Opportunities of non union forms of employee representation essay

Non Union Forms of employee representation have become seeable following the diminution of trade brotherhoods (Terry 1999) . Harmonizing to Charlwood and Terry (2007) the analysis of workplace outside the fabrication and public sector heartlands of 1970s unionism has given room for administrations to pattern other theoretical accounts of representation such as the non brotherhood signifiers. It is hence necessary to give attending to the survey of non-union employee representation since a figure of administrations in the society are get downing to follow it (Metcalf 1997) but this signifier of employee representation has been enormously criticised for its premise that employer and employee involvements are homogeneous (Kaufman and Taras 2002) . As Blyton and Turnbull (2004) note that the nature of employment dealingss involves employee ' s aim at work being concerned with income, security, calling while that of direction is to increase net income at the least cost. They are of the position that this struggle of involvements makes employment relationship debatable. Hence, conformance and consent can non be assumed. In malice of these unfavorable judgments ; a figure of benefits such as competitory advantage, control of work force and employee committedness have been linked with this system. As a consequence, this essay adopts the Unitarists, Pluralist and Marxist attacks of employee dealingss in analyzing the chances and challenges of non brotherhood signifiers of employee representation with focal point on the private sector in the United Kingdom and draws a decision based on these analyses.

The term non- brotherhood is concerned with fortunes where trade brotherhood acknowledgment is absent as a agency to make up one's mind

either in whole or in portion the footings and conditions of employment (Dundon et al 2005) . The construct of non unionism is frequently associated with human resource patterns and suggests that employees voice can be incorporated through direct or indirect voice battle in the signifier of bi- one-year studies, joint audience, work councils, direct reference by the company CEO, on-line inquiry and reply forum for employees, CEO web log and remarks every bit good as board of directors newssheets (CIPD 2010) . It suggests that through communicating, employers become more committed to their employee ' s demands and frailty versa. The thought of direct communicating with the company CEO besides suggests that non – brotherhood employee representation is more realistic in the private sector than the public. As Flood and Toner (1997) opine that big administrations where top direction is far from the work force are more likely to run a brotherhood administration because the distance makes it near impossible for direction to keep personal relationship with employees. In unfavorable judgment, Bruce et Al (2002) argue that non brotherhood signifiers of employee representation are normally created, structured and operated by the employer as portion of the Human Resource Management Practice of the Organisation which can be established, manipulated and terminated at the employer ' s discretion. Despite this booby trap, several private administrations notably IBM, Eastman-Kodak, Gillette and Marks and Spencer have been known to run a non brotherhood employee representation system successfully (Flood and Toner 1997) .

For Marks and Spencer, in the words of Sieff (1990) cited in Blyton and Turnbull (2004: 279) , " the cardinal fact about a policy human dealingss at

work is that it is non chiefly concerned with the nature of the work which the employee does but with the province of head, the spirit in which he or she does it. " This show of concern is assumed to convey out a high degree of public presentation from the employee (Guest and Hoque 1994) . Similarly, Dietz et Al (2005) in reexamining a survey on non -union signifiers of workplace partnership conclude that administrations whose human resource patterns are flexible and " employee focussed " are able to procure competitory border, employee committedness and occupation satisfaction without a brotherhood representation. Arguably, the Marks and Spencer claim to good human dealingss pattern may merely be on the surface. As contrary to Blyton and Turnbull (2004) , Johnson et Al (2011) suggest that the employees in Marks and Spencer were compelled to move committed for fright of losing their occupations. The absence of a strong representation makes employees weak against direction ' s determination even when it does non favor them (Storey 1997) . Yet, the chance for employees to pass on straight with their employers gives both parties (employers and employees) a opportunity to cognize each other ' s demands and go more like household and therefore construct a squad spirit in the administration (Metcalf 1995) . This implies that the pattern of non brotherhood signifier of employee representation has helped to make better apprehension between both parties. Therefore, Metcalf (1995) further opines that instead than give a corporate voice which may pretermit an person ' s pressing demand, non - union signifier of employee representation helps the administration place employee ' s demands and outlooks. In kernel, the non- brotherhood signifier of employee representation fills the spread which brotherhoods create.

