Chapter Four

How can we be happy at work? Rethinking the role of law in the 21st century

Glenn Patmore

For years, job satisfaction has been a recurrent theme in our newspapers and other popular media.[1] The headlines tell the story: 'Job satisfaction should always be at the top of your wish list' (*Sydney Morning Herald*, October 12, 1999); 'Job satisfaction: is there a law against it?' (*Business Review Weekly*, July 30, 1995);} 'Forget the millions, try job satisfaction' (*Sydney Morning Herald*, September 27, 2002).

For employees, work is an important domain of life, and feelings of satisfaction at work are of obvious importance in living a good life. For employers, too, employee satisfaction has significant benefits. Happier employees tend to take less sick leave, are less often absent, have lower turnover rates, and are more committed to the firm (Sonhee 2002; Argyle 1989).

Over the past 30 years there has been a significant volume of writing in social science literature relating to happiness at work (Veenhoven 1997; Sonhee 2002). Much of it is concerned with working hours, stress, expectations, job characteristics and social recognition. Some scholars have undertaken research into the relationship between happiness, work and leisure. Others have examined economic and social benefits stemming from job satisfaction (see generally the World Database of Happiness). Whilst one would expect that in any comprehensive study of workplace happiness, labour law would figure in the analysis, there has to date been no significant examination of the subject in this field. This can be viewed as a striking omission.

There are many possible explanations for this gap, several of

them related to the current nature of legal scholarship. Lawyers tend to focus on the formal rights and obligations of parties. They tend to favour the technical analysis of legal rules over the empirical evaluation of the law's impact. Its purpose is seen to be the balancing of economic efficiency goals with the protection of the rights of employees. In adopting this focus, lawyers have averted their eyes from the subject of workplace happiness.

This chapter investigates how promoting workplace happiness might be made an explicit objective of labour law. I discuss one manner in which this objective could be implemented in a concrete way. The focus of this book has caused me to consider a practical scheme of employee democracy which might contribute to the advancement of workplace satisfaction. Some may be skeptical of the promotion of happiness at work as an objective for labour law. Yet happiness is a serious objective which I invite people to consider. It allows us to assess the employment relationship in more human terms; the achievement of happiness at work is also a significant objective in its own right.

Happiness as a new objective of labour law, and traditional objectives of labour law

We can learn much about labour law by considering its purposes (Mitchell and Murray 2002). Two purposes that are typically identified are redressing the power imbalance in the employment relationship, and producing efficient market outcomes.

In most Western countries, the traditional objective of labour law is to reduce the inequality, injustice and possible exploitation inherent in the employment relationship. Since the 1950s, this philosophy has been encapsulated in the well-known words of Kahn-Freund: 'The main object of labour law [is] to be a countervailing force to counteract the inequality of bargaining power which is inherent and must be inherent in the employment relationship' (Davies and Freedland 1983, p.18). The means chosen to pursue this objective are 'fair' employment contracts, minimum labour standards to guarantee acceptable limits of social welfare, and the permissibility of trade unions to counteract the greater power of employers. The extent of these measures has varied over time and in different countries (Creighton and Stewart 2000, p.5; Creighton *et al* 1993, p.1). The other main objective of labour law is economic regulation. This purpose sees labour law

as a means to ensure economic growth and prosperity.

Traditionally in Australia there has been an attempt to balance the protection and efficiency functions through the decisions of industrial tribunals and in national wage cases. Wage levels and conditions were set bearing in mind the capacity of the economy to sustain such conditions. In setting standards, consideration was given to their likely effect on unemployment and inflation. In more recent years, with the shift to a decentralised system of enterprise bargaining, there has been 'increasing pressure to break down legal structures and determinations in the name of economic efficiency' (Creighton *et al* 1993, p.2). The pre-eminent philosophy today promotes labour market regulation to enhance efficient market outcomes. This is seen as a means to promote flexible and productive work practices at the enterprise level (Creighton and Stewart 2000, p.7).

