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Introduction

- Origins, evidence and impact
- Private troubles to social issues (Wright Mills, 1959)
- Context - ‘Can’t we just get back to normal?’
- Nature and depth of crisis - more than ‘disconnected capitalism’ (Thompson, 2003) or ‘financialisation’ (Harman, 2009; Kliman, 2012)
- Shaping of new structures of accumulation post-crisis
• Ubiquitous managerial ‘discourse’ of ‘the new normal’ (McKinsey, 2009) – but more than ideological
• Not a turn of the business cycle but a redrawing of the political-economic landscape and recasting ER
• In tandem with ConDems’ onslaught on worker rights a managerial offensive on the work ‘front-line’
• Offensive has at least three integrated elements: 
  
  **Performance Management**
  
  **Lean Working**
  
  **Sickness Absence Management**
  
• Convergence - white-collar workers **and** manual workers **and** technical workers **and** professionals
Characterisations of Contemporary Workplace

WERS 2011 (van Wanroy et al, 2013)

• What did the recession look and feel like from a workplace perspective and how did it affect workplaces and the employees working within them?
• Distorted - or alternative – reality
• Workload increase and work reorganisation ‘a substantial minority of workplaces…unscathed’ (p.22)
• Re-orgnisation of work not elaborated upon
• Peculiar separation (p71) between ‘employment-related change’ and ‘production-related change’
• ER depicted as ‘benign’ 1998-2004 and 2004-8
• Managers ‘continued to involve employees in most workplace changes’ ‘usually through direct consultation’
• Some decline in JQ (2004-11) but increase in level of ‘job related contentment’ (Table 7.5)
• Reductions in job related pressures due to recession induced slack in the economy
• PM gets subsumed into discussion on performance appraisal in less than a page (p.98-9)
• Monitoring *en passant* nothing on KPIs, SLAs, targets
• Yet glimpses – most common reason for disciplinary action was poor performance (59%) (47% in 2004)
Fevre et al. (2012) Trouble at Work

- To explain structural causes behind private troubles
- Bullying as ‘straw man’ concept replaced by TAW which supposedly takes us to workplace dynamics
- 3 factors - ‘unreasonable treatment’, ‘incivility and disrespect’ and ‘violence’ – 21 items
- Bizarre findings – much more likely ‘white employees will experience UT than Asian’, ‘women less likely to experience UT than men’, ‘UT an affliction of the comparatively privileged [not] the most vulnerable’ (p58)
- Some quotes insightful but abstracted from capitalist employment relationship, control, labour process etc.
Employers’ Cost Reduction Strategies ‘STAR’

- Outsourcing/Offshoring
- Reduced Terms and Conditions
- Automation
- Work Intensification, Lean, PM and SAP
Lean, Performance Management and Work Intensification

• Most important from the perspective of unions, their members - those ‘survivors’ of the job cull
• Integrated managerial offensive that is squeezing increasing effort out of workers
• Cost-cutting strategies are being translated into an unprecedented intensification of work
• Restructuring, re-engineering, ‘lean’, creative synergies
• Equivalent or larger volumes of work being done with the same or - more likely - smaller workforces
• Sheer intensity of labour during shifts – porosity of day – more than a question of hours
1) Lean Working

- Core thesis – organisations which strip out waste gain significant quality and efficiency advantages = Toyota
- Rhetoric of multi-skilling, task enlargement, worker participation in kaizen (Womack et al, 1990)
- Lean’s claim to remove mind-numbing stress with ‘creative stress’ - ‘work smarter, not harder’ mantra
- Yet workers’ experiences in autos (Stewart et al, 2009)
  - tighter supervisory control - narrow tasking
  - job stress - managerial bullying - lack of voice
  - ‘traffic lights’ – workers on the edge
- ‘Consultemics’ apply lean efficiency savings to public sector, Civil Service, FS, NHS, HE etc. (Radnor, 2010)
• In HMRC lean created brutal form of Taylorism (Carter et al, 2011)

• After Lean 95% say work ‘very’/‘quite’ pressurised

• Pressure had increased ‘a great deal’ – 76%

‘After 27 years in the Inland Revenue following the introduction of lean, I am now deskilled, de-motivated [and] stressed-out most days, afraid to be sick, feel unappreciated, provide a poor service for customers, am not allowed to voice my opinion, looking forward to the day I can leave for good’. (HMRC Officer, Cardiff)

