in-depth analysis of five developed nations (the U.S., Britain, Germany, Japan, Sweden).

(3) a consideration of selected topics and issues relevant to comparative IR/HRM (e.g., developing nations, globalization and labour standards)

**Materials:**
Readings package (book store)

**Requirements:**

| Term paper (see attached) | = 40% |
| Tests (5 X 10 X 1.2) | = 60% |

The tests are tentatively scheduled for Sept. 19, Oct. 8, Oct. 24, Nov. 19, and Dec. 5. They will *normally* consist of one essay question drawn from the attached study questions, and of 5 multiple choice questions drawn from all material covered since the preceding test. Each will be 30 minutes long, followed by a regular lecture. Students who miss a test will normally be allowed to write a make-up, provided that they have a valid reason for missing the test and have notified me of this reason either before the test or as soon as reasonably possible after. Make-ups for tests 1 through 4 are tentatively scheduled for November 28, at 3:00, in Drake 663; make ups for test 5 are tentatively scheduled for the Asper school deferred exam date (TBA). Because make-ups are written under different conditions, they *may* be assigned a lower weighting. Also see "test guidelines" below.
Pedagogy:

This course adopts a broader perspective than most courses in this area. There is no single book that adequately covers the subject matter from this perspective. Accordingly, the course consists primarily of original lectures. Although these lectures are supplemented by readings, it is critical that students come to class and take good notes.

Students are asked to refrain from using electronic devices during lectures for any purpose other than taking notes, to arrive on time, and to remain until the class is finished. Any student who needs to arrive late or leave early is to please discuss this with me in advance or as soon as possible after the class.

Grading:

Test essay answers will be graded in accordance with a student's ability to convey an understanding as well as knowledge of the relevant subject matter. Answers that include information that is clearly not relevant to the question asked will be docked marks.

Term papers will be graded in accordance with the attached criteria for these papers.

Final grades will generally be as follows: under 50% = F; 50-59% = D; 60-66% = C; 67-69% = C+; 70-76% = B; 77-79% = B+; 80-89% = A; 90-100% = A+. However, poor performance (less than 65%) on either the term paper or the tests may prevent a student from receiving a final grade higher than a C+. Student attendance and in-class contributions, if noticeably good or bad, may also be taken into account when assigning final grades.

My Availability:

I will try to be in my office from 2:30 to 3:30 on Tuesdays and Thursdays and will be available after each class. However, I work far more efficiently in my office at home, and so I can be reached there most of the time when not teaching or in meetings. Students may try me at home (269-1366) between 10:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. from Sunday through Friday. Please do not phone me at home outside of these time periods unless it is urgent. Also, please do not attempt to contact me by e-mail. If I am not in my office and you cannot reach me at home, leave a message on my home voice-mail (269-1366).

Student Services:

Students are encouraged to speak with me should they be experiencing problems that are likely to interfere with their performance in this course. However, they are also encouraged to seek assistance from either Accessibility Services or Counselling Services if needed. For more information, go to http://umanitoba.ca/student/accessibility/ and http://umanitoba.ca/student/counselling/.
OUTLINE

Note: "P" refers to the readings package, available in the university book store.

I. Themes

1) Comparative IR and HRM: Diversity vs. Convergence


2) Framing IR and HRM: An Institutional Environments Approach


II. Key Developed Nations

3) the United States


4) Britain


5) Japan


6) Germany


7) Sweden


III. Selected Topics and Issues

8) IR & HRM in Developing Nations


9) Globalization and Labour Regulation


IV. Review

10) Do Institutions Really Matter, and if so, How?


Test Guidelines

1. Any multiple choice questions addressing statistics will be general, "ball park" questions.

2. Always go with what is in the class notes if the reading is different or the question does not seem to quite fit the notes.

3. You may be asked a portion of a study question; do not assume that you need to know less than what has been covered simply because the material for an entire question is too much to answer in the specified test time.

4. Your essay answer will be graded on your apparent understanding -- simply listing points will not get you a strong grade. You will notice that, on many study questions, I give hints, so that there is less need for memorization.

5. If your answer contains a lot of information not relevant to the answer, you will lose marks. If the grader thinks you have little idea, you may get zero even if you happen to have one or a few correct points.
Term Papers

Due dates: Proposal – October 29
Final Paper – November 26
Reflective essay – any time in exam period.