The increasing dominance of the efficiency function challenges and often undermines the traditional, protective purpose of labour law. This is because the market analysis does not necessarily take into account the inequality of bargaining power between parties to the employment relationship. Rather, it uses the quite different criterion of economic efficiency. Efficiency-based arguments can be used both to justify and criticise state intervention in labour markets, but historically this analysis has been used primarily to criticise state intervention that maintains employment conditions which have preserved the power-balancing function (see Collins 2000, p.3). As Creighton and Stewart explain, some extreme libertarian proponents of this view believe that the law should merely facilitate

> the individual transaction between the seller and purchaser of labour, without seeking to regulate the outcomes of that transaction. If individual workers are prepared to agree to being hired on apparently harsh or unfavourable conditions, this is not only unobjectionable, but indeed an indication of both their 'freedom of choice' and the operation of the 'forces of supply and demand.' (Creighton and Stewart 2000, p.6)

Libertarians have also criticised the actions of trade unions which play a vital role with regard to the power-balancing objective of

labour law (see Hayek 1960). The actions of trade unions are perceived to 'have a distorting effect on the operation of the market,' and their capacity 'to exert collective power through coordinated industrial action must be curtailed, if not entirely eliminated' (Creighton and Stewart, 2000, p.7).

The market approach has gained significant support in Western countries over the past 30 years. This support takes the form of reforms 'favouring individual employment arrangements over collective agreements or state-imposed conditions' and limiting the power of trade unions. In addition, the business community has welcomed changes that have 'strengthened the power of employers *vis-à-vis* unions and workers' (Creighton and Stewart 2000, p.8).

It is clear today that the conflict between these two objectives is increasing, and this is accompanied by a shift from a balancing to a conflictual model. Difficulties will arise in reconciling the conflicting purposes; minds will differ on the appropriate balance between efficiency and protection. Fairness to all parties would require an open approach, one which is capable of assessing the overall costs of efficiency and protection. Both purposes have played a vital role in shaping and developing labour law over the last century. They will no doubt continue to be of enduring importance.

Introducing happiness

Apart from the two traditional goals, there are other important values to be taken into account in labour law. Our working lives are not just a calculus to minimize fear and to get the most out of our time and effort: there are other important aspects to our experience of work, such as contentment and enjoyment. Consideration should be given to how people can be happy with their work. This is all the more important because work is a very significant facet of most people's lives. For present purposes, I use the term happiness to refer to a subjective sense of satisfaction, and not a state of bliss. My focus in this chapter is specifically on employee satisfaction, as satisfaction is a significant aspect of human happiness.[2]

One important question is whether the law can promote a highly subjective state such as happiness. Is it really possible for law to promote happiness at work? Given the subjective nature of

satisfaction, it could be argued that its attainment would be speculative and impossible to measure. However, the determinants of satisfaction are not simply matters of personal taste nor arbitrary choice. Through contemporary survey techniques it is possible to identify common determinants of happiness amongst people. There is a considerable body of social science research into the determinants of happiness in various contexts. (Veenhoven 1997, 2001)

Some determinants of happiness in the workplace seem obvious. Not surprisingly, 'jobs which provide intrinsic rewards such as challenge, meaning, variety and complexity are the most satisfying' (Loscocco and Roschelle 1991, p. 192). On the other hand, some jobs are repetitive, boring, involve minimal skill, enjoy little social recognition, involve little feedback and comprise the completion of only part of the entire piece of work. These jobs are experienced as less satisfying. Quite surprisingly, after a person attains a certain level of income, additional income does not necessarily add to their overall happiness (Veenhoven 1997, pp. 12,15). Contrary to what some commentators would have us believe, money cannot always buy happiness, and satisfying work can be more important than financial remuneration. In Western societies, it seems that the ability to control one's environment is a common unifying factor across many different determinants of happiness (Veenhoven 1997, p.16). More specifically, there is a considerable body of research showing that participation in the workplace has a positive effect on employee satisfaction (World Database of Happiness).[3]

Thus, there are measurable determinants of happiness for the workplace. Based on these measures, it is possible to frame laws of general application to promote employee satisfaction. State regulation can be justified if it promotes the greatest happiness for the greatest number.