• Statistical relationship between work intensity, time spent at work station, coming to work ill and frequency of symptoms (Carter et al, 2013)
## Ill-health Symptoms and Time at Work Station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symptom</th>
<th>% of time at work station</th>
<th>Daily/several times a week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;85%</td>
<td>85-95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental fatigue***</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical tiredness***</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiff shoulders</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiff neck**</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress**</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backache*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headaches</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain/numbness in arms/wrists*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyesight problems*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocked nose**</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) Performance Management

- Measurement of performance central to management
- Alignment of individual with organisational objectives
• Performance Management historically synonymous with Performance Appraisal- an ‘annual ritual’
• Whether PAs were/are annual or 6-monthly always a problem with subjectivity – who decides?
• Managing underperformance ‘a positive process’ according to texts e.g. Armstrong (2009)
• PM now not periodic and retrospective, but continuous, backward looking and forward looking and with a serious shift to disciplinary purpose
• Performance Improvement, PIPs, Managing Performance, PIMs, IIPs – the real bite in PM
• Micro-measurement and micro-management of individual performance – facilitated by technologies
• **Quantitative** outputs and targets – AHTs, CHTs etc.
• KPIs, SLAs – determined at the top, ‘cascade down’ through tiers of managers, to TLs and then workers
• This is the (not) disconnected capitalism
• Removing the discretion of the FLM – tight links in the chain of command – ‘**nothing to do with me**’
• Managers themselves given targets for the numbers of ‘managed exits’, underperformers, SAP actions etc.
• Even the so-called measurables are ‘pseudo-science’ - parameters and definitions set by management
The 6 Stages of Performance Management

1. First Day at Work
You Listen to Sweet Soul Music
Everything is Wonderful
The 6 Stages of Performance Management

2. After 3 Months- Targets Get Hiked Up

You Listen to Motörhead

You Have No idea If You Are Coming or Going
The 6 Stages of Performance Management

3. After 9 Months – You Are An Underperformer
   You Listen to Napalm Death
   Your Day Starts at 8:00 and Ends at 20.00
   You Go Mental
The 6 Stages of Performance Management

4. After 12 Months – You Are Put on a PIP
   You Listen to Hip Hop
   Your Are Passive/Aggressive Most of the Time
   You Put on Weight – You Are Stressed
The 6 Stages of Performance Management

5. After 15 Months – You Are Given a Warning

You Listen to Gangsta Rap

You Have Seriously Considered Gunning Down Your Team Leaders

You Fall From Bed Every Day

You Live on Chips and Caffeine
The 6 Stages of Performance Management

6. After 18 Months – You Listen to LMFAO
   You Have Totally Lost It
• **Quantitative** measures are strictly imposed
• Targets first systemically used in contact centres then spread to the back office and more widely
• HMRC – 6 tax cases an hour, 80 for opening letters
• BT engineers – tightly timed jobs, monitoring
• Universities – workload models, ‘dashboards’, REF
• Pre-dated the crisis but accelerated by it
• ‘The new normal’ of ‘doing more with less’
• **Qualitative** behaviours, attitudes and traits

• In one finance sector company there were 13 ‘measurable’ quality criteria including –
  – ‘delight the customer’, ‘speaks up’, ‘shares ideas’
  – ‘Do what is right for the customer, community and organisation, putting aside own agenda’
  – ‘Act like the owners of the business…’
  – ‘having heart’ ‘achieving excellence’, building trust’

• Greater room for **subjectivity** and ulterior motives

• ‘leaves people vulnerable to the whim of a supervisor’

(Telecoms Regional Officer)
The Performance Management Bell Curve

- Serious under performance
- Below expectations
- Meets expectations
- Above expectations
- Excellent performance

10% 15% 50% 15% 10%
Bank A – Expected Performance Ratings
BT – Performance Ratings (2102-13)
The Bell Curve and Forced Distribution

- Plethora of terms – forced distribution, forced ranking, Bell Curve, normal distribution, group ordering
- ‘Pioneered’ by Jack Welch CEO of GE - the ‘principle’ of differentiation
- ‘Rank and yank’ – remove the bottom 10% annually
- Impossibly fine gradations between categories
- Schleicher et al (2008) – managers found unfair
- Anti-discrimination litigation in US (Stewart et al, 2010)
- Lawler (2002) better not to use if termination involved
- Scullen et al (2005) any improvement is unsustainable
• ‘The language is specific, “You have not achieved, you are an underachiever”’.

• Wide discontent but formal ‘grievances’ over rankings?