Content: The proposals are to be no more than a single page (single or double space), including references, and with no cover page. They should include a preliminary title and a brief discussion of the objective of the paper and of the topics to be covered. They should also include at least two academic sources (see below), referenced as per pages 8 and 9 of this outline. These two sources must be in addition to any course readings, textbook sources, or web-site sources, and must have clear application to the paper. If this is not clear from the title of an article, it should be explained in one or two sentences.

The final paper is to be from 3,000 to 3,500 words per author, typed, double spaced, with one-sided printing. Penalties may apply for papers that exceed 3,500 words per author. Students are to hand in two copies. One will be graded and returned; the other will be kept in my files.

To meet a faculty requirement, students must also complete a short “reflective essay” discussing what they learned from doing the paper. This will be no longer than 300 words, and can be submitted any time during exam period. It will be discussed more fully in class.

Topics: Papers must have a comparative IR/HRM focus and should ideally draw on themes or concepts from the course. In general, students may:

(1) compare and attempt to explain similarities and differences between two or more nations with respect to one or more specific aspects of IR/HRM, or

(2) focus on a particular country, but analyse it from a comparative perspective, comparing to another country or other countries where relevant, or

(3) go into greater detail than does the course with respect to a particular topic or theme, either in general (e.g., the role of states) or in a particular country other than Canada (e.g., works councils in Germany), drawing implications for other countries or for IR/HR in general.

Students may consider countries and topics not covered in this course, provided they are relevant to the course and meet with my approval.

Group papers. Although not recommended, students may do group papers. For each additional person, the paper should be roughly 3,000 to 3,500 words longer than otherwise.

Sources. The paper is to involve an original library search and to be based primarily on academic journals and books, as follows:

1. Although this may vary depending on the chosen topic, students should make use of roughly five to ten reputable, reasonably current (e.g., last 5 to 10 years), published academic sources; all academic sources must be obtainable from the University of Manitoba library system. Do NOT rely on non-academic search engines (e.g., Google) for your main sources -- they often yield garbage, and your paper (and grade) will suffer as a consequence.
2. You are discouraged from relying on non-academic sources, such as magazines, newspapers, practitioner periodicals (usually, these have articles of under 10 pages and/or do not contain references), general practitioner-oriented books, encyclopaedias (including Wikipedia), or any sources of questionable objectivity (e.g., the Fraser Institute, the CIA website).

3. Any non-academic sources must be attributable to a reputable institute, agency, or organization and must be properly referenced, so that they can be readily located on the net or elsewhere.

4. You should not rely extensively on class lectures, course readings, textbook sources, unpublished sources, or edited "survey" books (i.e., with separate chapters providing overviews of IR or HR in each of a number of different countries).

5. Unapproved use of material from other courses, students, or private sources will be considered an act of academic dishonesty, as will any of the actions identified on page 15 of this outline.

**Citations.** All papers should include in-text citations. Failure to satisfactorily cite one's sources, so that the reader can tell where your information is from, may substantially affect your grade and even result in rejection of the paper. You should not make any specific factual claims (e.g., "Union density is declining in Germany") without providing a citation, especially if such claims could be contentious. The same goes for any specific arguments drawn from other sources (e.g., "German unions are much weaker than in the 1980s"). If you are drawing extensively from a single source, you can convey this through explicit references to the author (e.g., "According to Smith (1998), the…") or through a footnote (e.g., "This section draws extensively from Smith, 1978."). See page 9 of this outline for examples of how to do citations.

**Bibliographies.** Bibliographies should include only those sources cited in the paper. See pages 9-10 of this outline for examples of how to do bibliographies.

**Footnotes.** Footnotes should be used sparingly, normally to elaborate on a point made in the text of the paper but which, if included in the text, would seem out-of-place.

**Grading.** The proposal will be assessed as a pass, fail, or marginal effort, and this assessment will be used to help determine the overall grade on the paper. In addition, grades will depend on:

1. how clearly the paper is written,
2. how well researched the paper is, including the quality of the sources
3. the ability of students to explain their subject, and
4. the ability of students to organize their paper around a clear theme, issue, or question (e.g., is the German system applicable to Canada?)
5. the ability to display an understanding of one or more themes introduced in this course.