Comparing the objectives of labour law

There are various ways in which labour law's aims of efficiency, protection and – potentially – happiness may interact with each other. It is possible to identify connections between the various objectives. In fact, it is sometimes hard to separate out happiness from the other two purposes. Protection against unfair working conditions may reduce unhappiness in the workplace. Therefore, it could be argued that in order to achieve the objective of happiness,

it is necessary to balance out efficiency with protection. Also economic efficiency can contribute to the generation of jobs, which may be conducive to happiness. If there is not an efficient labour market, there will be fewer jobs and the people without work might well be unhappy. One problem with these kinds of argument is that happiness is seen as a derivative of the other two functions.

There is not necessarily anything wrong with happiness being a byproduct of efficiency or protection. However, this form of analysis means that the objective of happiness is not considered in its own right. Considerations of happiness are often overlooked by proponents of the other two purposes, though sometimes they are dealt with indirectly.

Indeed, the concept of happiness does not figure directly in the protective function of labour law. The notion of employee satisfaction is not specifically addressed by the approach of balancing the power of employers and employees. But the protective function to 'relieve employees from some of the consequences of their relative lack of power' (Creighton and Stewart 2000, p.5) certainly may contribute to the removal of conditions of employment which are harsh, cruel or unpleasant. With the decline in the influence of the protective function, we can expect to see a corresponding decline in the satisfaction of employees. If the power-balancing function is reduced to a safety-net approach, with minimum conditions and with protection only for the most disadvantaged employees, it will provide much less protection against exploitation, deprivation and, ultimately, unhappiness.

The economic efficiency objective of labour law does address the satisfaction of employees more explicitly. Happiness enters the libertarian picture through the claim that if parties are left alone to pursue their own interests, this can produce satisfying results for everyone. State regulation is commonly regarded by libertarians as paternalistic, unnecessary and a hindrance to the promotion of happiness. This argument is open to objection. Some proponents of the market mechanism openly acknowledge that employees may accept apparently harsh or unfavorable conditions. Market transactions thus do not necessarily result in happiness.

By including the concept of happiness in our analysis, the potentially conflicting purposes of labour law can be made, in a sense, commensurable. Happiness can be seen as a mediating objective which allows an assessment of the other objectives in terms

of human experiences such as pleasure, suffering and gratification. In this way, the happiness objective challenges the view of efficiency and protection as the dominant objectives of labour law.

Labour law's limitations

According to this novel argument, happiness can be seen as an additional objective for labour law in its own right. The question, then, is: how can labour law promote satisfaction in the employment relationship? To answer this question it is necessary to consider the capabilities and limitations of labour law.

Law cannot directly provide for all necessary conditions of happiness in a market economy, since these conditions depend on economic forces. Under prevailing economic conditions, not all people can be employed as managers or professionals, who are empirically the most satisfied group of employees (Veenhoven 1997, p. 15). Not all jobs are satisfying and well paid. Unfortunately, unsatisfying, boring and even soul-destroying work exists in most societies – and at times in most jobs! Being unsatisfied at work is generally not a reason not to work. However, being unhappy at work may be a reason for leaving a job and looking for another one.

The law is also limited in its capacity to regulate the conditions of employment. It cannot provide an individual with a personal right to happiness, since a right based on individual personal satisfaction could not be enforced in a court of law. Such a right would be vague and uncertain. The subjective nature of happiness could give rise to idiosyncratic and vexatious claims. One can imagine labour lawyers having a field day with the concept.

Allowing for these limitations, there is still considerable scope for the law to promote happiness at work. If happiness is to be pursued via legal means, it must be through the formulation of general rules which encapsulate the strongest determinants of happiness. It may not be possible to ensure the personal satisfaction of every individual, in part because personal expectations may vary depending on personal circumstances. But we do know that there are some conditions that produce happiness for the vast majority. Some of these conditions are amenable to regulation; examples are minimum working conditions and participation in management decisions. Such regulation would not ensure individual happiness, but it would establish general

conditions that are conducive to it. One such option will be explored in the next section of this chapter.

