



**The Evolution of National Social  
Dialogue in Europe under the Single  
Market, 1992-2006**  
**Andreas Kornelakis**  
[a.kornelakis@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:a.kornelakis@sussex.ac.uk)

*University of Sussex*

**SEI Working Paper No. 134**

The **Sussex European Institute** publishes Working Papers (ISSN 1350-4649) to make research results, accounts of work-in-progress and background information available to those concerned with contemporary European issues. The Institute does not express opinions of its own; the views expressed in this publication are the responsibility of the author.

The **Sussex European Institute**, founded in Autumn 1992, is a research and graduate teaching centre of the University of Sussex, specialising in studies of contemporary Europe, particularly in the social sciences and contemporary history. The **SEI** has a developing research programme which defines Europe broadly and seeks to draw on the contributions of a range of disciplines to the understanding of contemporary Europe. The **SEI** draws on the expertise of many faculty members from the University, as well as on those of its own staff and visiting fellows. In addition, the **SEI** provides one-year MA courses in Contemporary European Studies and European Politics and opportunities for MPhil and DPhil research degrees.

<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/sei/>

First published in April 2014  
by the **Sussex European Institute**  
University of Sussex, Falmer,  
Brighton BN1 9RG  
Tel: 01273 678578  
Fax: 01273 678571  
[E-mail: sei@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:sei@sussex.ac.uk)

© **Sussex European Institute**

### ***Ordering Details***

The price of this Working Paper is £5.00 plus postage and packing. Orders should be sent to the Sussex European Institute, University of Sussex, Falmer, Brighton BN1 9RG. Cheques should be made payable to the University of Sussex. Please add £1.00 postage per copy in Europe and £2.00 per copy elsewhere. See page 19 for a list of other working papers published by Sussex European Institute. Alternatively, **SEI** Working Papers are available from our website at: <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/sei/publications/seiworkingpapers>.

## **Abstract**

*This paper examines the evolution of national social dialogue (bipartite wage bargaining) across European countries. Several commentators in the 1990s expected the dismantling of national social dialogue institutions. Following the liberalisation of markets, intensification of competition, and declining union power, bargaining structures were supposed to converge to the Anglo-Saxon model of decentralised bargaining. The paper seeks to gauge the plausibility of the 'decentralization thesis' using novel indicators of collective bargaining centralization across the EU15. It is shown that despite the changes in product markets, flexible working, and declining union density, a generalized decentralization of bargaining did not occur. Instead, in many European cases there is a counter-trend of centralization, which casts doubt to the decentralization thesis.*

**Keywords:** Europe, Labour Markets, Liberalization, Single Market, Social Dialogue.

# **The Evolution of National Social Dialogue in Europe under the Single Market, 1992-2006**

**Andreas Kornelakis**

**University of Sussex, Business & Management**

**[a.kornelakis@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:a.kornelakis@sussex.ac.uk)**

## **1. Introduction**

The progress of European economic integration and the internationalisation of employee management practices were expected to have far-reaching consequences on national social dialogue institutions across advanced capitalist countries. Social dialogue here refers to traditional bi-partite wage bargaining institutions between trade unions and employers associations. Responding to what is commonly perceived as the move from Fordism to the post-Fordist era, European firms sought to enhance their competitiveness by pushing for more labour flexibility. This ‘search for flexibility’ (Atkinson, 1984; Boyer, 1988; Deakin & Reed, 2000; Freeman, 2005; Marsden, 1995; Streeck, 1987) would involve –among other things– the breakdown of long-standing social dialogue institutions. However, the direction of change proved to be more nuanced and differentiated than initially anticipated. In this paper I examine the divergent trajectories of change in wage bargaining institutions in European countries.

The early 1990s marked a crucial turning point for the progress of European integration. On the road from the Single European Act of 1986 until the completion of the Single Market in 1992 the focus of rules harmonisation within the European Union shifted towards removing non-tariff barriers to trade in manufacturing and services sectors. The processes of liberalisation and rules-harmonization were expected to have a ‘domino effect’ on national social dialogue institutions leading to a generalised decentralisation of bargaining (Crouch, 2000; Dolvik, 2004; Wallerstein, 1998). Although the ‘convergence’ of wage bargaining arrangements was not a preoccupation of the EU-level negotiations for the Economic and

Monetary Union (Dyson & Featherstone, 1999:785), the expectation was based on several grounds. The opening up of these markets to competition was thought to have weakened the incentive for cost-standardisation from the part of the firms. The process of privatisation was expected to modernise the internal work organisation of the firms, introducing new and more flexible management practices, thus transforming bureaucratic organisations into competitive firms. Overall, the pressures from EU liberalisation and international diffusion of work flexibility were the implicit forces putting pressure for institutional convergence to the Liberal market model of decentralised industrial relations. Despite the above strong pressures, a uniform trend towards decentralised pay setting is not observed in Europe when looking in the period up to 1992 (Wallerstein, Golden, & Lange, 1997). Instead, the breakdown of wage bargaining occurred in some sectors, and is mostly observed within Anglo-Saxon countries (Brown & Walsh, 1991; Wallerstein, 1998).

At the backdrop of this academic debate this paper sets out to gauge the plausibility of the ‘decentralization thesis’ by examining collective bargaining developments across European countries since the early 1990s. It is shown that despite the completion of the Single Market, the increased introduction of flexible working systems and decline of union power, there is no generalised trend towards decentralization.

The structure of the paper is as follows; the next section presents some methodological considerations that inform this paper; the third section substantiates the trends of product markets liberalisation, flexibility in working time and pay systems, and union power decline that provided pressures to collective bargaining centralisation; the fourth section examines indices of collective bargaining centralization across EU15 countries since the 1990s and concludes that decentralization did not happen and instead, collective bargaining institutions

proved much more resilient than initially anticipated; and the final section summarises the findings and discusses limitations and avenues for further research.

## **2. Methodological Considerations**

The main research question that the paper is trying to answer is: how has wage bargaining centralisation evolved across Europe in light of the pressures from liberalisation and flexibility? A seminal study on the plausibility of the ‘decentralisation thesis’ by Michael Wallerstein, Miriam Golden and Peter Lange (1997:396-7) concluded that ‘overall the data indicate that recent institutional change is less universal’ and that ‘a general process of decentralisation is not evident’. However, they qualified their argument, admitting that ‘wage setting may become much more decentralised...in the future. Our point is that such a change has not happened yet’ (Wallerstein, et al., 1997:398). The aim of this section is to partly replicate and partly extend this seminal study.

The differences between the Wallerstein *et al.* (1997) article and this paper are summarised as follows. First, Wallerstein *et al.* looked at a time period from 1950 until 1992, while this paper picks the thread from 1992 onwards. This will allow the analysis to inquire into Wallerstein *et al.* qualification that ‘decentralisation may happen in the future’. Second, Wallerstein *et al.* looked at a sample of eight Northern and Central European countries (Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden). By contrast, this section looks at the whole range of EU15 countries, which were affected by the completion of the Single Market Programme since 1992. Third, Wallerstein *et al.* took for granted the hypothesised changes in product markets and work organisation/payment systems. Instead, this section provides empirical evidence from novel OECD indicators and European survey data that these changes have indeed taken place. Finally, Wallerstein *et al.*

used various proxies of wage bargaining centralisation (interconfederal concentration, statutory authority, collective bargaining coverage) to measure the centralisation level and gauge the plausibility of the ‘decentralisation thesis’. The paper presents a novel composite indicator on wage bargaining centralisation developed by Jelle Visser and available from the ICTWSS database. The use of this composite indicator is superior to the previous proxies, because it was developed to capture precisely the phenomenon under study and thereby has increased validity (cf. footnote 3).

