



Bruce Kaufman

## The founding of industrial relations and LERA

*IR celebrates 100 years, LERA 73*



**Bruce Kaufman, who has been researching the history of industrial relations for 30 years, recounts the early days of the development of IR:**

- In the first years of the twentieth century in the United States, “the term ‘industrial relations’ was recognized as the plural form of ‘industrial relation,’ a shortened version of ‘industrial relationship,’ which stood for the relationship among the parties to industry.”
- “Richard Lester, John Dunlop, Clark Kerr, and Lloyd Reynold ... left the American Economic Association (AEA) and, under Lester’s leadership, formed the IRRA as an ambitiously unique academic-practitioner organization.”
- As union membership declined, “by the mid- to late 1990s a palpable sense of crisis began to take hold with growing concern for the institutional survival of industrial relations as a field and IRRA/LERA as an organization.”
- Finally, Kaufman details events of the 1910s that led to the establishment of industrial relations as a field that he dates to 1920, making 2020 IR’s centenary year.

Above: Ruins of the Ludlow Colony near Trinidad, Colorado, following an attack by the Colorado National Guard.

Our association started in 1947 as the Industrial Relations Research Association (IRRA) but in 2005 was rebranded as the Labor and Employment Relations Association. If we continue to trace our lineage through industrial relations (IR), then a good case can be made that this year — 2020 — is the centenary year of the field’s founding and its 100th birthday.

A centenary is a rare event and an opportune time for an appreciative reflection on our collective journey. Part of the appreciation should go to each of our 72 past and present LERA presidents, starting with Edwin Witte in 1948 and through to Dennis Dabney in 2020, for their dedicated contributions and noteworthy roles in carrying our field and association forward to this milestone.

To honor the IR field’s centenary and all the people who have made it possible, sketched below is a short “when, who, and how” account of the origin and historical development of the field and LERA’s place in it. Rosemary Batt’s article in the 2019 *Perspectives* issue on LERA’s fast-approaching 75th birthday is an excellent complement to this piece, so, since she well covers more recent events and trends both in the IR field and LERA, I am going to focus on earlier history and stop at this century’s turn. I hope readers find this an interesting and informative bit of time travel.

### What is this thing called “industrial relations”?

Our association is anchored in the academic, practice, and policy field of industrial relations, also called employment relations. Both IR and ER terms were used in the early twentieth century, but IR became the convention. This choice has brought about problems, however. Most serious is that the ambiguous, ill-defined meaning and subject domain of the term “industrial relations” opened the

Beatrice and Sidney Webb, 1895. The Webbs are considered founders of the IR field in Britain.



door for different interpretations of what is “in” and “out” of the field, with consequent development of both broad and narrow versions of IR and some harm to its unity and coherence. A more recent but also serious problem is that IR as a term has acquired an archaic, smokestack-era public image.

The first English-language usage of the “industrial relations” term, according to a Google advanced book search, is 1840 in a book review in *The United States Magazine and Democratic Review*. The responsibility of mankind, the author states, is to fix upon a “system for the regulation of his social and industrial relations.” Industrial relations in this passage seems a generic descriptor for the network of connections among people and organizations in the sphere of productive industry, which, according to the author, requires an ordering system of regulation so that it functions smoothly. The ordering system was later conceived as a governance system, per Sidney and Beatrice Webb’s classic *Industrial Democracy* (1897), the chapter “Government in Industry” in *Industry and Humanity* (1918) by W.L.M. King, and the book *Industrial Government* (1921) by J.R. Commons.

The IR term had only scattered usage in the United States and Britain through the 1800s and did not acquire a recognized meaning and subject area until the early part of the twentieth century. The Webbs, considered founders of the IR field in Britain, used the term only once in all of their voluminous writings. The IR term was entirely foreign to people in non-English speaking countries and did not gain any currency, either in Anglicized or transliterated form (e.g., *relations industrielles* in French, *industrielle beziehungen* in German), until the 1950s–1960s

and largely coterminous with American geopolitical dominance and the founding of the International Industrial Relations Association (1966, now ILERA; there was in the 1930s an earlier management/social-planning-oriented International Industrial Relations Association; see Kaufman 2004).

By the first decade of the twentieth century in the United States, the term “industrial relations” was recognized as the plural form of the noun “industrial relation,” a shortened version of “industrial relationship,” which stood for the relationship among the parties to industry. Industry was generically defined to include everything from agriculture to government, and the parties to industry in earliest usage were also generically defined to include relations between companies in product markets and between employers (capital) and employees (labor) in factor markets and the workplace.