Employee representation and happiness at work: Influencing the work environment

I now consider how the objective of promoting happiness may be implemented in a practical way. The law may play a vital role in promoting the satisfaction of employees at work through schemes of employee information-sharing and consultation.

Unlike citizens in many other Western democracies, under Commonwealth law Australians do not have a general right to be consulted in the workplace.[4] Australians have neither a right to become 'industrial citizens' nor to elect a 'consultative body to participate in workplace governance' (*The Age*, March 9, 2001). By contrast, in Western Europe there exist quite extensive legislative mechanisms which provide employees with a general right of consultation and representation. This is achieved through bodies known as works councils.

European-style works councils[5] are a promising form of employee participation, and their introduction into Australia has been foreshadowed as a possible reform. In introducing such a reform there are many important considerations of appropriateness and desirability. Typically, considerations include the financial costs of establishing such schemes, their potential legal operation, their effect on efficiency and productivity, and on the relations between employers and unions (Patmore 1999; 2001). However, in this chapter, I take quite a different approach, exploring the relationship between works councils and employee satisfaction.

Works councils provide a means through which employees can exercise control over their work environment by being able to participate in decisions that affect them. Seeing that control over one's environment and participation in the workplace are associated with human happiness, there appears to be significant potential for works councils to enhance employee satisfaction. To explore this potential, I will take the Dutch system of works councils as a case study. Works councils have operated in the Netherlands for over 50 years and are now a well-established workplace institution. They are widely accepted by employees, employers and government (Van het Kaar, 2000).

For my purposes the critical question is: are Dutch works

councils capable of promoting happiness at work? In answering this question, one key issue is the extent to which works councils give employees the legal right to exert influence over their own work environment. I am mindful of the fact that merely having a legal right is one thing, while the question of how the right is actually exercised is another. In particular, I am interested in the extent to which decisions affected by works councils are directed towards the promotion of employee satisfaction.

The legal system of works councils in the Netherlands

Dutch employees have the opportunity to participate in workplace decision making through a democratic process which is in turn underpinned by legislation. As members of works councils are directly elected by and from employees in the enterprise, they possess a democratic mandate (Works Council Act (WCA), section 6). Works councils exert power and influence through processes of information sharing, consultation and discussion. They meet with management regularly (WCA section 24(1); Rood 1999, [265]). The strength of works councils' influence is reinforced by a bedrock of key legal rights. These rights impose obligations on management (Van het Kaar, 2000). The form of influence, and its subject matter, is prescribed by law. Works councils thus draw upon a legal mandate in addition to their democratic mandate.

The four central rights bestowed by law upon these works councils are:

a) a right to information reasonably necessary to perform its representative functions (e.g. information about the economic status of the firm) (WCA section 31);
b) a right to prior consultation, and a right to tender advice, on many important social, economic and strategic decisions (e.g. corporate restructuring, the introduction of new technology)[6] (WCA sections 25, 30);
c) a right to co-determination (consent) on changes to rules relating to many important conditions of employment[7] (WCA section 27);
d) a right to submit proposals and have them considered by management, typically concerning labour policy matters (WCA section 23(2) and 23(3)); (see also Rood 1999, [263] and Van het Kaar 2000).

These rights bestow upon works councils a very considerable capacity to exert influence on enterprise decision making. Importantly, works councils also have the power to enforce their rights. Informally, they can defer meetings and withhold consent on certain specified issues. More formally, they can refer disputes to the courts (WCA section 26). Employers have similar rights of referral[8] (WCA section 26, 27(4); Rood 1999, [274]). Nonetheless, works councils do not generally exercise a veto right.[9]

The works council mandate extends to large and medium-sized businesses. All firms with more than 50 staff are required by law to establish a works council (WCA section 2; for small companies: section 35 (b), (c), (d); company-wide councils: sections 33–35). A recent study found 71 per cent compliance. Government bodies had a much higher than average rate of compliance (Engelen et al, 2001; Van het Kaar, 2002).