• Moving goalposts e.g. 1s and 2s as underperformers – LBG – 2014 is last year for 2s pay increase

• ‘Round table process’, ‘moderation’, ‘calibration’ to prevent FLMs inflating scores – fixed pot of money

• ‘Lifeboat discussions’

• Speed of ‘managing out’ underperformers - 6 weeks

• Scale of intimidation – in one bank 10% on actions

• McKinsey propagating FDRS (Michaels et al, 2001)
• Ethnicity, age, part-time and disability discriminations
• Evidence from Prospect BT members’ survey (2013)

**Ethnicity**

- *BME* – high performers – 14%, low performers 25%
- *White* – high performers – 19%, low performers 14%

**Disability Discrimination Act impairment**

- 10% high performance rating, 23% low rating

**Age**

- High performance – under 50 – 23%, 50 or over 15%
- Low performance – under 50 – 16%, 50 or over 19%
‘There was quite a sinister practice that we were to use – the car-park conversation. A manager would be expected to take an employee, who had received poor performance score, outside for an informal discussion. The manager would then start a conversation along the lines of, ‘You know your last review. It’s only going one way, isn’t it? You should perhaps think about coming to an arrangement’. It was important that the manager would never make any explicit suggestion that the worker should leave. We were given training in how to conduct these conversations; a one-day course on employee relations for HR managers, where we would go through the best mechanisms for ensuring that an employee would voluntarily suggest a compromise agreement’. (Ex-HR Manager, BT)
Consequences for Workers

‘If your name is up on the whiteboard, you’ll have emails going saying who is performing badly and who is performing well, who is red, who is amber, who is green, that kind of thing, so the pressure is very intense and it really does affect people badly’ (Bank A, National Officer)

‘There is a culture in our workplace of managers using extreme, derogatory language. Don’t get me wrong, there are decent ones, but they are overshadowed by the aggressive ones...downright nasty, horrible stuff – ‘bottom feeders’ for those on the lowest rankings’ (Rep)
**Sickness Absence Management**

- Public discourse that malingering is endemic in ‘sick note Britain’, swinging the lead’ or ‘duvet days’

> ‘At a direct cost of £17bn, absence remains a significant burden on the UK economy…particular concern in the public sector, where absence levels remain substantially higher (CBI)

- Focus on - short-term absences – associated with ‘sickies’ + long-term sickness

- Aim to reduce sickness absence to acceptable (i.e. negligible) levels

- Raft of prescriptive measures introduced for when workers go sick plus metrics, scores and triggers

- Bradford factor – penalises short-term sickness, gender
• Yet, sickness absence historically low – 7.2 days in 1993 and 4.4 days in 2013 - ONS (2014)
• ‘Sickies’ linked to weekends/sport is largely myth
  Public sector explained by age, gender etc. (HSE)
• **Presenteeism** the main problem (CIPD, 2012)
• Strict sickness absence policies and practices
• Studies over 15 years show increase in coming to work when ill, because of SAP, fearful of discipline
• Exacerbates the problem (Taylor *et al*, 2010)
• Glasgow City Council study – Unison reps spend 46% of time on sickness absence cases
• ‘*I had my first cancer*’ – HR Manager from LA
Conclusion

- Punitive PM is not merely short-termist but driven by capitalist accumulation and austerity imperatives
- Tendency to a new workplace regime
- Opposition at different levels
- Business/soft-HRM case – huge commitment of managers’ time with questionable outcomes
- Bell Curve to be rejected in principle and practice – the Microsoft case
- Potentially discriminatory – DDA, Equality and Age – conduct audits of rankings by gender, age, status
- Unions – at workplace level – actively challenge unfair rankings, before the event as well as after
• *Appeal, appeal, appeal* – break the culture of people individualising their scores/ranks

• H&S and stress audits can be an organisational tool – working conditions and ill-health inseparable

• Broad opposition to Tories attack on employment rights - protected conversations

• Public exposure of the worst cases of ‘*new tyranny in the contemporary workplace*’ – name and shame

• National level – FDA, CWU and industrial action

• Opportunities for organising and recruiting in unionised and non-unionised environments
The Vicious Circle

1. Intensification of work & insecurity
   - Mental ill-health
   - Increases insecurity & likelihood of disciplinary

2. Coming to work when ill SAP
   - PM & so-called underperformance
   - Makes condition worse

3. Contributes to illness

4. Makes condition worse

Department of Human Resource Management
References


