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**INTRODUCTION**

The development of labor process analysis was heavily based on Harry Braverman’s *Labor and Monopoly Capital* (LMC). French and Italian Marxists in the 1970s had used labor process ideas derived from Marx’s Capital Volume 1, but their impact was limited geographically and to small left circles. Braverman’s book in 1974 had a huge impact around the world, especially in Anglo-Saxon societies, and across many academic disciplines. Moreover, his work has been an inspiration for theory building and development and the establishment of a labor process perspective or framework, with robust concepts of management control, indeterminacy and workplace regimes. Ackroyd (2010) has suggested that labor process analysis has evolved over this time into what he calls ‘normal science’ – an established domain of thought and writing with a community of scholars and researchers anchored within agreed terminologies.

This paper reviews developments in labor process writing from Braverman, with a strong UK orientation. It is structured into four sections. Firstly, Braverman’s contribution and legacy – what he said in *LMC* and what has been taken forward by researchers and scholars, following Braverman’s death in 1976, shortly after the publication of *LMC*. Secondly, I look at what’s been left behind, namely those elements of *LMC* that were not developed in the explosion of interest in labor process ideas in the 1980s and 1990s. Much of this relates to the political economy of capitalism, class structures, the state, labor markets (especially the reserve army of labor) and Marxist ideas linking these elements together. Thirdly, I look at what was missing or underdeveloped in *LMC* and how the development of labor process theory and research expanded these areas, especially the national institutional setting of the labor process and employment relations; the importance of space and geography of capitalism and work; the politics of production and linking of workplace relations to the state and wider political structures; the subjectivity of actors – workers and managers – and the importance of conceiving of social relations in embodied terms. Finally, I examine the continued renewal of labor process analysis, and vitality of the ideas, as capitalism evolves into a global political economy, and how the discourse around capitalism, the labor process, skills and work, develop ideological autonomy from structural developments, and the need therefore to address both talk of the labor process, actual new labor process and labor power developments, and underlying structural shifts in the organisation of work in 21st century capitalism.

**HARRY BRAVERMAN AND *LABOR AND MONOPOLY CAPITAL***

It is 41 years since the publication of *LMC* which has not been out of print, and has gained over 12000 citations (Google Scholar citations July 2015) and continues to acquire 400 plus citations per year. *LMC* has sold over 150,000 copies in English, the bulk sales occurring in 1970s and 1980s. It has been translated into Chinese, Italian, Spanish, Japanese, Portuguese, French, Swedish, German, Dutch, Greek, Norwegian, Serbo-Croatian among others.

The concept of the labor process is taken from Marx's political economy and refers to purposeful activity in which a natural object or raw material is transformed into a useful product which satisfies a human need. The labor process is a *transformation process* – a conversion movement whereby the labor power of the worker enters a production process in which labor is realised to produce a concrete commodity or service which contains a use and exchange value (and surplus value that the employer or capitalist takes as reward). What Marx (1976, 284) called the 'simple elements of the labor process' consist of human labor, the object on which work is performed, instruments or tools and a purpose or goal.

Building on Marx’s writing about the ‘labor process’ Braverman set out to critically analyse what he considered to be the degrading effects of technology and scientific management on the nature of work in the twentieth century. Principally, he proposed that the drive for efficient production is also a drive for the control of workers movement and creativity by management. Managerial control is achieved through monopolising judgement, knowledge and the conceptual side of work, and concomitantly excluding workers from control and ownership of knowledge of production as a whole process. For Braverman, the expansion of capitalist work in the twentieth century was one of work *degradation* - as knowledge is systematically removed from direct producers and concentrated in the hands of management and their agents. This leads to the impoverishment and debasement of the quality and experience of working, both for manual and mental workers, who are condemned to execute an expanding range of routine and conceptually depleted tasks in the service of capital. Expressed succinctly, Braverman said:

*‘The ideal organization toward which the capitalist strives is one in which the worker possess no basic skill upon which the enterprise is dependent and no historical knowledge of the past of the enterprise to serve as a fund from which to draw on in daily work, but rather where everything is codified in rules of performance or laid down in lists that may be consulted (by machines or computers, for instance), so that the worker really becomes an interchangeable part and may be exchanged for another worker with little disruption’ (Braverman 1994, 24-25).*

What is central to Braverman’s work is the linking of work to political economy and capitalist expansion, and the unequal distribution of power over work in the capitalist workplace, whether office or factory. It can be argued that “Braverman … single-handedly caused a major upset by insisting on viewing work as a labor process, so placing the fact that work contributes centrally to processes of accumulation that are specifically capitalist back at the center of attention” (Ackroyd 2009, 265).