In particular, your paper should tell a "story" or address a particular question or issue of relevance to the course. It should also cohere into a unified whole. Purely descriptive papers, and papers that are disjointed and do not fit together well, will normally not qualify for a good grade.

Students may be docked as much as one mark (out of 40) for each calendar day that their proposal or final paper is late.

Some pointers/over
Some pointers:

1) Papers must have good introductions, addressing what the paper is about, why this is of interest/importance, and how the paper is laid out (i.e., what is addressed and in what order). Introductions should be from half-a-page to a page-and-a-half.

2) The pages (excluding the title page) are to be benumbered.

3) Papers should NOT normally rely on the framework used in class -- although of use for pedagogical purposes, this framework does not lend itself to a coherent or in-depth analysis in a 10-15 page paper.

4) Use sub-headings to guide the reader through the paper, as per all course readings.

5) If the paper is to compare two or more countries, make sure that you are not just describing each in isolation from the other(s) -- you need to actively compare, referring back and forth as you go.

6) Be careful on grammar, etc.. If the paper is not of university quality (i.e., minimal errors, typos, etc.), I cannot grant a pass and may reject the paper outright. Avoid the use of point form.

7) All material drawn directly from other sources must be cited. If this material is taken word-for-word, then it must be enclosed in quotations. If it is adapted, with word changes, it is important that this be made clear in a footnote.

8) Papers should have a concluding section summarizing and discussing what you have found.

Suggested Journal Sources: The following does not include all possible quality sources. However, student grades will be positively affected if they draw on articles from one or more of them.

British Journal of Industrial Relations (UK)
Industrial Relations Journal (UK)
Industrial and Labor Relations Review (U.S.)
Industrial Relations (U.S.)
International Journal of Human Resource Management (UK)
Human Resource Management Journal (UK)
Human Resource Management Review (US)
European Journal of Industrial Relations (U.K.)
Socio-Economic Review
Work, Employment, and Society (U.K)
Economic and Industrial Democracy (Sweden)
Relations Industrielles (Canada)
Journal of Industrial Relations (Australia)
International Labour Review
How to do Citations and Bibliographies

Citations belong in the body of the paper, in brackets. Include the author's last name, the year the article or book was published, and the page number(s) in which the specific point you are citing is discussed (unless you are referring to an entire article or book). If you are referring to the author in the text of the paper, then you only need the year and page numbers. If there are two authors, cite both; if more than two, cite only the first, and follow it by "et al". If you are citing two or more separate sources at the same time, divide the cites by a semi-colon.

  e.g., "One study (Smith et al, 1999: 23-25) found that..."
  "Johnson and Smith (1999: 23-25) found that..."
  "Many authors (e.g., Wood, 1999: 12-14; Thomas, 2000: 365-68) argue ..."

In the case of an edited book (i.e., containing articles or chapters written by different authors), you must cite the author of the specific chapter, not the editors of the book.

If the source you are using is published by an organization and there is no identifiable author, then insert the name of the organization.

  e.g., "One study (OECD, 1999: 23-25) found that..."

If the source is a web site, and no author is identified (often you simply need to look carefully for the name), you should cite the name of the organization that operates the web site. If this organization is not named, the information on the site may be unreliable. If you still decide to use it, you should use the name of the website.

  e.g., "One study (European Foundation, 2001) found that..."
  "One study (eiroline, 2001) found that..."

If referring to a source that you have not read but is cited by a source you have read, identify both:

  e.g., "(Smith 2002: 24, cited in Johnson, 2004: 46)"

Bibliographies belong at the end of the paper. They are to include all sources cited in the paper. Do not identify any sources that are not cited as sources in the body of the paper. Sources must be listed alphabetically, by the last name of the author or, if no author, the name of the source cited; the author's last name must go before his/her first name. Examples of the relevant conventions are as follows. Note that papers and chapter titles should be enclosed in quotes; books should be in italics.

  a) a book written by one or a few authors or by an organization:

    Godard, John, and Jay Hamilton, 2000. Industrial Relations, Toronto: Captus
b) an article or chapter in an edited book:


c) an article in a journal:

Wood, Stephen J., and John Godard, 1998. "The Statutory Union Recognition Procedure in the Employment Relations Bill: A Comparative Analysis," *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 213-243. ("no." refers to issue number; but some journals may not use this convention; if this is the case, identify the month or season the issue was published in)

d) an article in a journal or magazine for which no author is identified. (Refrain from using any such sources unless the publication has a strong reputation.)


e) an unpublished article


f) a website article with an identifiable author


g) a website with the name of the organization but not the author


h) a website without the name of an author or organization

Study Questions

NOTE: There may be some changes to these questions as the term progresses. All such changes will be announced in class, normally in the session preceding each test. In any cases where the topics covered in class lectures differ from those identified in the question (e.g., in brackets), follow the class lecture.

Topic 1. Comparative IR/HRM: Diversity vs. Convergence

1-1 Discuss the characteristics associated with "pure" capitalism, their social and economic implications, and the role of historical compromises. Then discuss the reasons for diversity and the two forces for convergence identified in class.

1-2. Discuss the "industrialization” thesis, including the conditions under which it emerged (i.e., the characteristics of the golden age and the virtuous circle), the logic associated with it, and what its assumptions appear to have been.

1-3. Discuss the demise of the golden age, two choices faced by governments (corporatist vs. neoliberal) and why different choices were made, the relative success of each, and the conditions associated with the rise of the globalization thesis.

1-4. Identify and outline the key components and/or arguments associated with the three developments in IR/HRM emergent in the 1980s and 1990s (strategic HRM, flexible employment, and union decline).

1-5. Discuss the cultural and the power resource explanations for variation across nations in IR/HRM, including the limitations to each.

Topic 2. Framing IR and HRM: An Institutional Environments Approach

2-1 Discuss the essential arguments (the importance of rules) underlying the "institutional environments" approach and how they are illustrated by the Varieties of Capitalism thesis.

2-2 Discuss the importance of national policy paradigms and then briefly elaborate on the key components of the neoliberal and democratic corporatist paradigms. Then, discuss the importance of history and institutional norms (including path trajectories).

Topic 3: the United States

3-1. Discuss the social, economic, and political foundations (i.e., formative conditions and norms) of the USA, comparing them where possible to those of northern Europe and then to those of Canada. In roughly 30 words for each, what light do the Hutton, Godard, and Frege and Godard readings shed on this topic?
3-2. Discuss the predominant state paradigm in the USA and the policies associated with it, especially as they pertain to IR&HRM. Then do the same for the predominant state paradigm in Canada.

3-3. Discuss each of the following aspects of the U.S. national IR/HR environment and compare them to Canada's.
   a) constitutive
   b) labour law (discuss history of and similarities only; do not cover differences)
   c) employment laws
   d) labour policies and programs
   e) labour and mgmt organizations and institutions (union goals, density & stres; bargaining; employer orgs)
   f) finance/governance structures
   g) market relations.

3-4. There are a number of differences in U.S. and Canadian labour law with regard to: certification processes, employer rights, the first agreement, strikes, enforcement, and public sector laws. Briefly elaborate on each of these differences and why they are believed to matter, both individually and in combination.

3-5. Discuss and explain (in a few sentences) the predominant behavioural context (mgmt and worker orientations) and predominant IR/HR practices in the U.S. (re collective rep, flex employment, new vs. old HRM, high perf practices). Compare to Canada where applicable.

**Topic 4. Britain**

4-1. Discuss the social and economic foundations of IR/HRM in the U.K.. What light do the Hyman and Jacoby readings shed on this topic?

4-2. The political foundations of the UK system entail traditionally moderate union goals, moderate employer behaviour, and a moderate state, preferring "voluntaristic" solutions. Discuss.

4-3 Discuss the predominant state paradigm in the UK.

4-4. Discuss the following aspects of the U.K. national IR/HR environment and, to the extent possible, explain why they differ from those in the U.S. (if they do) and what they illustrate about the UK in general.
   a) constitutive
   b) labour law (goals, the law, implications in theory, evidence, why?)
   c) employment laws (contracts, discipline, tribunals, min wage, flex working)
   d) labour policies and programs
   e) labour and mgmt organizations and institutions (union goals, density & stres; bargaining; employer orgs)
   f) finance/governance structures
   g) market relations.
4-5. Discuss and explain (in a few sentences) the predominant behavioural context (mgmt and worker orientations) and predominant IR/HR policies and practices in the U.K. (re collective rep, flex employment, new vs. old HRM, high perf practices).