The next sub-section starts by examining the trends towards liberalisation of product markets across EU15, before gauging the extent of diffusion of flexible working practices. Finally, the section presents the trends of wage bargaining centralisation across Europe using novel indicators. It shows that a generalised decentralisation has not still happened. Instead, divergent trajectories of change are observed across Europe.

### **3. The Pressures towards Decentralization of Bargaining**

#### ***3.1. Single Market and the Liberalisation of European Product Markets***

As regarding product markets liberalisation<sup>1</sup> in Europe there was a decisive impact of the Single Market programme launched by the European Commission. The Single European Act of 1986 aimed at constructing a single market within the European Union and had a direct impact on the regulatory frameworks of national product markets, requiring the removal of protection from sectors and abolition of monopolies. Therefore ‘network industries’ such as transportation (railways, shipping, airlines), energy (electricity, gas), telecommunications, and financial services became part of the agenda of EU liberalisation (Begg & El-Agraa, 2004).

---

<sup>1</sup> The concept of liberalisation is preferred over the concept of deregulation. The single market indeed abolished restrictions, however, leading to a re-regulation of product markets, rather than complete ‘deregulation’; cf. Thatcher (2007:33,fn57).

The single market has brought about harmonisation of technical standards not only in products but also in production processes, which were largely seen as not-tariff barriers to trade (Young, 2005:109). On balance the completion of the internal market has led to substantial restructuring of industries facilitating greater competition in a wide range of sectors (Mercado, Welford, & Prescott, 2000:101). The product market regulation indicators developed by the OECD (Table below) reflect the impact of the Single market on member-states.

**Table 1: Product Market Regulation across EU15, 1998 - 2008.**

<i>Year</i>	<i>AT</i>	<i>BE</i>	<i>DK</i>	<i>FI</i>	<i>FR</i>	<i>DE</i>	<i>EL</i>	<i>IE</i>	<i>IT</i>	<i>LU</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>PT</i>	<i>ES</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>UK</i>
<b>1998</b>	2.33	2.17	1.59	2.08	2.52	2.06	2.99	1.65	2.59	..	1.66	2.25	2.55	1.93	1.07
<b>2003</b>	1.76	1.59	1.18	1.30	1.75	1.60	2.58	1.35	1.81	1.48	1.36	1.64	1.68	1.49	0.82
<b>2008</b>	1.45	1.43	1.06	1.19	1.45	1.33	2.37	0.92	1.38	1.56	0.97	1.43	1.03	1.30	0.84

*Source: Wölf et al. (2009).*

In almost all European countries – with the exception of Luxembourg – there is a downward trend in product market regulation. However, the extent of liberalisation varies from one country to another. By 2008 the LMEs of United Kingdom and Ireland are the member-states with the least economy-wide product market regulation. By contrast, Greece reduced the regulation of product markets compared to late 1990s, but by the end of the 2000s still remained one of the most regulated in Europe.

### ***3.2. The Internationalisation of Flexible Working Practices and their Diffusion in Europe***

The internationalisation of ‘best management practices’ and their diffusion across Europe has been the outcome of best practice benchmarking and more generally mimetic modelling. Ronald Dore (2002:117) insists that the diffusion of best practice methods and principles can be partly attributed to these processes. While the term ‘globalisation’ has been a popular



buzzword to describe this process, the thesis takes internationalisation as a more appropriate term. Indeed, research suggests that ‘global’ practices are usually transformed considerably when they are introduced into domestic economies (Ferner, Almond, & Colling, 2005). Hence, the weak development of globally oriented firms is consistent with a continuing internationalising economy, but much less so with a rapidly globalising economy (Rees & Edwards, 2011:19-21). This line of argument concurs with other scholars who criticised the strong ‘globalisation’ thesis (see also Thatcher, 2007:34).

Flexible working practices entail a range of different types of flexibility: (i) functional flexibility, (ii) numerical flexibility; (iii) temporal or working time flexibility and (iv) financial or pay flexibility (Casey, Keep, & Mayhew, 1999:71; Procter & Ackroyd, 2009:497-8; Treu, 1992). Functional flexibility denotes a qualitative adjustability in work organisation such as team-work and task rotation between employees with polyvalent skills, who may carry out different tasks in responses to fluctuations in demand. Unfortunately, the extent to which these practices have surfaced in European manufacturing and services sectors is difficult to measure.

However, there is evidence that the other three types of flexibility have been on the ascendance in Europe. Forms of numerical flexibility (such as fixed-term contracts, part-time work, and temporary/agency work) have been increased in Europe during the 1990s (Brewster, Mayne, & Tregaskis, 1997; Tregaskis & Brewster, 2006:121). Additionally, working time flexibility (e.g. flexitime) and pay flexibility (e.g. performance-related pay systems or PRP) have been increasingly used by European firms. Regrettably, there are no longitudinal data on the magnitude of change since the 1990s. Instead, a survey from the European Foundation for Working and Living Conditions provides compelling evidence on

how widespread they are in Europe (see tables below). The data refer to companies with 10 or more employees. This sampling does not pose a problem for this research context, because workplaces with less than 10 employees are likely to be outside the remit of wage bargaining agreements anyway.

**Table 2. Percentage of Companies (%) with Flexi-time across EU15, 2009.**

<i>Chapter 1</i>	AT	BE	DE	DK	EL	ES	FI	FR	IE	IT	LU	NL	PT	SE	UK
<b>Industry</b>	48.8	46.5	51.3	68.4	38.4	52.8	78	46.9	49.5	38.7	48.3	55.3	42.9	60.3	64.6
<b>Services</b>	54.7	55.8	61	69.7	33	56.9	84.8	52	63.1	56.6	61.5	59.6	50.9	68.7	71.1
<b>All</b>	53.1	53.8	58.5	69.4	34.3	55.6	82.8	50.8	60.6	48.8	58	58.7	48.1	67	70.1

*Source: European Foundation (2009).*

Indeed, flexitime practices are widespread across Europe, with Greek companies having the lowest percentage of companies (34 per cent) and Finish companies having the highest percentage (83 per cent). In twelve out of fifteen European countries, the majority of companies over 10 employees use flexitime arrangements. Interestingly, there are no significant differences between services and manufacturing sectors.