**THE SCHOLARLY IMPACT** **OF LABOR AND MONOPOLY CAPITAL**

Braverman’s death in 1976 two years after the appearance of *LMC* gave the debate around the labor process a slightly unreal inflection. Because Braverman was not around to either respond to critics or apply the ideas within *LMC* to new circumstances as work in capitalism changed, *LMC* became artificially frozen as text, providing a target that couldn't answer back and an icon for the faithful to venerate. Without the central author around to expand and coordinate the narrative, *LMC* rapidly became codified into a few catch phrases, such as the 'deskilling thesis', for an army of PhD students to examine. In the UK for example, there have been around 120 PhDs on the topic of the labor process since the publication of LMC. Across North America, Europe, Japan and Australia many hundreds of students studied Braverman and the labor process debate that developed, especially from the 1980s.

Initially writers responded to Braverman's agenda. This agenda was broad – including the expansion of capitalism and growth of waged labor in the US; the expansion of white collar workers; the role of the state in capitalist society and the reserve army of labor. Many of these sociological and economic subjects were lost as the debate on the labor process developed post-*LMC*. The main elements that were taken forward were management control, deskilling and Taylorism – in other words, a narrow set of concerns, isolated from monopoly capitalism, the giant firm, the labor market and the state.

We can also classify reactions to *LMC* in terms of those stressing how Braverman neglected certain themes- subjectivity (see chapters in Knights and Willmott 1990; and Thompson and Smith, 2010 for a review); consciousness and agency (Burawoy 1979); resistance (Edwards 1986; 2010); gender (see chapters in Wood 1982, 1989; Thompson 1989; Thompson and Smith, 2010); managerial strategy and national diversity within capitalism (Littler 1982; Burawoy 1985; Smith and Meiksins 1995) and later the ideas of national institutions, the employment relationship and the geography of capitalism as the global economic system expanded.

**WHAT IS TAKEN FORWARD**

***Control***

Control is the major concept in the labor process literature on worker-management relations. Whether through a catalogue of the various 'means' of management control or the historical evolution of employer's control strategies (Edwards 1979; Storey 1985) it has been argued that management as an agency is simply *synonymous* with labor control. Professional justification or managerial ideology for Braverman goes back to the writings of Fredrick Taylor, and Scientific Management which has as its *raison d'être* managerial control over workers movement, thought and skill. Fordism, through the assembly line, introduces a technology aimed at pacing and controlling the action of workers. Control in the labor process directs attention to working environments in which there is low trust, coercion, limited worker responsibility and a generally directed and regulated working environment.

An early critic of this bonding of management with control was the late Craig Littler (1982), who made an important contribution to the labor process arguments on control by blending Marxist analysis of control and capitalism with Weberian theories of bureaucracy and legitimation. He proposed a three level framework for analysing the labor process, consisting of employment relationships, the structure of control and job design. The labor process sits within this nest of levels, and his 1982 book provided a historical analysis of the spread of Taylorist job design into the UK and a useful comparative portrait of the labour process in Japan – drawing from Japanese scholars such a Cole (1971) and Dore (1973) who, while not using labor process ideas explicitly, did thorough work on the sociology of work and industry in Japan.

Braverman assumed management direct control was the primary glue of social relations within all societies in the era of monopoly capitalism. However, post-Braverman labor process writing focused on both the themes of compliance and consent, suggesting that employers may more productively use labor power by engaging with it rather than controlling it. Groups of relatively autonomous workers, who are increasing as manual labor declines in certain parts of the world economy, either cannot, will not or do not need to be tightly controlled. Indeed rigid control is expensive and can be counter-productive. This does not mean the end of managerial control as some claim (Raelin 2011). Rather, appeals to professional values, creativity, career, good will or trust are deemed more suitable methods of translating the capacity of skilled and professional workers into labor effort and value. Edwards (1979) saw control cycles evolving through contradictions of conflicts between labor and capital, but more recently control has not been conceived in zero-sum or replacement terms, but as coexisting and multiple forms (Thompson & Hartley 2007).