**Topic 5. Japan**

5-1. Discuss the social, economic (industrialization, ownership, post WWII) and political (historical role, post-war compromise) foundations of the Japanese system and to the extent possible their implications for why the Japanese system is different.

5-2. Discuss and to the extent possible explain the Japanese state paradigm and the policies that are associated with it (reg., law, soc programs).

5-3. Discuss each of the following and what they seem to reflect about Japan.
   a) constitutive
   b) labour law
   c) employment laws
   d) labour policies and programs
   e) labour and mgmt organizations and institutions (union goals, density & stres; bargaining; employer orgs)
   f) finance/governance structures
   g) market relations.

5-4. Discuss and explain (in a few sentences) the predominant behavioural context (mgmt strategies/orientations, worker orientations) and predominant HR/IR policies and practices in Japan (re collective rep, flex employment, HR practices, work practices).

5-5. What does the reading by Jacoby suggest about current developments in Japanese IR/HR and how they might differ from, e.g., Canada or the USA.

**Topic 6. Germany**

6-1. Discuss the social, economic, and political foundations of the German system.

6-2. Discuss the German state paradigm and the policies associated with it.

6-3. Discuss the following aspects of the German institutional environment:
   a) constitutive
   b) labour law
   c) employment laws
   d) labour policies and programs
   e) labour and mgmt organizations and institutions (union goals, density & stres; bargaining; employer orgs)
   f) finance/governance structures
   g) market relations.
6-4. Discuss and explain (in a few sentences) the predominant behavioural context (mgmt strategies/orientations, worker orientations) and predominant HR/IR policies and practices in Germany (re collective rep, flex employment, HR practices, work practices).

6-5. Discuss the Finkin reading (P-6c) and how it may explain differences in HRM between Germany and the USA.

**Topic 7. Sweden**

7-1. Although perhaps weakened in recent decades, Sweden can be said to have traditionally been characterized by a social democratic paradigm. Discuss what this means, and then identify some of its economic, social, and political foundations.

7-2. Discuss the following aspects of the IR/HR institutional environment in Sweden:
   a) constitutive
   b) labour law
   c) employment laws
   d) labour policies and programs
   e) labour and mgmt organizations and institutions (union goals, density & stres; bargaining; employer orgs)
   f) finance/governance structures
   g) market relations.

7-3. Discuss and explain (in a few sentences) the predominant behavioural context (mgmt strategies/orientations, worker orientations) and predominant HR/IR policies and practices in Sweden (re collective rep, flex employment, HR practices, work practices).

**Topics 8 to 10**

   to be announced
About Your Professor:

John Godard is a full professor in the Asper School of Business. He holds a PhD from Cornell University and both a B.Comm. (Hons.) and an MBA from the University of Manitoba. His main interest is in labour and employment, with a focus on the nature of the employment relation under alternative institutional conditions and its implications for employer practices and ultimately societal outcomes. He has a particular interest in the realization of democratic values at work, both as an ideal and as a measure of the democratic quality of societies.

John’s work has appeared most often in the British Journal of Industrial Relations (LSE), the Industrial and Labor Relations Review (Cornell), and Industrial Relations (UC Berkeley). However, it has been published in numerous additional outlets, including, in recent years, the American Sociological Review, the Queen’s Law Journal, and the Human Resource Management Journal.

John has also served in a number of professional service capacities, ranging from chief editor of the British Journal of Industrial Relations, to president of the Canadian Industrial Relations Association, to chair of the Minimum Wage Board of Manitoba, to departmental representative in the University of Manitoba Faculty Association.

John’s text, Industrial Relations, the Economy, and Society, is now in its 5th edition. This text adopts a critical approach to the study of industrial relations, and advocates substantial reforms to Canadian labour and employment laws. He believes that these reforms may become increasingly feasible as the era of neoliberal globalization comes to an end, but that much may depend on the intellectual quality of business practitioners and ultimately of business school education. He is passionate about the need to strengthen the latter.
BUREAUCRATIC STUFF

Unclaimed Assignments

Pursuant to the FIPPA Review Committee's approved recommendations as of August 15, 2007, all unclaimed student assignments will become the property of the faculty and will be subject to destruction six months after the completion of any given academic term.