After 1900, usage narrowed, and the industrial relationship was understood to mean the *employment relationship* and, hence, *industrial relations* = *employment relations*. A further complication is that the noun phrase “industrial relations” contains an implicit double meaning in which “relations” connotes both the objective structure/organization of the employment relation (e.g., institutional/legal framework) and subjective-affective state/climate of the relation (e.g., the attitudes/feelings between the parties).

From my thirty years of research on the history of the field, I give the award for best-articulated definition of the IR field, as originally conceived at its founding, to class of 1957 IRRA

Many management people have been LERA presidents, yet none from a non-union company.

president Dale Yoder and coauthors Herbert Heneman and John Turnbull. They state,

In current practice, careful usage employs the terms “personnel management” or “personnel administration” to refer to the management of manpower within a plant or agency, and the terms emphasize employer relations with individual employees, in such activities as selection, rating, promotion, transfer, etc. In contrast, the term “labor relations” is generally used to describe employer relations with groups of employees, especially collective bargaining — contract negotiation and administration. “Industrial relations,” or “employment relations” in recent years, has come to be used as the broadest of these terms, including the areas of both personnel management and labor relations and thus describes all types of activities designed to secure the efficient cooperation of manpower resources.

## Industrial relations: Contending twentieth-century versions

Since the field’s founding a century ago, the concept of industrial relations has had different interpretations with regard to its central subject, boundaries, content, and normative values. In an earlier work, I distinguish “three faces” of industrial relations through which these different conceptions refract: *science-building* (theory, principles), *problem-solving* (practice, tools, policy), and *ethical/ideological value-commitments* (normative, political beliefs), and how the three faces emerge in different configurations across countries and world regions. The relevance for this American-based story is that the three faces also change and reconfigure over time as different conceptions of industrial relations come in and out of vogue.

The broadest, most inclusive conception of industrial relations is the one the field started with. It defines IR’s focal subject generically as the employment relationship and its domain as inclusive of all types and forms of employment relationships, and all attendant institutions, relations, practices, and policies, irrespective of normative criteria. This generic, inclusive, values-neutral definition of the field is the one enshrined in LERA’s constitution (see items a, b, and e under Purposes, with a moderate values-related qualification in item f).

However, both post-World War II IR as a field and LERA as an organization have long exhibited a split personality in which in formal statements they hew to a broad, inclusive,



Four of the most influential IR scholars; from left: Richard Lester, John Dunlop, Clark Kerr, and Lloyd Reynolds.

In the 1960s, the personnel management, human relations, and organizational behavior parts of the IR coalition broke away and set up independent homes in management departments of business schools.

“all employment relationships” domain but in practice show preference in all three faces for narrower, union-favoring, “collectively-organized employment relationships” domain (e.g., many management people have been LERA presidents, yet none from a non-union company). The impetus and rationale come from the 1930s–40s and three momentous events.

First was collapse of the welfare-capitalism industrial relations model during the Great Depression and management’s

loss of credibility and legitimacy. Second was enactment of the National Labor Relations Act in 1935, which made it national labor policy to encourage the practice of collective bargaining though independent unions and to discourage non-union situations by prohibiting as “dominated labor organizations” (a.k.a. company unions) nearly all forms of joint dealing through employee representation councils and committees — the linchpin employment practice of the 1920s corporate-liberal industrial relations movement. Third was the mass union-

ization of industry from 1935 to 1955, with union density 35 percent nationwide and 80 percent or more in major industries.

When the IRRA was founded in 1947, and more than two dozen new IR schools, institutes, and centers were established after the war (at Cornell, Minnesota, Berkeley/UCLA, Illinois, and Rutgers, for example), it was entirely logical and defensible, in light of these events, to give priority to the collectively organized/union part of the workforce. Despite this shift to a more union-focused and -favoring position, for most of the 1950s the IR field was uniquely successful in fostering a broad, multidisciplinary, management, union, and government mixture of participants.

The core of the IRRA and IR field was a group of institutional-oriented labor economists, many of whom became IRRA presidents and noted IR scholars. Shown in the photograph on this spread are four of the most influential: Richard Lester, John Dunlop, Clark Kerr, and Lloyd Reynolds. They left the American Economic Association (AEA) and, under Lester’s leadership, formed the IRRA as an ambitiously unique

“Both LERA and the IR field have recently emerged as survivors of a near-death experience, in LERA’s case through exceptional leader/staff dedication, grueling work, time commitment, and successful strategic initiatives.”