***Skills***

Struggles between labor and capital can be around use values of workers – the skills required in producing surplus value – and higher skills can mean higher productivity, but also higher costs, and levels of skills of workers (the use values workers possess and sell) are important for both workers and employers. While Braverman judged capitalism to possess a ‘degradation imperative’, whereby high value skills are replaced by low value ones; in practice this is one tendency, among several, more contingent than absolute.

***Conflict***

Conflict is at the centre of the relations between employers and employee as a structured interest antagonism in other words something not contingent upon the subjective attitudes of either side. Marx forces us to consider the fundamental power imbalance between labor and capital – capital needs labor to expand; but labor needs capital to survive, and starvation and fear can be the whip that keeps workers at work. The collective power of labor, both structural and associative (Wright, 2000) is different from capital, which can move though different forms and store itself (in money) in different places (in housing property which is never used but held as exchange value in cities like London for example). Although Marx, following Adam Smith, saw labor power as ‘variable capital’ (see below) it is important to note the substantive structural differences between labor and capital. As a recent discussion by Hodgson (2014) notes capital is money or a deposit external to the individual and in this sense “‘human capital’ can only be collateral if the humans involved are slaves. ‘Social capital’ can never be used as collateral and it is not even owned.” This strict definition of capital misses its’ symbolic, emotional and status elements, which are part of the way it is represented beyond material form. But labor power cannot be stored or transformed - at least not in the short-run – while in moving within and outside one’s country to work is always a possibility – controls on labor flows are greater than on capitals flows (Sassen 1988) and migrant and illegal workers are always more vulnerable to super-exploitation (Anderson 2010, 1013).

**WHAT WAS MISSING OR UNDERDEVELOPED IN *LMC***

Braverman drew on his own experience and the work of others, but did not engage in empirical fieldwork in the conventional sense. Many reactions to his work have applied standard methodological 'tests' through surveys, but most especially case studies, to examine whether or not skills are declining and work degraded by new technology and managerial control. Reactions have also challenged the theoretical basis of Braverman's work - his determinism in judging Scientific Management the 'one best way' of capitalist practice and his historical chronology - in the transition from contracting relations to employment relations and Taylorism (see Zimbalist 1979; Clawson 1980; Littler 1982; Burawoy 1985; Knights and Willmott 1990). A central empirical short-coming of his work, was around the so-called 'de-skilling' thesis, which writers have explored historically, sectorally, occupationally and nationally to check whether deskilling has occurred as a universal tendency (see Brown 1992 for a review of the evidence on deskilling; Grugulis and Lloyd 2010; Fitzgerald, Rainnie, & Burgess 2013).

***Agency – micro and macro***

The most significant Marxist sociologist of the labor process - an influential theorist and ethnographic researcher – has been Michael Burawoy. His *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 empirically destroyed the patronising view of workers in the Human Relations school, 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 labor market segmentation and the labor process. 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 social life inside a large modern, unionised corporation with strong internal labor markets and a labor process where winning workers consent not managing through coercion was required.

Michael Burawoy’s other key text on the labor 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 labor markets, collective bargaining and an ‘internal state’ of consent and compromise between labor 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 labor markets were absent, thus increasing workers dependence of a wages, which were difficult to stabilise due to competitive labor markets.

In broad terms Michael Burawoy opened access to the micro level of shop floor practices were workers are active agents in the resistance and reproduction of capitalist social relation as well as more macro comparative labor 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 labor processes in a then command economy.

***LMC, Institutions and Capitalism***

Comparatively Braverman’s message of ‘work degradation’ fitted some capitalist societies better than others – the UK and US especially had greater ‘deskilling tendencies’. But even in countries with institutionalised craft apprenticeship systems and an abundance of skilled labor, 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). But deskilling was not a simple process. In a recent review Gallie highlights strong survey evidence of upskilling, but notes ‘… that the assumption that rising skills would necessarily lead to greater employee influence at work is incorrect’ (Gallie 2013, 339). In other words skills do not automatically equate with job control. It appears national institutional arrangements mediate any such effect – such that one cannot read off common outcomes from generic tendencies in the labor process without factoring in institutional elements.

Therefore 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 labor which is more properly anchored to particular institutions - occupational and training systems. There was one reference to Japan in *LMC*. Yet in the 1980s and 1990s, the Japanese workplace was seen to typify a major contrast with the US –– where greater employment security for workers (especially male ones) working in large companies was exchanged for higher utilisation and managerial control over the deployment of labor power (Elger and Smith 1994; 2005). The place of national institutions was underdeveloped by Braverman, but as Elger and Smith (2005) show it is possible to combine together a labor process and institutional perspective for analysing workplace relations and the function ‘nationality’ of capital plays in shaping labor process practices.