**Table 3. Percentage of Companies (%) with Employees Receiving Performance related Pay across EU15, 2009.**

	AT	BE	DE	DK	EL	ES	FI	FR	IE	IT	LU	NL	PT	SE	UK
<b>Individual Performance Related Pay Systems</b>															
<b>Industry</b>	85.7	84	89.5	85.8	93.8	95.7	79.5	86.3	89	94.7	95.9	88.8	92.6	67.6	81.1
<b>Services</b>	86.5	88.5	92.3	87.5	92.7	90.6	81.7	94.1	92.6	91.2	94.2	94	89.8	73	86.5
<b>All</b>	86.3	87.6	91.6	87.1	93	92.1	81	92.2	92.1	92.6	94.6	93	90.6	71.4	85.6
<b>Group Performance Related Pay Systems</b>															
<b>Industry</b>	44.4	59.9	43	49.6	34.9	50.3	64.2	54.2	61.9	47.2	34.9	45.9	51.5	54.6	66
<b>Services</b>	47.8	67.2	41.5	53	29.5	62.4	59.4	59.3	59.7	43.2	26.8	60.6	63.1	51.3	56.5
<b>All</b>	47	65.8	41.9	52.2	30.6	58.8	60.8	58.1	60	44.8	28.7	57.8	59.5	52.3	58.1

*Source: European Foundation (2009).*

Similarly, the table above provides evidence for the widespread application of performance related pay systems in both services and manufacturing sectors. The percentage of firms

utilising individual-based performance related pay ranges from 71 per cent in Sweden to almost 95 per cent in Luxembourg. Similarly, there are very high percentages of firms using group-based performance related pay systems ranging from 30 per cent in Greece to 66 per cent in Belgium.

### 3.3. The Decline of Trade Union Membership in Europe

The expectation for a generalised breakdown of centralised bargaining was also associated with a generalised trend of decline in union membership across advanced industrial countries (Katz, 1993). Indeed the decline has taken place not only in Anglo-Saxon countries, but also across Europe. The next table substantiates this constant decline in union density<sup>2</sup> across EU15 since the 1990s.

**Table 4. Union Density Rates across EU15, 1990 - 2006.**

Chapter 2	Year	AT	BE	DK	EL	ES	FI	FR	DE	IE	IT	LU	NL	PT	SE	UK
	1990	40.5	53.9	75.3	37.5	12.5	72.5	10.1	31.2	56.7	38.8	47.3	24.3	31.7	81.5	39.3
	1991	40.2	54.3	75.8	37.0	14.7	75.4	9.9	36.0	56.9	38.7	46.5	24.1	30.0	82.8	38.5
	1992	39.6	54.3	75.8	36.5	16.5	78.4	9.9	33.9	57.0	38.9	45.7	24.8	29.0	85.0	37.2
	1993	37.6	54.3	77.3	36.3	18.0	80.7	9.6	31.8	55.6	39.2	44.6	25.3	28.0	87.1	36.1
	1994	35.0	53.8	77.5	35.0	17.6	80.3	9.2	30.4	54.0	38.7	44.0	25.6	27.0	87.4	34.2
	1995	32.7	55.7	77.0	33.6	16.3	80.4	9.0	29.2	52.3	38.1	43.4	25.2	25.4	86.6	32.6
	1996	31.1	54.7	77.4	32.0	16.1	80.4	8.3	27.8	49.1	37.4	42.8	24.9	25.0	85.1	31.7
	1997	30.3	54.6	75.6	31.0	15.7	79.5	8.2	27.0	49.1	36.2	42.3	24.4	24.3	82.0	31.0
	1998	28.1	53.7	75.5	29.2	16.4	78.0	8.0	25.9	45.5	35.7	43.6	23.8	23.0	82.3	30.1
	1999	25.7	51.8	74.9	29.0	16.2	76.3	8.1	25.3	42.6	35.4	43.5	23.5	22.0	81.6	29.8
	2000	24.7	50.5	74.2	28.0	16.9	75.0	8.2	24.6	40.8	34.7	43.4	23.1	21.0	80.1	29.7
	2001	24.5	50.8	73.8	27.0	16.1	74.5	8.1	23.7	39.7	34.2	43.3	22.6	20.0	78.0	29.3
	2002	23.1	51.9	81.4	26.0	16.4	73.5	8.2	23.5	39.8	33.6	43.2	22.4	18.9	77.7	29.2
	2003	23.0	52.9	72.4	26.3	16.4	72.9	8.4	23.0	39.5	33.5	43.1	22.5	16.6	77.2	29.3
	2004	22.7	52.9	71.7	25.0	16.0	74.1	8.4	22.1	38.1	34.0	43.0	22.4	17.0	78.0	28.8
	2005	22.4	52.5	71.8	23.1	15.5	73.3	8.5	21.6	35.9	34.4	43.0	22.3	17.0	76.5	29.0
	2006	20.3	..	69.4	23.0	15.1	72.4	8.5	20.9	..	34.8	..	21.8	17.0	75.3	28.4

Source: Visser (2007).

<sup>2</sup> Union density is the conventional indicator of the strength of union membership. It is derived as follows: actual members in trade unions divided by the potential members (i.e. total of employed wage earners).

Overall, the evidence suggests that in fourteen out of fifteen European countries, union density has been in constant decline since the 1990s. Only Spain managed to increase union members by a few percentage points between 1990 and 2006. Still, Spain and France share the lowest union densities in Europe, standing at 15 per cent and 8.5 per cent respectively. The countries that recorded the greatest losses (ranging from 10.4 per cent to 20.8 per cent) are Greece, Portugal, Austria, Germany, the United Kingdom and Ireland.

#### **4. Divergent Trajectories of Change in Wage Bargaining Centralisation**

The above-sketched picture of generalised decline in union density is not matched by a generalised breakdown of centralised wage bargaining. Despite the liberalisation of markets across Europe and the introduction of flexible working practices, which were documented in the previous sections, the evidence below suggest that wage bargaining centralisation held well, even if it took divergent trajectories of change. Taking advantage of a newly constructed indicator<sup>3</sup> from the ICTWSS database, we are able to gauge the trends in wage bargaining centralisation across EU15 countries since 1992. The evidence against the ‘decentralisation thesis’ is overwhelming; there is no generalised trend towards breakdown of centralised bargaining across Europe. This confirms the earlier finding of Wallerstein et al. (1997:398) that there is little evidence to support this claim and that the expectation of decentralisation was not borne out (Ferner & Hyman, 1998). Instead, a picture of divergent trajectories emerges, with some countries experiencing decentralisation and some others centralisation, while most are somewhere in the middle with stability in the centralisation of bargaining.

---

<sup>3</sup> According to Visser (2007) this indicator is a summary measure of centralisation of wage bargaining, which takes into account both union authority and union concentration at multiple levels. It is derived from Iversen’s centralisation index, taking values from 0 to 1. The formula is given by the equation:  $\sqrt{[(\mathbf{C} \mathbf{f} \mathbf{a} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{h} \mathbf{o} \mathbf{r} \mathbf{i} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{y} * \mathbf{H} \mathbf{c} \mathbf{f} ) + (\mathbf{A} \mathbf{f} \mathbf{f} \mathbf{a} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{h} \mathbf{o} \mathbf{r} \mathbf{i} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{y} * \mathbf{H} \mathbf{a} \mathbf{f} \mathbf{f} )]}$ , where: **Cfauthority**: authority of union confederation over its affiliates; **Hcf**: Membership concentration at central or confederal level (Herfindahl index at central level); **Affauthority**: authority of affiliate over their local or workplace branches and representatives; **Haff**: Membership concentration at the industry level, within union confederations (Herfindahl index at sectoral level).