The subject matter over which works councils can exert influence is limited by the presence of unions and collective bargaining. In the Netherlands, works councils provide an additional form of employee participation in workplace decision-making. They are designed to complement, not replace, union schemes of collective bargaining at the sectoral level.[10] Union agreements deal with wages and some key working conditions (Collective Bargaining Agreements Act, section 1). However, unions have attempted to replicate the rights given to works councils through legislation by including rights to consultation over certain issues in some collective agreements (*WCA* section 27; Murray 1998, p. 88). For instance, the right of consent by works councils does not apply to items which have been included as a part of a collective agreement (Van het Kaar, 1997).

In sum, the works councils legislation provides very significant legal rights allowing employees to exert influence over many key workplace decisions. I now explore whether this influence is being exercised in a way that is conducive to employee satisfaction.[11]

Happiness: the possession and exercise of legal rights

There is no apparent legal right to employee satisfaction under the Dutch works councils legislation. Rather, there is a legal right to consultation over many critical issues which in turn have a bearing upon employee satisfaction. Thus, through consultation, employee satisfaction is promoted indirectly. Indeed, the legislation is

implicitly concerned with the satisfaction of employees. This can be discerned from the topics set down by the legislature to be discussed by works councils, since many of these issues are those having a clear bearing upon employees enjoyment of their work. It is likely that issues such as recruitment of groups of temporary employees, new technologies and the appointment or dismissal of managers would have an effect on the happiness of employees. After all, these issues have a direct impact on the conditions under which employees perform their jobs.

The capacity of works councils to promote happiness in the workplace is strongly related to their influence on various policy matters. According to 'The Mature Works Council' study[12], works councils exert a 'reasonable to high' degree of influence only with regard to personnel policy, followed by a 'reasonable' degree of influence on general and organisational policy. Works councils exert very little influence in the remaining policy areas (commercial, financial and technological).

Managers too seem to view the role of works councils primarily in terms of personnel policy, which further reinforces their link with workplace happiness. There appears to be a considerable rise in managers' appreciation of the contribution of works councils towards 'gaining the personnel's support for decisions ... improving the handling of the personnel's interests and reducing differences in hierarchy' (The Mature Works Council study). However, works councils exert little influence over other areas which may also have an important bearing on job satisfaction (for example technological change). From the managerial point of view, works councils perform a vital function in enhancing employee satisfaction, though this is limited by concerns about interference in strategic matters.

Employee representatives similarly focus on personnel issues in works council consultation. When matters 'are classified according to topic, it transpires that working hours are the most controversial issue and are responsible for 30 per cent of the total number of consent refusals' (The Mature Works Council study). Control over working hours is an issue quintessentially pertaining to employee happiness.

It is plausible to conclude that at a deep level, the promotion of employee satisfaction is a critical function of works councils in the Netherlands. The pursuit of happiness is a significant goal in any

democratic system, and the advancement of employee satisfaction is inherent in the industrial representative's role. It should thus be unsurprising that works councils function in this way. Further research regarding the views of works council representatives, managers and employees would give us greater understanding of the works councils' satisfaction-enhancing function. Research would be especially helpful given that this function has hitherto operated without explicit legislative acknowledgment.

Works councils clearly perform other important functions. The topics dealt with by the councils have an obvious bearing on economic efficiency. At the same time, works councils perform a protective function, allowing employees to protect their own interests. However, based on the available empirical evidence, each of these functions is somewhat curtailed by the focus on personnel issues. The happiness function, though less readily apparent, is given considerable prominence by both managers and employee representatives.