Academic Integrity

It is critical to the reputation of the Faculty of Management and of our degrees that everyone associated with our faculty behave with the highest academic integrity. As the faculty that helps create business and government leaders, we have a special obligation to ensure that our ethical standards are beyond reproach. Any dishonesty in our academic transactions violates this trust. Page 31 of the University of Manitoba General Calendar addresses the issue of academic dishonesty under the heading "Plagiarism and Cheating." Specifically, acts of academic dishonesty include, but are not limited to:

- using the exact words of a published or unpublished author without quotation marks and without referencing the source of these words
- duplicating a table, graph or diagram, in whole or in part, without referencing the source
- paraphrasing the conceptual framework, research design, interpretation, or any other ideas of another person, whether written or verbal (e.g. personal communications, ideas from a verbal presentation) without referencing the source
- copying the answers of another student in any test, examination, or take-home assignment
- providing answers to another student in any test, examination, or take-home assignment
- taking any unauthorized materials into an examination or term test (crib notes)
- impersonating another student or allowing another person to impersonate oneself for the purpose of submitting academic work or writing any test or examination
- stealing or mutilating library materials
- accessing tests prior to the time and date of the sitting
- changing name or answer(s) on a test after that test has been graded and returned
- submitting the same paper or portions thereof for more than one assignment, without discussions with the instructors involved

Group Projects and Group Work

Many courses in the Faculty of Management require group projects. Students should be aware that group projects are subject to the same rules regarding academic dishonesty. Because of the unique nature of group projects, all group members should exercise special care to ensure that the group project does not violate the policy on Academic Integrity. Should a violation occur, group members are jointly accountable unless the violation can be attributed to a specific individual(s).

Some courses, while not requiring group projects, encourage students to work together in groups (or at least do not prohibit it) before submitting individual assignments. Students are encouraged to discuss this issue as it relates to academic integrity with their instructor to avoid violating this policy.

In the Faculty of Management, all suspected cases of academic dishonesty are passed to the Dean's office.
MORE BUREAUCRATIC STUFF

NOTE. The following is included because it is a faculty requirement to do so. Although some of the goals identified will no doubt be served in the process of taking this course, the purpose of this course is to enhance your knowledge and understanding of IR and HR from a comparative perspective. It is not to teach generic skills, ethics, or core business knowledge (however defined) per se. As such, it would be misleading to tick off any of the various and sundry boxes below.

AACSB Assurance of Learning Goals and Objectives.

The Asper School of Business is proudly accredited by AACSB. Accreditation requires a process of continuous improvement of the School and our students. Part of “student improvement” is ensuring that students graduate with the knowledge and skills they need to succeed in their careers. To do so, the Asper School has set the learning goals and objectives listed below for the Undergraduate Program. The checked goal(s) and objective(s) will be addressed in this course and done so by means of the items listed next to the checkmark.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals and Objective in the Undergraduate Program</th>
<th>Goals and Objectives Addressed in this Course</th>
<th>Course Item(s) Relevant to these Goals and Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Determine which quantitative analysis technique is appropriate for solving a specific problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Use the appropriate quantitative method in a technically correct way to solve a business problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Analyze quantitative output and arrive at a conclusion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Written Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Use correct English grammar and mechanics in their written work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Communicate in a coherent and logical manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Present ideas in a clear and organized fashion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ethical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Identify ethical issues in a problem or case situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Identify the stakeholders in the situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Analyze the consequences of alternatives from an ethical standpoint.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Discuss the ethical implications of the decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Core Business Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Formative Conditions & Institutional Norms
A. Social
B. Economic
C. Political

II. Dominant State Paradigm

III. IR/HR Institutional Environment
A. IR/HR Regs/Laws
   1. Constitutive
   2. Labour Regs.
   3. Employment Regs.
B. Socio-economic context:
   1. Lab Mkt Policies & Programs
   2. IR/HR institutions
   3. Finance/Gov. Stre
   4. Mkt Relns