Chris Smith has made conceptual contributions to comparative theory and the labor process with his development of the system, society and dominance (SSD) framework and applications to occupations and transfer of work practices between countries (Smith and Meiksins 1995; Elger and Smith 2005). The SSD framework emphasises the importance of national institutional boundaries and rules, but additionally the centrality of systemic and dominant models – that create common and best practices, such as HRM, lean production, total quality management, that are imposed across societies. Other contributions have been his understanding of the organisation of the labor process in China, with is concept of the ‘dormitory labor regime’ (Smith 2003; Ngai and Smith 2007). This builds upon the work of Burawoy, but explores the interaction between the reproduction of labor power and the production process. It has been picked up as a way of characterising workplace regimes in export-factories in China (Pun and Smith 2007; Kim 2013; Zhang 2014).

***Gender***

Although Marx said that labor power is the ‘property’ of the worker, it is different from capital (which has objective multiple identities independent of the capitalist) because labor power is part of ‘the person of the worker’. In other words, labor power possesses what can be called *embodiment* and as such workers or sellers of labor power come in different bodies – by gender, age, nationality, ethnicity, skill, region etc. – and this differentiation makes uniting labor power into collectives harder, and the management of labor more particular and problematic.

Braverman was challenged by feminist writers who argued the gendered or embodied identity (of craft workers) was missing in his work. Craft and skilled labor is highly gendered as Pollert (1981) made clear in her book on tobacco workers; and Cavendish (1984) made clear in her book on assembly workers and Cynthia Cockburn (1983) demonstrated in her book on print workers. Rubery (1978) was part of the early feminist writers examining the short-coming of *LMC*, coming from a radical economist background she used Braverman to extend dual labor market theory and institutional economics to develop a theory of labor market segmentation. Like Burawoy, who emphasised the agency of labor, Rubery argued that labor markets are structured not just by the actions of capitalists, but by the capacity of workers "to maintain, develop, extend and reshape their organisation and bargaining power" (1978, 34). In this gender was an important way male workers could maintain controls over work and structure labor markets into non-competing segments, an idea close to the Weber’s ideas of “occupational closure” – rather than Marxist notion of the reserve army of labor found in Braverman. Feminist writers have produced more dynamic explanations of the lived experience of discrimination on the shop or office floor, see for example Gottfried (1994), as well as theorisation of the interactions between gender ‘structures’, such as patriarchy and economic structures, such as capitalism and class (Gottfried, 1998 ).

More recent work has looked at struggles around the body (Wolkowitz 1986; Wolkowitz and Warhurst 2010) and the inclusion and exclusion of certain ‘body types’ (for example, the *aesthetics* of labor, Warhurst et al 2000). The race of bodies has a long history in the US (see Roediger and Esch (2012) for a history of race and work in US management) and all this research highlights the fact that while the capitalist purchases ‘labor power’ this always comes embodied, and there is a valuation placed on certain bodies by the employer or customer.

***Space***

The spatial division of labor was largely absent from Marx and Braverman’s discussion of the labor process. Radical geographers working within a Marxist framework have theorised the spatial distribution of production and the main elements of the labor process – including workers. Increased geographical movement of labor and capital, can create what Harvey (1982) called a ‘spatial fix’, that capital can utilise in bargaining with governments and employees, that is movement or threat of closing workplaces in one country or locality can be used to bargain with states and workers’ representatives, such threats often extracting concessions on working conditions and wages. Such threats are only possible because of the spread of the capitalist system geographically and the opening-up of news territories for expansion and re-location. At a macro level countries compete for Foreign Direct Investment and this can mobilise the distribution of ‘human resources’ by institutions like local authorities and schools to serve the demands of new entrants (see Smith and Chan 2015). ‘Space’ is therefore an important element of management control and a factor of production – see also Harvey (1982), Massey (1995), Peck (1996) and McGrath-Champ et al (2010) who elaborate on the implications for the labor process of a more fluid understanding of space as resource for capital, and mobility as a resource for labor. All explore how labor markets develop alongside social and political institutions.

***Mobility and Flow***

Braverman saw worker’s autonomy as a function of skill. He assumed a powerful relationship between skill, job autonomy, knowledge and control. He separated education and work; the increased formal education of the workforce did not translate into increased skill levels – this was a myth in monopoly capitalism. Braverman rightly stressed the importance of production (not the training or preparation of labor power pre-work) as central to capitalism. But this did understate the mobility of labor into and out of work, and the consequences of free waged labor for the organisation of the labor process.

