OPEN ACCESS

UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
10.1177/1024258920919346

Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research
PDF-document

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research
General rights

Disruption and Re-Regulation in Work and Employment: From Organizational to Institutional Experimentation

Summary *(186 words)*

This article proposes experimentation as a framework for understanding actor agency in the changing regulation of work and employment. This involves contrasting institutional change with *organizational and institutional experimentation* approaches in order to understand how, in the context of uncertainty, social actors experiment with new ways of organizing and seek to institutionalize them into new understandings, norms and rules. The article describes the cognitive challenges and fault lines of disruption that are generating a vast range of experiments in the world of work. These fault lines invite resilient responses and the development of collective capabilities at two levels: first, organizational experimentation, where social actors seek to new types of organizations, networks and alliances and reflect on, assess and learn from their experiments; second, institutional experimentation, where these responses are scaled up and institutionalized over time through more general understandings, norms and rules. A key challenge for comparative research and strategizing is to find the appropriate institutional conditions that will facilitate and enable organizational experiments, whilst overcoming constraining institutional conditions. This challenge is illustrated through the examples of co-working the development of new forms of collective representation.

Introduction

This article proposes experimentation as a framework for understanding change in the regulation of work and employment. Middle-range theories typically respond to ongoing changes in the world of work. From the mid-1990s, there was a shift from studying varieties of capitalism to institutional change. Both these approaches tend to: 1) underestimate the degree of crisis and uncertainty in the global economy and overestimate the coherence and stability of neo-liberalism; 2) underplay the role of diverse forms of social agency in seeking new ways to contend, resist and survive in such an environment; and 3) overlook how these processes shape and are shaped by power dynamics and the interplay between agentic and systemic or structural power.

This article therefore seeks to develop tools to understand institutional change by considering how social actors at different levels are strategizing relative to the disruption they face. These actors are evident in multiple organizational contexts and institutional arenas in the world of work and they are likely to draw on a variety of capabilities and resources in the development and pursuit of their strategies. This involves contrasting an *institutional change* approach (generally based on the efforts of organized collective actors to rebuild institutions from the top downward in order to shift the established rules of the game more in the direction of their own interests) to an *organizational and institutional experimentation* approach. By focusing on the latter, this article looks at how, in the context of considerable uncertainty, social actors experiment with new ways of organizing and sometimes then seek to institutionalize them into new understandings, norms and rules.

The article first describes the cognitive challenges and real-world changes in response to which a vast range of experiments in the world of work have been generated. In particular, we identify fault lines of disruption in the regulation of work and employment, with special emphasis on the uncertainties generated by these processes and their implications for the reordering of regulation among different regulatory arenas.

Secondly, these fault lines invite the examination of resilient responses to these uncertainties, i.e. how social actors are trying to search for new options to regain control by building on existing institutions and creating new types of organizations, networks and alliances, by mobilizing new identities, by promoting new understandings of the meanings of work and employment and, inter alia, by using technology to create new forms of solidarity. This is labelled *organizational experimentation*. We argue that this is one of the defining characteristics for actors focused on the regulation of work and that there are multiple examples of such experimentation as actors reflect on, assess, learn from and modify their experiments in the changing circumstances and sources of disruption with which they must contend.

Thirdly, the article considers whether these are ephemeral responses to crises or whether and how they have the capability to be sustainable over time, i.e. to become scaled up and institutionalized through more general understandings, norms and rules in particular social settings (local, regional, national, international, inter-organizational, sectoral). Such scaling up requires *institutional experimentation*, whereby social actors negotiate the interface between their organizational and institutional contexts in order to try and find the appropriate institutional conditions that will facilitate and enable their organizational experiments, whilst overcoming constraining institutional conditions. This article asks how social actors engage

with, circumvent or change these institutional conditions and illustrates these processes through the examples of co-working the development of new forms of collective representation.

We conclude by highlighting the importance of comparative research on different types of organizational and institutional experimentation so as to understand better the emergence and interconnections between different types of experimentation and the implications for social actors in their strategizing for a better future.