**Table 5. Wage Bargaining Centralisation across EU15, 1992 - 2006.**

Year	AT	FR	PT	LU	UK	EL	SE	BE	DK	IT	NL	ES	IE	DE	FI	
1992	0.523	0.269	0.391	0.419	0.299	0.462	0.519	0.512	0.425	0.375	0.583	0.376	0.451	0.438	0.396	
1993	0.534	0.278	0.389	0.417	0.298	0.470	0.520	0.513	0.430	0.389	0.573	0.373	0.450	0.438	0.422	
1994	0.441	0.287	0.385	0.412	0.296	0.463	0.521	0.514	0.430	0.389	0.563	0.373	0.450	0.438	0.420	
1995	0.440	0.283	0.385	0.412	0.298	0.457	0.518	0.514	0.429	0.390	0.573	0.373	0.449	0.438	0.421	
1996	0.414	0.273	0.385	0.408	0.301	0.457	0.516	0.514	0.429	0.388	0.593	0.373	0.505	0.436	0.465	
1997	0.416	0.272	0.382	0.405	0.302	0.452	0.548	0.514	0.429	0.388	0.594	0.374	0.505	0.434	0.465	
1998	0.424	0.268	0.382	0.415	0.299	0.449	0.546	0.514	0.429	0.388	0.643	0.375	0.504	0.502	0.459	
1999	0.424	0.268	0.382	0.412	0.302	0.447	0.550	0.514	0.427	0.388	0.642	0.376	0.502	0.516	0.459	
2000	0.424	0.267	0.377	0.412	0.302	0.447	0.541	0.514	0.427	0.388	0.643	0.367	0.502	0.518	0.460	
2001	0.420	0.263	0.378	0.407	0.303	0.453	0.537	0.515	0.426	0.388	0.641	0.375	0.503	0.538	0.461	
2002	0.420	0.265	0.379	0.407	0.303	0.458	0.534	0.528	0.426	0.389	0.640	0.417	0.503	0.528	0.460	
2003	0.421	0.261	0.377	0.401	0.303	0.465	0.532	0.529	0.425	0.389	0.632	0.416	0.503	0.527	0.460	
2004	0.421	0.257	0.377	0.407	0.302	0.465	0.531	0.529	0.421	0.389	0.632	0.418	0.503	0.501	0.472	
2005	0.421	0.255	0.377	0.407	0.301	0.464	0.529	0.530	0.442	0.388	0.631	0.419	0.503	0.498	0.471	
2006	0.421	0.252	0.377	n.a.	0.300	0.465	0.529	0.530	0.440	0.389	0.629	0.419	0.501	0.497	0.470	
92-06 (Δ)	-0.102	-0.018	-0.014	-0.012	0.001	0.003	0.009	0.017	0.015	0.014	0.046	0.043	0.051	0.059	0.073	
92-06 (%)	-19.55	-6.53	-3.64	-2.86	0.24	0.75	1.78	3.37	3.47	3.60	7.84	11.41	11.24	13.43	18.54	
Trend	Decentralisation (< -3.5%)			Stability (± 3.5%)					Centralisation (> 3.5%)							

## 5. Concluding Remarks and Further Research

The core finding of this paper confirm the findings of studies examining an earlier period (Wallerstein, et al., 1997:398). Moreover, it suggests that since the completion of the Single Market in 1992, there is little evidence of a generalised trend towards decentralization of wage bargaining arrangements. Instead, there is tentative evidence to suggest that changes in collective bargaining institutions have been mixed including both convergent and divergent trends (Marginson & Sisson, 2002, 2006). However, there is evidence to suggest a more informal and subtle trend towards what has been termed as ‘organized decentralization’ (Ilsøe, 2012; Kornelakis, 2014; Traxler, 1995). In the more coordinated cases, those novel compromises have accommodated wage restraint under EMU (Herrmann, 2005; Johnston & Hancké, 2009) and hence explain part of the resilience of institutions. This tentative finding has some limitations that further research could explore. I briefly elaborate on those below.

First, the fact that there is no ‘generalised trend’ does not mean that decentralization has not taken place in individual countries or specific sectors within countries. The summary measure that we used here provided evidence against a generalised trend. The findings from this paper imply that the causal mechanism linking purported causes with the process of decentralization is flawed. Product market liberalisation, flexible time and pay practices, and union decline may be necessary but they are not sufficient conditions for the process of decentralization to be observed.

Second, existing indicators of wage bargaining centralization document, at best, incremental changes over time. Collective bargaining change (just like any sort of institutional change) is likely to be slow and path-dependent. This is partly warranted by the very small changes in the levels of centralization indicators. In fact, in many countries the indicator does not even vary from a given year to another. Additionally, while the wage bargaining summary measure is a useful tool, it is unable to capture more nuanced changes such as the ‘organized decentralization’ mentioned above. While this (informal) change may take place the indicator will be prone to identify institutional stability rather than change.

Third, shifting the unit of analysis from national-level to sub-national level is likely to yield valuable methodological advantages. Notably, it will hold constant a number of pertinent explanatory variables. King et al (1994) praise the merits of this approach and this is congruent with methodological choices in part of the literature dwelling on collective bargaining change. Pontusson & Swenson (1996) focused on the motives of the metalworking sector employers in abandoning the centralised bargaining system. Mueller & Purcell (1992) studied the changes in work organization within the automobile sector to

identify factors leading to decentralization. Thelen (2000) looked at the manufacturing industry to explain resilience of collective bargaining arrangements in Germany. Poulsen (2006) used the coal mining and steel industries to test hypotheses about collective bargaining decentralization. Similar sectoral case studies might yield useful insights.

Finally, the analysis did not take into account the re-emergence of social pacts in Europe (Avdagic, Rhodes, & Visser, 2011). Instead, the focus was on bi-partite social dialogue that takes the form of collective bargaining agreements. Hence, it leaves out the possibility that coordination could take the form of ad hoc tripartite social pacts at the national level. Those may involve not only employers and trade unions, but also the state and may be focused on wider set of economic and social policy issues, rather than the wages and working conditions that typically fall within the remit of collective bargaining agreements. Exploring further the dynamics of social dialogue structures is important, because they are a standard feature of the European Social Model (Hyman, 2005; Jepsen & Pascual, 2005; Scharpf, 2002). This line of research becomes even timelier in the context of the on-going economic recession.

### **Acknowledgements**

The author would like to thank Christa van Wijnbergen, Kevin Featherstone and Marco Simoni for helpful comments in earlier drafts, and acknowledge financial support from Bodossaki Foundation. The usual disclaimers apply.