An explicit attempt to apply movement and mobility into labor process theory was developed in a paper by Smith (2006) This incorporated the importance of ‘mobility power’ into labor power in what is called a ‘double indeterminacy’ framework. Labor power possesses two components or indeterminacies: mobility power and effort power. The first indeterminacy emerges from the distinction between labor and labor power made by Marx, reflecting the decentralization of the authority over the disposal of labor power to the individual worker who has the burden and freedom (constraint and choice) as to where and to which employer the individual sells his or her labor services. This can be called mobility power, which is indeterminate in the sense that the decision on which employer the worker sells his or her labor power is given to the individual and therefore remains an uncertainty for the employing firm in calculating whether or not workers will remain with them (Smith 2006). It is also an uncertainty for the worker as to whether or not the employing firm will continue to buy their labor services. Around the issue of mobility power both capital and labor strategize, plan and mobilize resources of a collective and individual kind as rational-strategic actors (Alberti 2014).

The second indeterminacy is around labor effort and the wage-work bargain in production (Baldamus 1961). How much effort is required for a particular wage for supporting the basic level of reproduction of labor has been the primary subject of labor process theory that has focused on management strategies to control labor and realize the returns from labor once hired (Thompson and Smith 2009; 2010). Similarly, how workers develop formal and informal work rules to limit effort and contain managerial claims on their time and body have also been widely discussed (Burawoy 1979; Edwards 1990). We therefore have mobility and effort power as indeterminacies for capital and labor, and forming the basis for labor and management strategies, tactics and policies to direct the exchange process within the capitalist employment relationship.

Mobility power has a strong political dimension – with employers seeking to limit the freedom of workers and to move employment at will, through contracts that stipulate length of service, notice periods for mutual separation, and limitations on labor supply and mobility (Jacoby 1995). Within the firm the uncertainties over mobility create what Mann (1973) calls a ‘mutual dependency’ obligation, in which workers reduce job searching for internal promotion opportunities, and employers give up seeking external labor, through focusing on the utilization of existing labor. In some economies (Japan and Korea, for example), and in some companies a paternalist practice is widely espoused that reinforces mutual obligations beyond the naked cash nexus (Smith 2003; 2006).

This attention to mobility was expanded into what he calls a ‘flow approach’ towards labor power which combines the importance of mobility and movement in new capitalism (Smith 2010). A flow perspective on the labor process is against human capital and resource-based views of the firm, and versions of HRM which advocate a ‘high commitment workplace’ perspectives, as well as ‘organisation-centric models of capitalism’. All these approaches represent labor power as fixed, centred and located, rather than moving and dynamic – with mobility-capability as a core characteristic. They represent the employer’s perspective on containing labor mobility as something positive for both workers (guaranteeing access to work) and employers (securing access to labor). A ‘flow approach’ brings in the nature of labor power, mobility, turnover, migration, employment contracts and challenges the orthodoxy of labor as fixed commodity. Labor power can be ‘stored’ socially through, *occupations* (professions with exclusionary rules); *organisations* (large firms with strong ILMs); *social networks* (family, kin and place networks for migrant labor for example); *industrial districts/communities* (mining, company towns, industrial towns etc.); *social institutions* – workers store of collective identity and organisations – e.g. trade unions (craft/work rules of job boundaries, even transfers of jobs through father-to-son dynasties – London printers before computerisation, for example). Stores are however partially ‘fictive’ and vulnerable because labor power is not property like capital and the need to animate labor power through the labor process in order to secure exchange/realisation (in the form of wages) forever requires labor power to seek out capital. Stores are vulnerable to change as a result of class struggle between labor and capital around the double indeterminacy of labor (both effort power and mobility power). They are vulnerable to technological and market change that can overturn established patterns.