– Bruce Kaufman

academic–practitioner organization. It was intended to bring together academics from all the fields and disciplines related to the employment relationship, with the goal of breaking down academic silos and encouraging collaborative cross-disciplinary research, and at the same time to bring together IR-related academics and practitioners, with the goal of promoting a two-way learning exchange and helping academics do more grounded, realistic types of labor research than found in conventional economics.

The “golden age” of industrial relations started to fray and fade by the end of the 1950s as the cross-disciplinary coalition weakened and different groups peeled off to pursue their own specializations; momentum and public approval of the labor movement peaked and started to decline, disciplinary and ideological conflicts broke out among academics over things such as human relations, and a hardening attitude developed toward the management side and, particularly, companies that didn’t have unions. One result, not deemed consequential at the time, was that the personnel management, human relations, and organizational behavior parts of the IR coalition broke away and set up independent homes in management departments of business schools.

The IR field, therefore, went through a gradual narrowing and hollowing-out process from the 1960s to century’s end with its subject and practice domain shrinking to (mostly) unionized employment relationships and its value commitments similarly shifting to a more explicit union-favoring position. In this respect, American IR converged to the union-centric paradigm that defines IR across the rest of the world — although disciplinary bases still differ (economics is dominant in North America, sociology in Britain and northern Europe, and labor law in Mediterranean Europe/Latin America).

As long as unions were a large and influential presence in the economy, as at their peak in the 1950s, the field’s shift to a narrower union/collective bargaining version of industrial relations worked reasonably well. However, as union density steadily declined from the 1970s onward, neoliberal free-market fundamentalism took



Members of the Commission on Industrial Relations

hold, the born-again version of personnel management started to take off as human resource management, and the name “industrial relations” developed a tired, out-of-date image, the fortunes of the IR field and IRRA began to deteriorate. The decline was sufficiently long and severe that by the mid- to late 1990s a palpable sense of crisis began to take hold with growing concern for the institutional survival of industrial relations as a field and IRRA/LERA as an organization.

If I go further, I not only transition from history to current events but also start to duplicate what Rosemary Batt well covered in her article in the last *Perspectives on Work* issue on the past two decades of IR/LERA challenges and responses. I will simply say that it is my sense that both LERA and the IR field have recently emerged as intact survivors of a near-death experience, in LERA’s case through exceptional leader/staff dedication, grueling work and time commitment, and successful strategic initiatives.

## Founding-era events and people

For the remainder of the article, I go back to the 1910s and provide a brief sketch of some of the key events and people responsible for the official founding of the IR field, as I date it to 1920. Included is LERA’s earliest predecessor organization, the Industrial Relations Association of America (IRAA).

### 1. Commission on Industrial Relations (1912-15)

The United States had become the leading industrial nation by 1900 but, unfortunately, also the leader in industrial violence and extremes of wealth and poverty. A group of social progressives associated with *Survey* magazine petitioned President Taft to form a commission to investigate the causes of labor violence and radicalization. The petition was titled “Petition to the President for a Federal Commission on Industrial Relations [CoIR].” The petition states, “Today, as fifty years ago, a house divided against itself cannot stand. We have yet to solve the problems of democracy in its industrial relationships [and consequent] ... breakdown of our machinery of industrial government.”

The nine members of the CoIR are shown in the photograph on page 49. Three management people represented employers (capital), three union leaders represented workers (labor), and three people represented the public: a lawyer (Frank Walsh, chair), a social activist (Florence Harriman), and an academic (John Commons from the University of Wisconsin).

The commission held 154 days of hearings across the nation and published its findings and conclusions in 11 large volumes. It generated considerable controversy and charges of partisanship because Walsh led it in a no-holds-barred prosecution of what he regarded as a rogue's gallery of greedy, unscrupulous, inhumane captains of industry, along with unrelenting exposure of widespread abuse, oppression, and mistreatment of workers. He was also unabashed in his support for widespread unionization of industry. The final report, supervised by Walsh, paints a grim picture, stating the situation facing most workers is "undeniably gloomy and depressing" with "entire counties and towns" controlled by one or several companies in "industrial feudalism in an extreme form."