In sum, there are two possible ways in which the influence of works councils can promote happiness at work. Firstly, works councils provide employees with a legal right to exert influence on their working environment. The mere sense of possession of this right is likely to promote the happiness of employees. Secondly, works councils provide a means through which employees can actively address concrete issues affecting their job satisfaction. Of course, in order to address these issues, employees first need the right to do so. Works councils provide an effective means of addressing such issues. If the contemporary fears, aspirations and opportunities of employees are to be dealt with more adequately, there needs to be a mechanism which deals with these sensibilities in the workforce. The furtherance of workplace happiness is a key function of works councils, and this makes them a particularly attractive social institution.

Conclusion

This chapter has introduced, in a preliminary way, the idea that happiness might become an explicit objective of labour law. The significance of this approach is that it enables us to assess the employment relationship in very human terms. It also shows signs of promise as a mediator between the two dominant and conflicting purposes of labour law.

In my consideration of the satisfaction-enhancing objective, I have opened up some possibilities for its implementation. Although there are limits on how vigorously the law can promote happiness within a market economy, there are many possibilities for instituting changes which may increase happiness at work.

One example is the way in which works councils may promote the satisfaction of employees. The Dutch system of works councils provides a mature model for regulated consultation, drawing on a democratic and a legal mandate. Australia may draw inspiration from this example in developing a new form of employee representation. Other areas in which the law might further employee satisfaction include job security, working hours and family leave arrangements. Over all there is much scope for labour law to promote happiness at work.

Notes

1 I am indebted to Ms Anne Löhnberg, Mr Anthony O'Donnell and Professor Richard Mitchell, who read previous drafts of this chapter and offered very thoughtful comments. Some of the research for this chapter was undertaken while I was a visitor at the Department of Labour Law at the University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands. I would like to thank members of the department for their assistance and helpful suggestions - particularly, prof. dr. Evert Verhulp, prof.dr. Klara Boonstra, dr. Ronald Beltzer and Margreet Kroon. I would like to especially thank prof. dr. Ton Wilthagen of the Tilburg University (the University of Brabant) for his hospitality and guidance. Finally, I am particularly indebted to Mr Patrick Whyte, Ms Machteld Vonk and Ms Sam Horsfield who provided invaluable research assistance.

2 A search of the archives of *The Age* newspaper showed 149 instances of documents containing the phrase 'job satisfaction' from October 2000 to October 2002.

I realise that satisfaction is only part of a broader concept of happiness. Happiness refers to the emotions experienced when in a state of well-being. A state of well-being can be ach6ieved in various ways, such as when we feel secure or respected. Discussion of the broader aspects of happiness would require a much more detailed treatment.

3 Note that there is a difference of views over the extent to which participation enhances job satisfaction (World Database of Happiness).

4 Note that there are several limited Commonwealth legislative entitlements relating to redundancy (see Workplace Relations Act 1996 (Cth), Part VIA, Division 3, Subdivisions D and E). Redundancy entitlements have also been achieved through bargaining and included in some certified agreements.

5 The European Commission has been active in promoting the establishment of works councils in all member states.

6 Rood, 1999, p. 269: 'The employer has to give the works council the opportunity to render advice on any decision he proposes to make concerning:

a) transfer of control of the enterprise or part thereof;

b) introduction, substantial change or termination of long-term co-operation

with another enterprise, including financial participation;
c) termination of activities of the enterprise or major part thereof;
d) substantial reduction, expansion or other changes in the activities of the enterprise;
e) substantial changes in the organisation of the enterprise or in the allocation of responsibilities within the enterprise;
f) change of location;
g) recruitment or hiring of labour on a group basis;
h) making of a substantial capital investment;
i) contracting of a substantial loan;
j) 'The employer should obtain the consent of the works council for any decision he proposes to make concerning the introduction, modification or withdrawal of use of outside experts on the above matters.' (Rood 1999, p. 272)
a) a pension insurance, profit-sharing or savings plans;
b) arrangements relating to working hours or vacation policy;
c) a remuneration or job evaluation system;
d) an arrangement relating to safety, health or welfare at work;
e) an arrangement in the field of recruitment, dismissal or promotion policy;
f) an arrangement in the field of employee training policy;
g) an arrangement in the field of employee appraisal systems;
h) an arrangement in the field of industrial welfare work;
i) an arrangement in the field of work consultation;
j) an arrangement in the handling of complaints;
k) an arrangement relating to the position of juveniles in the enterprise.'