***Precarious employment***

Braverman saw capitalism evolving into monopoly forms and the expansion of waged labor within the giant firm. Post-Braverman we have seen the expansion of ‘flexible and precarious labor’ that has an increasingly weak attachment to the firm. This suggests that while capitalism is historically the most dynamic production system, but it is difficult to plot a linear trend to the development of the labor process in capitalist societies. As new countries are pulled into global capitalism, ‘old forms’ can be revised; or new technologies, allow renewal of old systems. Informalisation and the expansion of self-employment during the recent financial crisis means decline in waged labor formally managed/controlled through the firm’s bureaucratic hierarchy, and the rise of contractors, self-policing and self-control: “… Developing economies are marked by the existence of an overwhelmingly large volume of economic activities that fall within what is described as the informal sector. It is an economic space in which workers engage in economic activities in ways that are very different from the capitalist organisation of production. In particular, the prevalent form of labor in the informal sector is self-employment, which is different from the usual wage-based employment resting on the alienation of labor from capital” (Sanyal and Bhattacharyya 2009, 35). Informal working is now being researched more thoroughly in developed economies (Williams and Nadin 2012).

There has been a systemic growth of different categories of worker on different contracts and the growth of employment agencies to source labor globally. There has been a shortening of the length of employment stay within one organisation, although rates of tenure vary between say Europe and US, and within different branches of capital. While flexible or precarious work has been much debated in the US and Europe, contract changes have been more dramatic in East Asian societies. Organisation dependency which characterised the large firms that Braverman (and Burawoy 1977) had used to characterise the good jobs (high wage and high security) in what was a hegemonic, welfarist employment pattern of monopoly capitalism, which was constructed throughout the twentieth century (Gospel 1992; Montgomery 1979, 1995; Jacoby 1997 ) now looks increasingly untenable. Writers continue to explore the connection between the labor market, social networks and labor process, examining the development of new informalities and old labor forms (Kalleberg, 2009), for example the return of gang labor in the UK (Strauss 2013) or the growth of third parties, such as employment agencies, in employment relationship (Enright 2013; Fudge and Strauss 2013).

While the movement from cottage industry to factory production was a productivity and control transformation for industrial capitalism, it would be wrong to consider this a historical movement. Today having workers at home (or anywhere with internet access connection) has been part of a cost reduction strategy of today’s capitalists, where contemporary technologies, especially ICTs, can put-out or disaggregate production and producers into new cottage systems, and draw in competitive labor production from across borders and temporal zones, thus ensuring continuous production, often in civil society and from workers on the move, at a higher productive performance than in a fixed centres like an factory or office (Felstead and Jewson 2000; 2012). In developing countries ‘factories in the living room’ are common (Hsiung 1996). The cottage industry or putting-out system has also been revitalised with the internet, as distributive service work, can create virtual factories composed of workers who only meet on line, and employers that contract labor services without building a bureaucracy or firm as was common to many industries in the last century (Arvidsson and Peitersen 2013).

Struggles over working time have long been part of the narrative of employer-worker engagement, with societal and political struggles part of this story, from the 10 hours movement in the 19th century, to the introduction of the 35 hour week in France, to zero-hours contracts in the UK, and annualised hours increasingly part of the debate around time in work. In abstract, in capitalism workers are selling their time – they are ‘merchants of time’ – and there will always be debates around how this time is used (the intensity of labor) and for how long (the extensiveness of labor). In annualised hours, there is abstraction of working hours, from the standard punctuation of everyday time – by days, weeks and months - into a more remote yearly cycle. This is part of the abstraction of working time from the regular intervals of social life (Heyes 1997; Rubery, et al 2005; Arrowsmith, 2007). Struggles around rewards - the terms of exchange – for what wages workers get for their ‘effort bargain’ with employers – is central to workers interests and interest group representation on both sides of the collective bargaining relationship. Struggle around the content of work – what is to be done, how workers are directed and the scope for autonomy and self-management.

**CONTINUED RENEWAL OF LABOR PROCESS ANALYSIS**

***Materialism not Marxism***

Braverman was explicit in theorising the labour process within a Marxist political economy. One trend in recent work has been to disconnect a materialist analysis of the labour process from a Marxist analysis. Paul Edwards (1986) moved labor process theory away from Marxism, towards materialism which has no historical transformation agency: "Marxism must propose some logic of social development such that exploitation will be transcended, whereas materialism makes no such claim" (1986: 89). Edwards is sympathetic towards workers, but there is no expectation that class conflict will necessarily lead to social transformation or even that the common class situation of labor will result in shared subjective interests. Labor is a particular commodity in capitalism which possesses exchange and use values, but Edwards has put emphasis on use value, especially the utility and pride of work for workers. He has also contributed to the comparative approach (not only cross-national) and the diversity and ‘relative autonomy’ of the labor process within capitalism, which does not inevitably produce one dominant control regime, but neither are there an infinite variety of control regimes as suggested by contingency theory. Like both Littler and Thompson (see below) Edwards stresses the importance of examining the workplace in capitalism at a series of levels of analysis.