The three employer representatives refused to sign the final report and, perhaps more unexpected, Commons also refused to endorse it and wrote a separate dissenting report (with Harriman). I say unexpected because earlier in his career Commons was a vocal supporter of industry-wide collective bargaining. However, as I have detailed elsewhere, his thinking on industrial relations evolved over thirty years in a four-step pattern with unions and collective bargaining always an important component to police and raise standards among the lowest tier of employers but with more weight in his thinking given progressively over time to labor/employment law, progressive

industrial relations management, and macroeconomic stabilization/full-employment policy. Thus, his primary recommendation to the CoIR for improving industrial relations in the nation was creation of state-level tripartite industrial commissions as a form of industry-wide cooperative joint-regulation and interest-group collective bargaining.

## 2. John D. Rockefeller Jr. and Mackenzie King

Coal miners across southern Colorado went on strike in early fall of 1913 and demanded union representation and collective bargaining. The largest company in the strike was Colorado Fuel and Iron (CFI), owned by the Rockefeller family but with nearly all operational decisions made by an autonomous president and executive group. All the companies, including CFI, took a hard line against the union and strikers and, at CFI, the strikers were evicted from company-owned housing and forced to spend the winter months in tent colonies on the barren, wind-swept plains.

The strike dragged into the spring and, in mid-April, a group of state militia (see photo below), claiming they were shot at, stormed the main tent colony and burned it to the ground; in the melee twenty-one strikers and family members were killed. The event quickly became known as the Ludlow Massacre.

Walsh subpoenaed John D. Rockefeller Jr. to testify before the CoIR, grilling him for three days. Rockefeller emerged with a very badly tarnished public image as an absentee capitalist concerned only about quarterly dividends and with no knowledge of or interest in the treatment and conditions of the labor that produce the dividends. Other industrialists of that era refused to acknowledge wrong or responsibility in labor matters,



Colorado National Guard troops arrive in the strike district during the Ludlow strike.



John D. Rockefeller Jr. (above); United Mine Workers organizers speak to miners at the Southern Colorado Coal Strike in Ludlow, Colorado, in 1914 (right).



but Rockefeller brought in Canada's former federal Deputy Minister of Labour Mackenzie King, who was experienced in labor disputes, to go to CFI, investigate the causes of the strike, and recommend reforms.

King concluded old-line industrial autocracy was at the root of the strike and that the workers needed collective representation and voice. He met with the union strike leaders but concluded they were not likely to be a constructive force. Thus, King made the centerpiece of his proposal a company-financed plan of employee representation with local-, division-, and company-level joint employer-management councils in which employee and management representatives meet, discuss mutual concerns, and attempt to resolve differences.

Rockefeller implemented King's proposal at CFI, spread it to his other companies, and during the 1920s worked to implement it more widely across industry through the Standard Conference Committee (SCC) (a group of 10 corporations in the vanguard of the industrial relations movement); he also set up and financed the consulting/research organization, Industrial Relations Counselors. Clarence Hicks, executive vice president of industrial relations at Standard Oil (New Jersey), chair of the SCC and board chair of IRC, was instrumental, with financial help from Rockefeller and associates, in establishing the first six IR centers in the United States and Canada, starting with Princeton in 1922 and followed in the 1930s by Cal Tech, Michigan, MIT, Queen's (Canada), and Stanford, with a seventh planned but not completed at Wisconsin (his alma mater).

IRC's Bryce Stewart (catalyst for the Queen's IR unit) and Murray Latimer worked with Edwin Witte from Wisconsin in creating the nation's social security and unemployment compensation systems. Richard Lester, lead organizer of the IRRA in 1947, was a member of the IR unit at Princeton and did IRC-sponsored research on unemployment compensation. The IR unit set up by Hicks in 1937 at MIT spawned numerous IRRA presidents,

including Charles Myers, Douglass V. Brown, Phyllis Wallace, Robert McKersie, and Thomas Kochan.

Rockefeller and King were connected with two other events, both in 1918, that helped establish the IR field as a going concern. In 1918, Rockefeller installed an entirely new, state-of-the-art industrial relations program at the family's flagship Standard Oil (New Jersey) company. Modern-day management academics — to bolster their narrative about HR management's strategic transformation since the 1980s — tend to caricature early personnel departments as limited to hiring, payroll, and company picnics and omit altogether mention of the large, advanced, and strategic IR departments, such as at Standard Oil and other large welfare-capitalist companies. Actually, during the 1920s thousands of people from other countries came to the United States, as Americans similarly went to Japan in the 1980s, for plant tours and to see firsthand the new IR employment model.