## References

- Atkinson, J. (1984). Manpower Strategies for Flexible Organizations. *Personnel Management*, 16(8), 28-31.
- Avdagic, S., Rhodes, M., & Visser, J. (Eds.). (2011). *Social Pacts in Europe: Emergence, Evolution, and Institutionalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Begg, I., & El-Agraa, A. (2004). The Economics of the Single Market. In A. El-Agraa (Ed.), *European Union: Economics and Policies* (pp. 186-198). Harlow: Financial Times Prentice Hall.
- Boyer, R. (Ed.). (1988). *The Search for Labour Market Flexibility: the European Economies in Transition*. Clarendon: Oxford.
- Brewster, C., Mayne, L., & Tregaskis, O. (1997). Flexible Working in Europe. *Journal of World Business*, 32(2), 133-151.
- Brown, W., & Walsh, J. (1991). Pay Determination in Britain in the 1980s: the Anatomy of Decentralization. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 7(1), 44-59.
- Casey, B., Keep, E., & Mayhew, K. (1999). Flexibility, Quality and Competitiveness. *National Institute Economic Review*, 168, 70-81.
- Crouch, C. (2000). National Wage determination and European Monetary Union. In C. Crouch (Ed.), *After the Euro* (pp. 203-206). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Deakin, S., & Reed, H. (2000). The Contested Meaning of Labour-market Flexibility: Economic Theory and the Discourse of European Integration. In J. Shaw (Ed.), *Social Law and Policy in an Evolving European Union* (pp. 71-99). Oxford: Hart.
- Dolvik, J. E. (2004). Industrial Relations in EMU: are Renationalization and Europeanization Two Sides of the Same Coin? In A. Martin & G. Ross (Eds.), *Euros and Europeans: Monetary Integration and the European Model of Society* (pp. 278-308). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dore, R. (2002). Stock Market Capitalism and its Diffusion. *New Political Economy*, 7(1), 115-121.
- Dyson, K., & Featherstone, K. (1999). *The Road to Maastricht: Negotiating EMU*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- European Foundation. (2009). European Company Survey 2009 Retrieved 19/09/2011, from <http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2010/05/en/1/EF1005EN.pdf>
- Ferner, A., Almond, P., & Colling, T. (2005). Institutional Theory and the Cross-national Transfer of Employment policy: the Case of 'Workforce Diversity' in US Multinationals. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36, 304-321.
- Ferner, A., & Hyman, R. (1998). Introduction: Towards European Industrial Relations? In A. Ferner & R. Hyman (Eds.), *Changing Industrial Relations in Europe* (pp. xi-xxvi). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Freeman, R. (2005). Labour Market Institutions without Blinders: The Debate over Flexibility and Labour Market Performance. *International Economic Journal*, 19(2), 129-145.
- Herrmann, A. (2005). Converging Divergence: How Competitive Advantages Condition Institutional Change under EMU. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 43(2), 287-310.
- Hyman, R. (2005). Trade unions and the politics of the European social model. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 26(1), 9-40.
- Ilsøe, A. (2012). The Flip Side of Organized Decentralization: Company-Level Bargaining in Denmark. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 50(4), 760-781.
- Jepsen, M., & Pascual, A. (2005). The European Social Model: an exercise in deconstruction. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 15(3), 231-245.



- Johnston, A., & Hancké, B. (2009). Wage inflation and labour unions in EMU. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 16(4), 601-622.
- Katz, H. (1993). The Decentralization of Collective Bargaining: a Literature Review and Comparative Analysis. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 47(1), 3-22.
- King, G., Keohane, R., & Verba, S. (1994). *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton; NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kornelakis, A. (2014). Liberalisation, Flexibility and Industrial Relations Institutions: Evidence from Italian and Greek Banking. *Work, Employment and Society*, 28(1), 40-57.
- Marginson, P., & Sisson, K. (2002). European Integration and Industrial Relations: A Case of Convergence and Divergence? *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 40(4), 671-692.
- Marginson, P., & Sisson, K. (2006). *European Integration and Industrial Relations: Multi-level Governance in the Making*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marsden, D. (1995). Deregulation or Cooperation? The future of Europe's Labour Markets. *Labour*, 8(Special Issue), S67-S91.
- Mercado, S., Welford, R., & Prescott, K. (2000). *European Business* (4th ed.). Harlow: Financial Times/Prentice Hall.
- Mueller, F., & Purcell, J. (1992). The Europeanization of Manufacturing and the Decentralization of Bargaining: Multinational Management Strategies in the European Automobile Industry. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 3(1), 15-34.
- Pontusson, J., & Swenson, P. (1996). Labor Markets, Production Strategies, and Wage Bargaining Institutions: the Swedish Employer Offensive in Comparative Perspective. *Comparative Political Studies*, 29(2), 223-250.
- Poulsen, J. (2006). The Feeble Strength of One? Interdependence, Strategic Interaction, and the Decentralization of Collective Bargaining. *Sociological Forum*, 21(1), 3-30.
- Procter, S., & Ackroyd, S. (2009). Flexibility. In T. Redman & A. Wilkinson (Eds.), *Contemporary Human Resource Management: Text and Cases* (3rd ed., pp. 495-516). Harlow, England; New York: FT/Prentice Hall.
- Rees, C., & Edwards, T. (2011). Globalization and Multinational Companies. In T. Edwards & C. Rees (Eds.), *International Human Resource Management: Globalization, National Systems and Multinational Companies* (2nd ed., pp. 11-31). Harlow, England; New York: FT/Prentice Hall.
- Scharpf, F. (2002). The European Social Model: Coping with the challenges of diversity. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 40(4), 645-670.
- Streeck, W. (1987). The Uncertainties of Management in the Management of Uncertainty: Employers, Labor Relations and Industrial Adjustment in the 80s. *Work, Employment and Society*, 1(3), 281-308.
- Thatcher, M. (2007). *Internationalisation and Economic Institutions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thelen, K. (2000). Why German Employers Cannot Bring Themselves to Dismantle the German Model? In T. Iversen, J. Pontusson & D. Soskice (Eds.), *Unions, Employers, and Central Banks: Macroeconomic Coordination and Institutional Change in Social Market Economies* (pp. 138-172). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traxler, F. (1995). Farewell to Labour Market Associations? Organized versus Disorganized Decentralization as a Map for Industrial Relations. In C. Crouch & F. Traxler (Eds.), *Organized Industrial Relations in Europe: What future?* (pp. 3-19). Aldershot: Avebury.

- Tregaskis, O., & Brewster, C. (2006). Converging or Diverging? A Comparative Analysis of trends in Contingent Employment Practice in Europe over a Decade. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(1), 111-126.
- Treu, T. (1992). Labour Flexibility in Europe. *International Labour Review*, 131(4/5), 497-512.
- Visser, J. (2007). Data Base on Institutional Characteristics of Trade Unions, Wage Setting, State Intervention and Social Pacts in 26 countries between 1960 and 2006 Retrieved 18/09/2011, from <http://www.uva-aias.net/207>
- Wallerstein, M. (1998). The Impact of Economic Integration on European Wage-Setting Institutions. In B. Eichengreen & J. Frieden (Eds.), *Forging an Integrated Europe* (pp. 185-208). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Wallerstein, M., Golden, M., & Lange, P. (1997). Unions, Employers' Associations, and Wage-setting Institutions in Northern and Central Europe, 1950-1992. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 50(3), 379-401.
- Wölfel, A., Wanner, I., Kozluk, T., & Nicoletti, G. (2009). Ten Years of Product Market Reform in OECD Countries – Insights from a Revised PMR Indicator. *OECD Economics Department Working Paper*, 695. Retrieved from [http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/economics/ten-years-of-product-market-reform-in-oecd-countries\\_224255001640](http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/economics/ten-years-of-product-market-reform-in-oecd-countries_224255001640)
- Young, A. (2005). The Single Market. In H. Wallace, W. Wallace & M. Pollack (Eds.), *Policy-Making in the European Union* (pp. 93-112). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