Paul Thompson has also moved away from Marxism toward materialism. He has been strongly identified with labor process theory building in the UK, being closely associated with the International Labor Process Conference. Through publications such as *The Nature of Work* (1983), *Work Organisations* (1990, 2009), *Workplaces of the Future* (1998) and *Organizational Misbehaviour* (1999) as well as many articles on such themes critiques of post-modernism, Foucault, surveillance, the knowledge economy, discourse analysis and HRM and ethics; he has consolidated and developed labor process analysis. Paul Thompson and Chris Smith have produced a series of papers and edited books that have offered a critique of post-modernist abandonment of employment relations and core elements of capitalism as real political economy. Smith and Thompson (1992) produced an early political economy book on the transition of labor and the labor process with the end of state socialism in Russia, Eastern Europe and China.

Thompson (2009) has been especially critical of post-structuralist writing on the labor process best represented by Damian O’Doherty (2001, 2008) – see debate between Thompson and O’Doherty in the *Handbook of Critical Management Studies (HCMS)*. O’Doherty, a student of Hugh Willmott, wrote a PhD against labor process theory and in his 2009 chapter of HCMS, he sought to construct a ‘Manchester School’ of work that had as intellectual tools existentialism and post-structuralism, and developed the analysis of work relations in workplaces and organisations as constituted as power hierarchies. Like Willmott the concern is with ‘human subjectivity’ and being, not labor power in a Marxist or materialist sense, and the approach is constructionist rather than ‘realist’. The work is more about organisation studies than labor-process studies – attention is focused on individuals within organisational settings. But labor processes are about the transformation process of moving labor capacity into labor; how individuals realise labor power through labor processes that can be very diverse; but capitalism imposes structural limits to variety.

In summaries of the history labor process debates Thompson has created ‘periodizations’, with the first wave containing writing following the immediate reactions to Braverman’s *LMC*, and earlier labor process theory from French and Italian Marxists. The second wave included writer such as Edwards, Burawoy, Freidman – who have all developing ‘typologies’ of ‘workplace regimes’ around a ‘control –resistance-consent’ dialectic, whereby managerial controls produce resistances from workers that then leads on to new control regimes in a cyclical manner. The third wave contained new developments of ‘alternative paradigms’ to Taylorism and Fordism, such as ‘flexible specialization’ (Piore and Sabel 1984); ‘lean production’ (Womack et al 1990); and ‘innovation-mediated production’ (Kenney and Florida 1993). Many of these new paradigms derived from new players, such as Japan, who entered the debate on how to organise work as Japanese firms moved abroad and Japanese products and production processes appeared superior to Western ones. These Thompson called ‘paradigm wars’ but in many ways they fit within the cycles of controls found in the second wave – for a review see Smith (1989, 1994).

Thompson (1990) developed the idea of a ‘core’ set of labor process ideas in the face of attempts to expand labor process writing beyond labor-capital relations in workplaces, with interest by post-structuralist writers (such as Willmott and Knights) focusing on subjectivity and the human condition, thus stretching boundaries of what constituted labor process analysis. He took labor process theory back a ‘core’ set of elements in which labor process analysis was about ‘transformation’ of labor power by different management workplace regimes, some of which gave workers greater autonomy, but none of which suppressed structural antagonisms of conflict and interests and the ‘imperative of control’ that was a core characteristic of capitalism given the need to extract labor-power from the body of the worker. Reinforcing the work of Edwards, Thompson emphasised the relative autonomy of labor process and centrality of the employment relationship and importance of political economy as a wider conditioner to labor process practice.

More recently her developed analytical models of work, with different levels, and returned labor process theorising back to a wider agenda, beyond the simple elements within production relations. Thompson (2003, 474) “…argued that political economy, firm governance, employment relations and the labor process should be treated as ‘distinctive spheres’ and patterns of connection and disconnection within their different trajectories be sought out”. In an update and expansion to this paper, Thompson (2013) proposes 4 distinct institutional domains: 1. accumulation – with no overall logic, but structure of separation, competition and coordination between capitals and ‘elites’; 2. Corporate level which is the domain of firm action by managers and workers; 3. work level or traditional labor process domain featuring a technical and social division of labor and labor process; and finally, 4. employment level consisting of employment relations and industrial relations. This model was applied to what Thompson sees as the dominant feature of capitalism today, namely financialisation or new shareholder capitalism, in which there is greater work intensity and increased employment insecurity. But not all societies are under this model. As Vidal and Hauptmeier (2014, 15 ) note “…Thompson (2003, 2013) argued that employment regimes (employment security, wage setting and voice systems) are more diverse across countries than labor processes (systems of skill, control and coordination) because the former are more influenced by national institutions”. In criticism of this multi-level contingency analysis one could say that Thompson misses problems with Varieties of Capitalism approach he alludes to, such as the myth of nationally integrated models business models, and that the focus on financialized capitalism may be more about Anglo-Saxon capitalism and not other parts of the world economy, especially Asia.