The second event was the 1918 publication of King's book *Industry and Humanity*. Virtually unknown and uncited in the past half-century of IR literature, it is the first written work — of more than 200 pages with nine diagrams delineating the core features of an industrial relations system — that describes from a founder's perspective what this new subject of industrial relations is about, including philosophy of employer-employee relations, domain of IR's subject content, and general theoretical and normative principles. It should be considered the founding work on IR theory and much surpasses in insight and formal model development Dunlop's 1958 *Industrial Relations Systems*.

### 3. John R. Commons

Commons, a co-founder of the institutional school of economics, was widely considered the nation's top academic expert on labor. Conventional economics is an abstract exercise in the



America's first unemployment compensation check was delivered to Neils B. Ridd (L) by Voyta Wrabetz, Chairman of the Industrial Commission of Wisconsin, on August 17, 1936. Also pictured are professors Edwin E. Witte and John R. Commons.

logic of market competition that Commons and fellow institutionalists considered largely sterile formalism and intellectual justification for unregulated, laissez-faire labor markets and workplaces. For Commons, IR in its science-building mode is an alternative institutional type of labor economics that shifts the focus from a perfect demand/supply labor market to a problem-prone employment relationship spanning two institutions with contradictory logics, markets (individual competition) and firms (team cooperation), and spanning two parties, employees and owners/managers, with partially conflicting interests, unequal power positions, and dysfunctional incentives for opportunism, exploitation, and free-riding. Industrial relations, therefore, seeks to discover the institutional design of employment systems and practices that lead to efficient, effective, balanced, and socially progressive outcomes.

The first two volumes of *History of Labor in the United States*, which Commons organized and edited, were published in 1918 and are conventionally cited as establishing his union-centered connection to industrial relations. The two history volumes, however, had been in progress for much of the decade and, rarely cited, are two other books Commons wrote at the time of the IR field's founding and which better reflect his thinking and approach to industrial relations. The first book is *Industrial Goodwill* (1919) and the second is *Industrial Government* (1921). The former distinguishes five types of employment systems, and the latter presents one or more company case studies that exemplify the different employment systems. Commons' conclusion is that the greatest threat to constructive industrial relations is capitalism's penchant to generate destabilizing business cycles and a chronic labor reserve of unemployed

workers, putting continual downward pressure on wages, conditions, and managerial treatment.

#### 4. Industrial relations institutionalized (1920)

By my reckoning, it was 1920 in the United States when IR, or IR/ER, was formally established as a recognized academic, professional practice, and public policy area. An event happened in each of these three areas that together established the field as an institutionalized going concern.

First, in the year 1920 a U.S. university created the first academic degree program specialization in industrial relations (not done outside North America until after World War II). Organized by Commons in the Economics Department at Wisconsin, students did coursework in four subject areas: labor management (personnel/HR), labor legislation/social insurance, labor history and industrial government (union/nonunion), and causes and remedies of unemployment. A Bureau of Commercial and Industrial Relations was also set up in the Extension Division to provide practical advice, consulting, and applied research to employers. Project work of the bureau was then written up as teaching cases for the labor management course.

Second, in 1920 the National Employment Managers Association (NEMA) changed its name to Industrial Relations Association of America (IRAA). NEMA began in 1912 with the founding of the Boston Employment Managers Association. Other city associations soon followed, and in 1918 the national organization was created. Meyer Bloomfield, active in vocational guidance and corporation schools, was lead organizer of the Boston association and became acknowledged

national leader of the employment management movement. Employment management started out primarily as a recruitment/hiring function but over the next several years added industrial training, safety, and welfare/service. At decade's end the national association decided the continued expansion in employment/personnel functions made the EM construct too self-limiting and chose IR as the replacement.

Third is the policy recommendation report (Department of Labor, 1921) from the members of the President's Second Industrial Conference. The first President's Industrial Conference was created in 1919 by Woodrow Wilson in response to the postwar surge in strikes and industrial violence. The same happened in Canada, punctuated by the Winnipeg General Strike (like the Seattle General Strike on the other side of the border) and appointment of a Royal Commission on Industrial Relations to investigate. The president's conference group was a large tripartite employer, labor, and public body charged with identifying the causes of the industrial breakdown and recommending legislative changes in national labor policy. It came apart, however, over the issue of collective bargaining and worker representation. The organized labor side insisted that national policy should declare in favor of independent labor organization and collective bargaining through unions, and against employer shop councils; the open-shop employer side rejected these things out of hand; the outcome was gridlock and acrimony.