8 Please note that s. 27 (4) of WCA states that the employer can seek the consent of the sub-district court [the Cantonal Court] if the works council has not given its consent. This is not the same court as the one the works council can appeal to, that is the Enterprise Section of the Amsterdam Court of Appeal.

9 As Van het Kaar (1997) explains, it would be wrong to conclude that the works council right to give advice is a veto right: 'A decision may be reversed only after it has been ruled unfair. In addition, the Enterprise Chamber of the Amsterdam Court generally confines itself to procedural rather than substantive aspects of a decision. ... The rulings of the Court over time reveal that mainly negligent decision-making is deemed unacceptable. Employers which provided sufficient information in a timely manner, explained their decisions and could show that consideration was given to employee interests in the decision-making process, were generally free to make their decision as they saw fit, even if the decision had adverse consequences for the employees.'

10 However, in practice, most works council members are also members of trade unions (Jelle Visser in Baglioni and Crouch, p. 204 referred to in Murray, 1998, p.78).

11 Another possible line of inquiry would be to examine the differences in levels of satisfaction between those workplaces with works councils and those without. It might also be possible to examine whether more direct forms of employee involvement and participation give higher satisfaction outcomes than indirect representatives forms such as works councils. However, there is an imbalance of power in the employment relationship in the areas of bargaining, organisation, administration, information etc, and these would need to be considered in any assessment of the satisfaction-enhancing ability of different forms of participation.

12 The mature works council study was a large-scale survey conducted in 1998 with a randomly selected group of organisations that had works councils. 'More than

400 managers and 400 works councils responded. The overlap between the two categories amounted to 151 – i.e. information was received from both a manager and the works council in 151 organisations' (Van het Kaar, 2000). References to the study in the text are also taken from Van het Kaar (2000).

Stone, I. (1945), *Clarence Darrow for the Defence*, evidence of George Baer, president of the Philadelphia and Reading Coal and Iron Company to the Coal Commission 1902-03 established by President Theodore Roosevelt, Garden City Publishing Co, p. 150.

United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (1995) *States of Disarray: The Social Effects of Globalization.*

Vinson, T. (1999) *Unequal in Life: The Distribution of Social Disadvantage in Victoria and New South Wales*, Ignatius Centre.

Chapter Four

The Age, March 9, 2001, p.15, Professor Ron MacCullum.

Argyle, Michael (1989), 'Do Happy Workers Work Harder: The effect of job satisfaction on work performance',in Hagenaars, Aldi (ed) *How Harmful is Happiness? Consequences of enjoying life or not.* Universitaire Pers Rotterdam, The Netherlands .

Collective Bargaining Agreements Act (*Wet op de collectieve arbeidsovereenkomst*), The Netherlands.

Collins, H. (2000), 'Justifications and techniques of legal regulation of the employment relation', in Collins, H., Davies, P., and Rideout, R. (eds) *Legal Regulation of the Employment Relation*, Kluwer Law International..

Creighton, B. and Stewart, A. (2000) *Labour Law: An Introduction* (third edition), Federation Press.

Creighton, B., Ford, W., and Mitchell, R. (1993) *Labour Law: Text and Materials* (second edition), The Law Book Co.

Davies P. and Freedland, M. (1983) *Kahn-Freund's Labour and the Law* (third edition), Stevens.

Hayek, F. A., (1960) *The Constitution of Liberty*, Routledge.

Loscocco, K. and Roschelle, A., (1991) 'Influences on the quality of work and nonwork life: two decades in review' *Journal of Vocational Behaviour* Vol 39, p. 182–225.

The Mature Works Council (1999), [De Volwassen OR], Van het Kaar, R. H. and Looise, J. C. (with contributions from Popma, J., Bijlsma, A.G.M., Drucker, M., and Veersma, U.), Samsom Bedrijfs Informatie .