IV. Predominant Behav. Context
A. Management Orientations & Strategies
B. Worker Norms & Orientations

V. IR/HR Practices
A. Representation
B. Employment
C. HRM practices
D. Work practices

VI. Economic & Social Performance

NB: This is an organizing framework. The arrows are intended to demonstrate the relationships of primary interest, not all possible associations. Moving from the left to the right, the categories in each box can be thought of as both operating on and filtered through those represented in each successive box.
# TABLE ONE
Comparative Statistics: Selected Countries

## State Policies & Institutional Environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(a) gov't tax revenue as % of GDP</th>
<th>(b) social spending as % of GDP</th>
<th>(c) lab mkt spending as % of GDP</th>
<th>(d) employment protection laws, 1985</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>(e) training and education, 2006 (in % lab. force)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b= as of 2018; from *OECD Stats/ilibrary*, July, 2019.
c= all except UK as of 2017 (UK is 2011); from *OECD Employment Outlook*, 2019.
d= most recent available; *OECD Stats/ilibrary*, July, 2019.
e= OECD *Ed. at a Glance 2008* ([www.oecd.org/edu/eag2008](http://www.oecd.org/edu/eag2008)) voc = ISCED 3C (long) + post-sec, non-tertiary; com coll = type B; univ=type A + advanced
### TABLE TWO

**Comparative Statistics: Selected Countries**

**IR/HRM Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(a) % part-time employment</th>
<th>(b) % temporary employment</th>
<th>(c) average employment tenure</th>
<th>(d) union density</th>
<th>(e) union coverage</th>
<th>(f) barg. centralization &amp; co-ordination 1975-9/1995-00</th>
<th>(g) annual strike days per '000 workers*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:***

- **a** = re: dependent employment, 1983 data from OECD Corporate Data Environment (web-site), Dec. 2005; 2018 (or earlier) data from OECD iLibrary, July 2019
- **b** = from OECD iLibrary, July 2019; brackets indicate most recent prior to 2018
- **c** = European data from OECD StatExtracts, July, 2011; US stat is from BLS for 2016; Japan data from JILPT for 2011; Swedish data are from 1995 and 2009; Canadian data are from Cansim 282-0038 for 2015.
- **e** = coverage, as of 1980, from OECD Employment Outlook, 2003; 2015 from OECD Employment Outlook, 2017
- **f** = 1979 data adapted from OECD Employment Outlook, 2003, where 1=low, 3=high; see source for more information; 2017 data adapted from http://www.oecd.org/employment/collective-bargaining.htm, where 1 = low, 3= high; NB: 1979 and 2018 may not match up due to different sources.
- **g** = approximations from http://www.oecd.org/employment/collective-bargaining.htm
- ***= strike data are only roughly comparable; e.g., US stats do not include strikes of less than 1,000 workers.
### TABLE THREE
Comparative Statistics: Selected Countries

#### Economic Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>(a) GDP growth 2016-18</th>
<th>(b) labour productivity growth 2010-18</th>
<th>(c) wage growth 2008-17</th>
<th>(d) nat'l income per capita (ppp, US$) 2018</th>
<th>(e) GDP/hour Worked (ppp, US$) 2018</th>
<th>(f) unemployment, Jan, 2019</th>
<th>(g) labour force partic. rate 2018 or latest</th>
<th>(h) hours worked/year in dep. emp. 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62,427</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>45,504</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42,823</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54,144</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48,107</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>41,626</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45,150</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53,752</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>56,325</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>52,767</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a, b, d, e, f, g, & h = OECD Stat / ilibrary, July 2019  
# TABLE FOUR
Comparative Statistics: Selected Countries

## Social Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>(a) % women in parliament 2017</th>
<th>(b) low paid employment % 2016</th>
<th>(c) wage inequality (Gini index) 2017</th>
<th>(d) inequality (top 20%/bottom 20%) 2015</th>
<th>(e) poverty (% under 50% of median income, after taxes and transfers) latest available</th>
<th>(f) % reporting food deprivation, past year</th>
<th>(g) average life expectancy 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = IPU (Inter-parliamentary Union), August 2018.
b = full-time emps earning less than 2/3 of median earnings for all full-time emps.; OECD Employment Outlook, 2018, Statistical Annex; Sweden = 2011
e & g = OECD iLibrary, July 2019