Wilson tried to salvage something out of the debacle and asked people from the public group, with some new members, to try again in a second conference. This time the conference worked to a consensus, and the report came out in mid-1920. Unfortunately for my narrative, the report's cover title doesn't contain the IR term and, instead, blandly declares "Conference Report." All is not lost, however, for inside the report is the big, bolded section heading: "Problems Affecting the Employment Relationship: The Development of Industrial Relations" (p. 252).

It's worth continuing on with the contents of the second conference report, not because it contains more uses of the IR term but because the "what if" posed had its policy recommendations been put into law. The report recommends, on one hand, that legislation be enacted to protect workers' rights to join unions and bargain collectively and, further, that workers' preference for representation be determined through secret ballot election. The report also recommends, on the other hand, that employee representation and collective bargaining be broadly defined to encompass, both independent unions and employers' representation committees and collective bargaining and collective dealing, and that workers have a protected right to opt for no representation.

Strong opposition greeted the report from unions and employers alike; it quickly sank out of sight and today is mostly a labor history footnote. Nonetheless, it is an interesting centenary thought-exercise to ponder how the course of IR history might have changed if these policy recommendations had become law of the land in 1920.

The United States had become the leading industrial nation by 1900 but, unfortunately, also the leader in industrial violence and extremes of wealth and poverty.

As a coda to this centenary review, one has to be struck by the paradox of, on one hand, immense areas of social and workplace progress over the last 100 years and, on the other, continued struggle with many of the same deeply existential problems and conflicts — e.g., economic crises/unemployment, lack of workplace representation/protection, marches in the streets for equal civil/suffrage rights — that helped birth the IR field a century ago. Thus, our field and its academic, practice, and policy

union of participants can look back with pride of social contribution on the first 100 years and look forward to the next century with assurance of many more opportunities for social contribution. As long as there are workplaces with human beings in employer–employee relationships, there will be a science and social need for industrial relations (broadly defined) — whatever precise name it may be called. ■

**Bruce Kaufman**, a labor/IR economist, is a professor at the Georgia State University Andrew Young School of Policy Studies; he has written or edited 16 books.

## References

- Bart, Rosemary. 2019. "LERA's Identity Crisis at 75." *Perspectives on Work* 23: 75-77.
- Commission on Industrial Relations. 1916. *Final Report and Testimony*. Washington, D.C.: GPO.
- Commons, John. 1919. *Industrial Goodwill*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Commons, John. 1921. *Industrial Government*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dunlop, John. 1958. *Industrial Relations Systems*. New York: Holt.
- Hicks, Clarence. 1941. *My Life in Industrial Relations*. New York: Harper.
- Kaufman, Bruce. 1988. *How Labor Markets Work: Reflections on Theory and Practice by John Dunlop, Clark Kerr, Richard Lester, and Lloyd Reynolds*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington.
- Kaufman, Bruce. 1993. *The Origins and Evolution of the Field of Industrial Relations in the United States*. Ithaca, N.Y.: ILR.
- Kaufman, Bruce. 2003a. "John R. Commons and the Wisconsin School on Industrial Relations Strategy and Policy." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 57:3-30.
- Kaufman, Bruce. 2003b. "Industrial Relations Counselors: Its History and Significance." In *Industrial Relations to Human Resources and Beyond: The Evolving Process of Employee Relations Management*, edited by Bruce Kaufman, Richard Beaumont, and Roy Helgott, 31-112. Armonk, N.Y.: Sharpe.
- Kaufman, Bruce. 2004. *The Global Evolution of Industrial Relations: Events, Ideas and the IIRA*. Geneva: ILO.
- Kaufman, Bruce. 2008. *Managing the Human Factor: The Early Years of Human Resource Management in American Industry*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Kaufman, Bruce, and Daphne Taras. 2000. *Nonunion Employee Representation: History, Contemporary Practice, and Policy*. Armonk, N.Y.: Sharpe.
- King, William Lyon Mackenzie. 1918/1973. *Industry and Humanity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Rees, Jonathan. 2010. *Representation and Rebellion: The Rockefeller Plan at Colorado Fuel and Iron, 1914-1942*. Boulder: University of Colorado Press.
- U.S. Department of Labor. 1921. *Annual Report for 1920*, pp. 236-71. Washington, D.C.: GPO.
- Yoder, Dale, Herbert Heneman, and John Turnbull. 1958. *Handbook of Personnel Management and Labor Relations*. New York: McGraw-Hill.