Mitchell R. and Murray J, (2002), Book Review, *Legal Regulation of the Employment Relation, Industrial Law Journal.*

Murray, J. (1998), 'The new social contract: The Netherlands: controlled deregulation', unpublished paper, copy on file with author.

Engelen, M, van der Aalst, M. and Hornstra, E. (2001) 'Naleving van de Wet op de ondernemingsraden [Compliance with the Works Councils Act], State of affairs at the beginning of 2001', The Hague.

Patmore, G. (1999), 'Creating the participatory society: workplace democracy for Australia', in Patmore G. and Glover D. (eds.), *New Voices for Social Democracy: Labor Essays 1999-2000*, Pluto Press, pp 100-115.

Patmore, G. (2001) 'A new light on an old hill: industrial democracy for Australia: towards a new form of employee representation in the workplace', *Arena* (June - July 2001), Melbourne.

Rood, M. G. (1999) 'The Netherlands', in Blainpain, R. (ed.) *International*

Encyclopaedia of Labour Law and Industrial Relations, 15.
Sonhee Kim, (2002) 'Participative management and job satisfaction: lessons for management leadership,' (Mar/Apr) 62(2) *Public Administration Review* 231-241.
Van het Kaar, R. H. (1997), 'Amendment of the Dutch Works Councils Act: a few surprises', http://www.eiro.eurofound.ie/1997/09/Feature/NL9709130F.html
Van het Kaar, R. H. (2000), 'Position of works councils examined', http://www.eiro.eurofound.ie/2000/10/feature/NL0010109F.html
Van het Kaar, R. H. (2002), 'Problems emerge as works councils' role expands', http://www.eiro.eurofound.ie/2002/03/feature/NL0203102F.html
Veenhoven. R (1997) 'Advances in understanding happiness', *Revue Quebecoise de Psychologie*, Vol 18, p. 29–74.
Veenhoven, R (2001) 'Quality of life and happiness: not quite the same', published in Italian in: DeGirolamo, G. et al (eds), 'Salute e qualità dell vida', Centro Scientifico Editore, Torino, Italia, pp 67-(Please note that Ruut Veenhoven's articles available in English and are on jois website, http://www.eur.nl/fsw/research/veenhoven/Pub2000s/2001f-txt.rtf.)
Visser, J (1990) 'Continuity and change in Dutch industrial relations', in Baglioni, G. and Crouch, C. (eds), *European Industrial Relations: the Challenge of Flexibility*, Sage Publishing.
Works Councils Act (WCA) (*Wet op de Ondernemingsraden*), the Netherlands.
World Database of Happiness, http://www.eur.nl/research/happiness/

Chapter Five

Archer, R. (1996) 'The philosophical case for economic democracy' in Pagano, U. and Rowthorn, R., *Democracy and Efficiency in the Economic Enterprise*, Routledge.
Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (1993) 'The democratic firm: an agency-theoretic evaluation' in Bowles, S., Gintis, H. & Gustafsson, B., *Democracy and Markets: Participation, Accountability and Efficiency*, Cambridge University Press.
Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (1996) 'Is the demand for workplace democracy redundant in a liberal economy' in Pagano, U. and Rowthorn, R., *Democracy and Efficiency in the Economic Enterprise*, Routledge.
Bowles, S. (1985), 'The production process in a competitive economy: Walrasian, Neo-Hobbesian, and Marxian Models', *American Economic Review*, vol. 75.
D'Art, D. (1992) *Economic Democracy and Financial Participation*, Routledge.
Dahl, R. (1970) *After the Revolution*, Yale University Press.
Deery, S. and Plowman, D. (1991) *Australian Industrial Relations*, McGraw-Hill.
Green, L. (1988) *The Authority of the State*, Clarendon.
Hirschman, A. (1970) *Exit, Voice and Loyalty*, Harvard University Press.
Marx, K. (1976) *Capital*, Random House, vol. 1.