## Working Papers in Contemporary European Studies

1. Vesna Bojicic and David Dyker June 1993  
*Sanctions on Serbia: Sledgehammer or Scalpel*
2. Gunther Burghardt August 1993  
*The Future for a European Foreign and Security Policy*
3. Xiudian Dai, Alan Cawson, Peter Holmes February 1994  
*Competition, Collaboration & Public Policy: A Case Study of the European HDTV Strategy*
4. Colin Crouch February 1994  
*The Future of Unemployment in Western Europe? Reconciling Demands for Flexibility, Quality and Security*
5. John Edmonds February 1994  
*Industrial Relations - Will the European Community Change Everything?*
6. Olli Rehn July 1994  
*The European Community and the Challenge of a Wider Europe*
7. Ulrich Sedelmeier October 1994  
*The EU's Association Policy towards Central Eastern Europe: Political and Economic Rationales in Conflict*
8. Mary Kaldor February 1995  
*Rethinking British Defence Policy and Its Economic Implications*
9. Alasdair Young December 1994  
*Ideas, Interests and Institutions: The Politics of Liberalisation in the EC's Road Haulage Industry*
10. Keith Richardson December 1994  
*Competitiveness in Europe: Cooperation or Conflict?*
11. Mike Hobday June 1995  
*The Technological Competence of European Semiconductor Producers*
12. Graham Avery July 1995  
*The Commission's Perspective on the Enlargement Negotiations*
13. Gerda Falkner September 1995  
*The Maastricht Protocol on Social Policy: Theory and Practice*
14. Vesna Bojicic, Mary Kaldor, Ivan Vejvoda November 1995  
*Post-War Reconstruction in the Balkans*

15. Alasdair Smith, Peter Holmes, Ulrich Sedelmeier, March 1996  
Edward Smith, Helen Wallace, Alasdair Young  
*The European Union and Central and Eastern Europe: Pre-Accession Strategies*
16. Helen Wallace March 1996  
*From an Island off the North-West Coast of Europe*
17. Indira Konjhdzic June 1996  
*Democratic Consolidation of the Political System in Finland, 1945-1970: Potential Model for the New States of Central and Eastern Europe?*
18. Antje Wiener and Vince Della Sala December 1996  
*Constitution Making and Citizenship Practice - Bridging the Democracy Gap in the EU?*
19. Helen Wallace and Alasdair Young December 1996  
*Balancing Public and Private Interests Under Duress*
20. S. Ran Kim April 1997  
*Evolution of Governance & the Growth Dynamics of the Korean Semiconductor Industry*
21. Tibor Navracsics June 1997  
*A Missing Debate?: Hungary and the European Union*
22. Peter Holmes with Jeremy Kempton September 1997  
*Study on the Economic and Industrial Aspects of Anti-Dumping Policy*
23. Helen Wallace January 1998  
*Coming to Terms with a Larger Europe: Options for Economic Integration*
24. Mike Hobday, Alan Cawson and S Ran Kim January 1998  
*The Pacific Asian Electronics Industries: Technology Governance and Implications for Europe*
25. Iain Begg August 1998  
*Structural Fund Reform in the Light of Enlargement*  
CENTRE ON EUROPEAN POLITICAL ECONOMY Working Paper No. 1
26. Mick Dunford and Adrian Smith August 1998  
*Trajectories of Change in Europe's Regions: Cohesion, Divergence and Regional Performance*  
CENTRE ON EUROPEAN POLITICAL ECONOMY Working Paper No. 2
27. Ray Hudson August 1998  
*What Makes Economically Successful Regions in Europe Successful? Implications for Transferring Success from West to East*  
CENTRE ON EUROPEAN POLITICAL ECONOMY Working Paper No. 3

28. Adam Swain August 1998  
*Institutions and Regional Development: Evidence from Hungary and Ukraine*  
CENTRE ON EUROPEAN POLITICAL ECONOMY Working Paper No. 4
29. Alasdair Young October 1998  
*Interpretation and 'Soft Integration' in the Adaptation of the European Community's Foreign Economic Policy*  
CENTRE ON EUROPEAN POLITICAL ECONOMY Working Paper No. 5
30. Rilka Dragneva March 1999  
*Corporate Governance Through Privatisation: Does Design Matter?*
31. Christopher Preston and Arkadiusz Michonski March 1999  
*Negotiating Regulatory Alignment in Central Europe: The Case of the Poland EU European Conformity Assessment Agreement*
32. Jeremy Kempton, Peter Holmes, Cliff Stevenson September 1999  
*Globalisation of Anti-Dumping and the EU*  
CENTRE ON EUROPEAN POLITICAL ECONOMY Working Paper No. 6
33. Alan Mayhew March 2000  
*Financial and Budgetary Implications of the Accession of Central and East European Countries to the European Union.*
34. Aleks Szczerbiak May 2000  
*Public Opinion and Eastward Enlargement - Explaining Declining Support for EU Membership in Poland*
35. Keith Richardson September 2000  
*Big Business and the European Agenda*
36. Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart October 2000  
*Opposing Europe: Party Systems and Opposition to the Union, the Euro and Europeanisation*  
OPPOSING EUROPE RESEARCH NETWORK Working Paper No. 1
37. Alasdair Young, Peter Holmes and Jim Rollo November 2000  
*The European Trade Agenda After Seattle*
38. Sławomir Tokarski and Alan Mayhew December 2000  
*Impact Assessment and European Integration Policy*
39. Alan Mayhew December 2000  
*Enlargement of the European Union: an Analysis of the Negotiations with the Central and Eastern European Candidate Countries*
40. Pierre Jacquet and Jean Pisani-Ferry January 2001  
*Economic Policy Co-ordination in the Eurozone: What has been achieved?*

*What should be done?*

41. Joseph F. Francois and Machiel Rombout February 2001  
*Trade Effects From The Integration Of The Central And East European Countries Into The European Union*
42. Peter Holmes and Alasdair Young February 2001  
*Emerging Regulatory Challenges to the EU's External Economic Relations*
43. Michael Johnson March 2001  
*EU Enlargement and Commercial Policy: Enlargement and the Making of Commercial Policy*
44. Witold Orłowski and Alan Mayhew May 2001  
*The Impact of EU Accession on Enterprise, Adaptation and Institutional Development in the Countries of Central and Eastern Europe*
45. Adam Lazowski May 2001  
*Adaptation of the Polish legal system to European Union law: Selected aspects*
46. Paul Taggart and Aleks Szczerbiak May 2001  
*Parties, Positions and Europe: Euroscepticism in the EU Candidate States of Central and Eastern Europe*  
**OPPOSING EUROPE RESEARCH NETWORK Working Paper No. 2**
47. Paul Webb and Justin Fisher May 2001  
*Professionalizing the Millbank Tendency: the Political Sociology of New Labour's Employees*
48. Aleks Szczerbiak June 2001  
*Europe as a Re-aligning Issue in Polish Politics?: Evidence from the October 2000 Presidential Election*  
**OPPOSING EUROPE RESEARCH NETWORK Working Paper No. 3**
49. Agnes Batory September 2001  
*Hungarian Party Identities and the Question of European Integration*  
**OPPOSING EUROPE RESEARCH NETWORK Working Paper No. 4**
50. Karen Henderson September 2001  
*Euroscepticism or Europhobia: Opposition attitudes to the EU in the Slovak Republic*  
**OPPOSING EUROPE RESEARCH NETWORK Working Paper No. 5**
51. Paul Taggart and Aleks Szczerbiak April 2002  
*The Party Politics of Euroscepticism in EU Member and Candidate States*  
**OPPOSING EUROPE RESEARCH NETWORK Working Paper No. 6.**
52. Alan Mayhew April 2002  
*The Negotiating Position of the European Union on Agriculture, the Structural Funds and the EU Budget.*