However, some theoreticians suggest that this signifier of representation

makes the employee vulnerable to exploitation by his employer if their footings do non hold. As Freeman and Medoff (1984) cited in Golla (2001) point out that corporate employee voice enable employees express dissatisfaction without fright of direction revenge.

However, the non-union signifier of employee representation is non restricted to direct voice as suggested by (Metcalf 1995) . Harmonizing to Gollan (2001) there is representation of employee involvement as opposed direct employee engagement. He states that the construction of NER varies, since it can take the signifier of company council or Joint Consultative Committees which is common in Britain and used to decide differences amicably between an employee and direction. But Bryson (2003) flaws these commissions on the footing of the absence of rank dues and true independency from direction and the fact that they lack legal protection which makes resistance hard. Likewise, Kim and Kim (2004) in a study comparing the effectivity of brotherhoods and non brotherhood works council found that non- brotherhood employees are less committed to their work council compared to brotherhood representation. Yet, Lloyd (2003) opines that from the UK position, it has been argued that advisory organic structures can be used to promote the development of a common civilization and committedness within an administration. An advantage of holding an organizational civilization is that it enables employers control their work force, give employees a feeling of belonging and helps keep peace within the society (Grugulis 2007) . But research has shown that perversely control of work force may be negative. This is apparent in a survey by Butler (2005) on researching the efficaciousness of the voice procedure in Medico, he

refers to the administration ' s work council as " direction ' s marionette " and his findings showed that instead than take a democratic signifier as suggested by theoreticians, councils in non employee signifier of representation give director ' s reading to state of affairss and strict inquiring of direction ' s determination is frequently deemed bastard. He attributes this to the council ' s deficiency of power and direction ' s control. Employees who are dissatisfied with the system may besides show their grudges by go forthing the administration (Redman and Wilkinson 2009) .

In decision, Guest and Hoque (1994) summarize the pattern of non-union employee representation into the good, the bad and ugly. However, their survey shows that non-union employee representation administrations who foster HRM patterns study better consequences in footings of public presentation result and employee dealingss but to presume that all non-union employee representation adopt good HRM pattern is questionable as it is besides dazed to impute good HRM pattern to public presentation result since Halachmi (2005) suggests that public presentation is subjective and can non be measured accurately. Kelly (2002) besides opines that the initial thought of human resource oriented non-union constitutions was to take attention of staff involvements but this thought has been replaced by employers taking advantage of the absence of brotherhood to supply fewer rights and benefits to workers. Yet, there is no uncertainty ; non-brotherhood employee representation creates chances such as committedness and a happy work force as is apparent from the survey on Sportasia, UK adopted by (Dietz et al 2005) where employees are seen to be incorporated in determination devising which gave them a sense of

company ownership. Their interview analysis besides shows that both employers and employees were pleased with the non brotherhood representation agreement. But this thought of non-unionism is Unitarists and (Wood 1995) opines that one disadvantage of the Unitarists perspective is that it can non be generalised because from a comparative position, the success of non -employee representation in the UK may non be practical in another state as a consequence of differences in regulative governments, public assistance governments and cultural governments (Ribery and Grimshaw 2003) . Furthermore, from a pluralist position, Gollan (2001) states that the function of JCC is to settle differences between employer and employee amicably. Nevertheless, advocates of Marxism may see NER as a tool for subjugation. Harmonizing to a survey on non-union dealingss in SMEs by Dundon et Al (1999) because of uncomplete employment contract between employee and employer, workers were faced with working " excess " difficult and unlike nonionized houses employees in NER scenes are prone to discrimination issues and direction absolutism which they may defy through absenteeism or surrender. These challenges of NER has made research workers like Charlwood and Terry (2007) opine that non brotherhood signifier of employee representation serves neither the employer nor the employee involvement and surely non the society ' s ' .