**CONCLUSION**

***New Trends***

Smith (2010) summarizes developments in the labor process in terms of nine themes:

1. Decentring work from the workplace – new mobile technologies, home working and working ‘on-the-move’.

2. Mobility of capital – and extended value and commodity chains.

3. Internationalisation &‘Globalisation’ - more labor (emergence of a world labor market for the first time) and more mobility of labor; challenges to national institutional settlements.

4. New forms of labor – creative, aesthetic, personal service etc. Labor process of old and new forms of labor.

5. Separation of work relations & employment relations - de-bureaucratisation, different contracts within the workplace.

6. Separation of ownership from management – disappearing bosses and principle employer - problem with legal work contracts– and the disappearance of owners (“who is and where is my boss?”).

7 Difficulties entering waged work – internships, employability, transfer of risk to the worker.

8. Taking the state out – value/commodity chains; international employment agencies; hedge fund capital.

9. New labor movement forms – community, internet, direct action, NGOs etc.

In *LMC*, there is a more definite chronological system shift from private, small scale capital under craft worker control to large-scale, monopoly capital, under Scientific Management as the pinnacle of labor process control. Post-Braverman writers have stressed post-Taylorist stages or phases of the labor process, and highlighted two things. Firstly, the continued evolution of labor process organisation within capitalism beyond the possibilities for accumulation afforded by classical Scientific Management. Control through culture, values and various neo-human relations policies seek to engage, not simply coerce the worker. And secondly, the role of new national and regional centres of accumulation which offer a synthesis of classical Scientific Management within different cultural contexts and class accords, which allow for post-Taylorist practices to be embedded in unique ways. The organisation of the labor process in Japan and the transfer of aspects of the Japanese system to the West is central here (see Elger and Smith 1994; 2005 for an overview) and the emergence of China and India as new international players (Ngai 2005; Lüthje, et al.2013; De Neve 2014). However, the European, especially the German experience of post and neo-Taylorism also remains important (see Altmann, Kohler and Meil 1992; Eichhorst and Tobsch 2013; Eichhorst 2014).

Marx's analysis of the nature of the capitalist labor process uses England as its historical laboratory. England, the most economically advanced and dominant capitalist economy represented the future all other societies would mirror. Braverman wrote through the experience of the US as dominant capitalist economy of the twentieth century, originator of Scientific Management and therefore the common model for all other societies. In fact both were wrong to associate the most advanced with a single future. If we interject country differences into this picture, as cross-national studies of labor process organisation have done, then we see that the norm is for there to be both national pluralism to work organisation as well as pressures to find a 'one best way'. National differences are not infinite, and dominant economies remain important sources of 'best practice' which are used in many societies.

There has been a continual *renewal* of labor process writing, development of new concepts, such as *emotional labor* (Hochschild 1983; Bolton and Boyd 2003; Bolton 2009, 2010; Brook et al 2013) or *aesthetic labor* (Warhurst et al 2000; Warhurst and Nickson 2009; Wolkowitz and Warhurst 2010). There has also been application of labor process ideas to new sectors, such as the creative industries (Smith and McKinlay 2008) and new organisational forms, such as the extensive literature on call centres. We have also seen labor process theory being linked to new areas, such as institutional theory (Elger and Smith 2005) or critical realism (Thompson and Vincent 2010). The prospects for labor process writing to continue to develop are good, and the annual International Labor Process Conference and associated book publishing (<http://www.palgrave.com/series/critical-perspectives-on-work-and-employment/CPWE/>) is likely to maintain the domain, as the evolution of forms of control and the continued globalisation of capitalism creates a demand for critical writing which engages micro and macro levels of analysis in a coherent fashion. This is something that labor process analysis in the 40 plus years since the publication of *Labor and Monopoly Capital* has consistently aimed to do.
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