53. Aleks Szczerbiak May 2002  
*After the Election, Nearing The Endgame: The Polish Euro-Debate in the Run Up To The 2003 EU Accession Referendum*  
**OPPOSING EUROPE RESEARCH NETWORK** Working Paper No. 7.
54. Charlie Lees June 2002  
*'Dark Matter': institutional constraints and the failure of party-based Euroscepticism in Germany*  
**OPPOSING EUROPE RESEARCH NETWORK** Working Paper No. 8
55. Pinar Tanlak October 2002  
*Turkey EU Relations in the Post Helsinki phase and the EU harmonisation laws adopted by the Turkish Grand National Assembly in August 2002*
56. Nick Sitter October 2002  
*Opposing Europe: Euro-Scepticism, Opposition and Party Competition*  
**OPPOSING EUROPE RESEARCH NETWORK** Working Paper No. 9
57. Hans G. Nilsson November 2002  
*Decision Making in EU Justice and Home Affairs: Current Shortcomings and Reform Possibilities*
58. Adriano Giovannelli November 2002  
*Semipresidentialism: an emerging pan-European model*
59. Daniel Naurin December 2002  
*Taking Transparency Seriously*
60. Lucia Quaglia March 2003  
*Euroscepticism in Italy and centre Right and Right wing political parties*  
**OPPOSING EUROPE RESEARCH NETWORK** Working Paper No. 10
61. Francesca Vassallo March 2003  
*Another Europeanisation Case: British Political Activism*
62. Kieran Williams, Aleks Szczerbiak, Brigid Fowler March 2003  
*Explaining Lustration in Eastern Europe: a Post-Communist Politics Approach*
63. Rasa Spokeviciute March 2003  
*The Impact of EU Membership of The Lithuanian Budget*
64. Clive Church May 2003  
*The Contexts of Swiss Opposition to Europe*  
**OPPOSING EUROPE RESEARCH NETWORK** Working Paper No. 11
65. Alan Mayhew May 2003  
*The Financial and Budgetary Impact of Enlargement and Accession*

66. Przemysław Biskup June 2003  
*Conflicts Between Community and National Laws: An Analysis of the British Approach*
67. Eleonora Crutini August 2003  
*Evolution of Local Systems in the Context of Enlargement*
68. Professor Jim Rollo August 2003  
*Agriculture, the Structural Funds and the Budget After Enlargement*
69. Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart October 2003  
*Theorising Party-Based Euroscepticism: Problems of Definition, Measurement and Causality*  
**EUROPEAN PARTIES ELECTIONS AND REFERENDUMS NETWORK Working Paper No. 12**
70. Nicolo Conti November 2003  
*Party Attitudes to European Integration: A Longitudinal Analysis of the Italian Case*  
**EUROPEAN PARTIES ELECTIONS AND REFERENDUMS NETWORK Working Paper No. 13**
71. Paul Lewis November 2003  
*The Impact of the Enlargement of the European Union on Central European Party Systems*  
**EUROPEAN PARTIES ELECTIONS AND REFERENDUMS NETWORK Working Paper No. 14**
72. Jonathan P. Aus December 2003  
*Supranational Governance in an “Area of Freedom, Security and Justice”: Eurodac and the Politics of Biometric Control*
73. Juraj Buzalk February 2004  
*Is Rural Populism on the decline? Continuities and Changes in Twentieth Century Europe: The case of Slovakia*
74. Anna Slodka May 2004  
*Eco Labelling in the EU: Lessons for Poland*
75. Pasquale Tridico May 2004  
*Institutional Change and Economic Performance in Transition Economics: The case of Poland*
76. Arkadiusz Domagala August 2004  
*Humanitarian Intervention: The Utopia of Just War?*  
*The NATO intervention in Kosovo and the restraints of Humanitarian Intervention*
77. Marisol Garcia, Antonio Cardesa Salzman & Marc Pradel September 2004  
*The European Employment Strategy: An Example of European*



*Multi-level Governance*

78. Alan Mayhew October 2004  
*The Financial Framework of the European Union, 2007–2013: New Policies? New Money?*
79. Wojciech Lewandowski October 2004  
*The Influence of the War in Iraq on Transatlantic Relations*
80. Susannah Verney October 2004  
*The End of Socialist Hegemony: Europe and the Greek Parliamentary Election of 7<sup>th</sup> March 2004*  
EUROPEAN PARTIES ELECTIONS AND REFERENDUMS NETWORK Working Paper No. 15
81. Kenneth Chan November 2004  
*Central and Eastern Europe in the 2004 European Parliamentary Elections: A Not So European Event*  
EUROPEAN PARTIES ELECTIONS AND REFERENDUMS NETWORK Working Paper No. 16
82. Lionel Marquis December 2004  
*The Priming of Referendum Votes on Swiss European Policy*  
EUROPEAN PARTIES ELECTIONS AND REFERENDUMS NETWORK Working Paper No. 17
83. Lionel Marquis and Karin Gilland Lutz December 2004  
*Thinking About and Voting on Swiss Foreign Policy: Does Affective and Cognitive Involvement Play a Role?*  
EUROPEAN PARTIES ELECTIONS AND REFERENDUMS NETWORK Working Paper No. 18
84. Nathaniel Copsey and Aleks Szczerbiak March 2005  
*The Future of Polish-Ukrainian Relations: Evidence from the June 2004 European Parliament Election Campaign in Poland*
85. Ece Ozlem Atikcan May 2006  
*Citizenship or Denizenship: The Treatment of Third Country Nationals in the European Union*
86. Aleks Szczerbiak May 2006  
*'Social Poland' Defeats 'Liberal Poland'? : The September-October 2005 Polish Parliamentary and Presidential Elections*
87. Nathaniel Copsey October 2006  
*Echoes of the Past in Contemporary Politics: the case of Polish-Ukrainian Relations*
88. Lyukba Savkova November 2006

*Spoilt for Choice, Yet Hard to Get: Voters and Parties at the Bulgarian  
2005 Parliamentary Election*

89. Tim Bale and Paul Taggart November 2006  
*First Timers Yes, Virgins No: The Roles and Backgrounds  
of New Members of the European Parliament*
90. Lucia Quaglia November 2006  
*Setting the pace? Private financial interests and European financial  
market integration*
91. Tim Bale and Aleks Szczerbiak December 2006  
*Why is there no Christian Democracy in Poland  
(and why does this matter)?*
92. Edward Phelps December 2006  
*Young Adults and Electoral Turnout in Britain: Towards a Generational  
Model of Political Participation*
93. Alan Mayhew April 2007  
*A certain idea of Europe: Can European integration survive  
eastern enlargement?*
94. Seán Hanley, Aleks Szczerbiak, Tim Haughton May 2007  
and Brigid Fowler  
*Explaining the Success of Centre-Right Parties in Post-Communist  
East Central Europe: A Comparative Analysis*
95. Dan Hough and Michael Koß May 2007  
*Territory and Electoral Politics in Germany*
96. Lucia Quaglia July 2007  
*Committee Governance in the Financial Sector in the European Union*
97. Lucia Quaglia, Dan Hough and Alan Mayhew August 2007  
*You Can't Always Get What You Want, But Do You Sometimes Get  
What You Need? The German Presidency of the EU in 2007*
98. Aleks Szczerbiak November 2007  
*Why do Poles love the EU and what do they love about it?: Polish  
attitudes towards European integration during the first three years  
of EU membership*
99. Francis McGowan January 2008  
*The Contrasting Fortunes of European Studies and EU Studies: Grounds  
for Reconciliation?*
100. Aleks Szczerbiak January 2008  
*The birth of a bi-polar party system or a referendum on a polarising  
government: The October 2007 Polish parliamentary election*

101. Catharina Sørensen January 2008  
*Love me, love me not... A typology of public euroscepticism*  
**EUROPEAN PARTIES ELECTIONS AND REFERENDUMS NETWORK** Working Paper  
 No. 19
102. Lucia Quaglia February 2008  
*Completing the Single Market in Financial services: An Advocacy  
 Coalition Framework*
103. Aleks Szczerbiak and Monika Bil May 2008  
*When in doubt, (re-)turn to domestic politics?*  
*The (non-) impact of the EU on party politics in Poland*  
**EUROPEAN PARTIES ELECTIONS AND REFERENDUMS NETWORK** Working Paper  
 No. 20
104. John Palmer July 2008  
*Beyond EU Enlargement-Creating a United European Commonwealth*
105. Paul Blokker September 2008  
*Constitutional Politics, Constitutional Texts and Democratic Variety in  
 Central and Eastern Europe*
106. Edward Maxfield September 2008  
*A New Right for a New Europe? Basescu, the Democrats & Romania's centre-right*
107. Emanuele Massetti November 2008  
*The Scottish and Welsh Party Systems Ten Years after Devolution: Format,  
 Ideological Polarization and Structure of Competition*
108. Stefano Braghiroli December 2008  
*Home Sweet Home: Assessing the Weight and Effectiveness  
 of National Parties' Interference on MEPs' everyday Activity*
109. Christophe Hillion and Alan Mayhew January 2009  
*The Eastern Partnership – something new or window-dressing*
110. John FitzGibbon September 2009  
*Ireland's No to Lisbon: Learning the Lessons from the  
 failure of the Yes and the Success of the No Side*  
**EUROPEAN PARTIES ELECTIONS AND REFERENDUMS NETWORK** Working Paper  
 No. 21
111. Emelie Lilliefeldt September 2009  
*Political parties and Gender Balanced Parliamentary Presence in Western Europe: A  
 two-step Fuzzy-set Qualitative Comparative Analysis*
112. Valeria Tarditi January 2010  
*THE SCOTTISH NATIONAL PARTY'S CHANGING ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE EUROPEAN UNION*

**EUROPEAN PARTIES ELECTIONS AND REFERENDUMS NETWORK Working Paper  
No. 22**

113. Stijn van Kessel February 2010  
*Swaying the disgruntled floating voter. The rise of populist parties in contemporary Dutch politics.*
114. Peter Holmes and Jim Rollo April 2010  
*EU Internal Market: Shaping a new Commission Agenda 2009-2014.*
115. Alan Mayhew June 2010  
*The Economic and Financial Crisis: impacts on an emerging economy – Ukraine*
116. Dan Keith June 2010  
*The Portuguese Communist Party – Lessons in Resisting Change*
117. Ariadna Ripoll Servent June 2010  
*The European Parliament and the ‘Returns’ directive: The end of radical contestation; the start of consensual constraints?*
118. Paul Webb, Tim Bale and Paul Taggart October 2010  
*Deliberative Versus Parliamentary Democracy in the UK: An Experimental Study*
119. Alan Mayhew, Kai Oppermann and Dan Hough April 2011  
*German foreign policy and leadership of the EU – ‘You can’t always get what you want ... but you sometimes get what you need’*
120. Tim Houwen June 2011  
*The non-European roots of the concept of populism*
121. Cas Mudde August 2011  
*Sussex v. North Carolina: The Comparative Study of Party Based Euroscepticism*  
**EUROPEAN PARTIES ELECTIONS AND REFERENDUMS NETWORK Working Paper  
No. 23**
122. Marko Stojic August 2011  
*The Changing Nature of Serbian Political Parties’ Attitudes Towards Serbian EU Membership*  
**EUROPEAN PARTIES ELECTIONS AND REFERENDUMS NETWORK Working Paper  
No. 24**
123. Dan Keith September 2011  
*‘When life gives you lemons make lemonade’: Party organisation and the adaptation of West European Communist Parties*
124. Marianne Sundlisæter Skinner October 2011  
*From Ambiguity to Euroscepticism? A Case Study of the Norwegian Progress Party’s Position on the European Union*  
**EUROPEAN PARTIES ELECTIONS AND REFERENDUMS NETWORK Working Paper  
No. 25**

125. Amy Busby October 2011  
*“You’re not going to write about that are you?”: what methodological issues arise when doing ethnography in an elite political setting?*
126. Robin Kolodny November 2011  
*The Bidirectional Benefits of Political Party Democracy Promotion: The Case of the UK’s Westminster Foundation for Democracy*
127. Tapio Raunio February 2012  
*‘Whenever the EU is involved, you get problems’: Explaining the European policy of The (True) Finns*  
EUROPEAN PARTIES ELECTIONS AND REFERENDUMS NETWORK Working Paper No. 26
128. Alan Mayhew March 2012  
*Reforming the EU budget to support economic growth*
129. Aleks Szczerbiak March 2012  
*Poland (Mainly) Chooses Stability and Continuity: The October 2011 Polish Parliamentary Election*
130. Lee Savage April 2012  
*A product of their bargaining environment: Explaining government duration in Central and Eastern Europe*
131. Paul Webb August 2012  
*Who is willing to participate, and how? Dissatisfied democrats, stealth democrats and populists in the UK*
132. Dan Keith and Francis McGowan February 2014  
*Radical left parties and immigration issues*
133. Aleks Szczerbiak March 2014  
*Explaining patterns of lustration and communist security service file access in post-1989 Poland*
134. Andreas Kornelakis April 2014  
*The Evolution of National Social Dialogue in Europe under the Single Market, 1992-2006*

All Working Papers are downloadable free of charge from the web -  
<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/sei/publications/seiworkingpapers>.

Otherwise, each Working Paper is £5.00 (unless noted otherwise) plus £1.00 postage and packing per copy in Europe and £2.00 per copy elsewhere. Payment by credit card or cheque (payable to 'University of Sussex').