Fault Lines of Regulatory Disruption

We identify six fault lines where, as a result of changes in the last four decades in multiple industries and national contexts, existing institutions appear to be out of synch with changes in the field of work and employment. These fault lines disrupt traditional modes of work regulation, compelling social actors to come up with strategies as best they can, but also opening up spaces for experimentation in the major arenas for the regulation of work and employment. Crouch (2005) points to the recombination of rules and modes of governance; Campbell (2004) to the importance of policy bricolage and entrepreneurship. Kristensen and Morgan (2012) make the case for an analysis of the co-constitution of institutions and actors. They identify a process where, faced with institutional crises, collective social actors draw on institutional legacies to innovate and make new combinations in the regulation of work, sometimes changing their own identities in the process. Understanding collective actor responses to these fault lines is essential to understanding the processes of experimentation that ensue: are they demobilized and constrained by the uncertainties with which they have to contend or are they empowered through opening up alternative scenarios of collective responses, renewed resources and enhanced capabilities?

1. *Disruptive technologies*. Increased technological intermediation means that many types of work are being disarticulated and performed virtually across work sites, firms, supply chains and borders. Technological platforms such as Uber and Amazon Mechanical Turk are rewriting the structure of firms, the nature of work organization and the frontiers of the employment relationship, highlighting the limits of existing forms of work regulation and public policy (Bergvall-Kareborn & Howcroft, 2014; Daugareilh et al 2019). What results is a blurring of boundaries between: paid and free labour (Burston et al, 2010), work and non-work (Bittman et al, 2009), jobs performed by robots (Ford, 2015) and those requiring enhanced skills, and high rewards and social exclusion. These new technologies also open up space for new forms of resistance, deliberation, collective organization and mobilization (Zuboff, 2019).

2. *Redefinitions of the role of the state*. The optimistic frame of the post-war decades was of a protective state geared to expand freedoms, including at work (Arthurs 2013). Over recent decades, what Peck (2010) labels the "free market project" has increasingly asserted its pre-eminence: in terms of market liberalization, the reduction of social welfare (Crouch, 2014), the "new public management" for state services (Bach & Givan, 2011), and the internalization of neoliberal norms by social, not least union, actors (MacDonald, 2014). The accelerated transfer of this neoliberal statecraft between jurisdictions challenges the narrative of the protective state, favouring the dismemberment of social rights and worker protections (Clauwaert & Schmann, 2012; Peck & Theodore, 2015). Yet, a counter-narrative points to the resurgence of a state role for industrial policy (Mazzucato, 2018), the environment (Rodrik

2014, Stroud et al 2015), equality through fiscal and social policy (Bourguignon, 2015), and equity for women, migrants and persons of colour (Connell 2011). This can create opportunities for enhancing voice, deliberation and actor capabilities (Bowman et al, 2014. Salais & Villeneuve, 2004; Wainwright, 2009).

3. *Unbundling the firm*. Financialization, pressures associated with globalization and the liberalization of markets have prompted the reorganization of the internal and external boundaries of the firm (Appelbaum & Batt, 2014; Marchington et al, 2005). The outsourcing of work, the recourse to more elaborate production networks, the offshoring and reshoring of work, the externalization of services, the transformation of some employers to deployers of labour (Haiven, 2006) and the fissuring of the workplace into multiple strata of contractors (Weil, 2014) modify the dynamics of power relations, undermine the efficacy of traditional labour law frameworks and challenge the strategic repertoires of actors in the governance of work. However, this also opens up new space for different kinds of stakeholder representation and advocacy (Bonner & Carré, 2013) as well as claims for new forms of participation and democracy in the governance of firms (Ferreras, 2017; Blasi et al, 2014).

4. *Reconfiguration of global production networks*. New technology and free trade facilitate the organization of production across borders, rescaling the governance of work, with a displacement towards both trans- and sub-national levels (Dickens, 2011; Almond et al, 2014). This reach is further complicated by the extension of market capitalism to a whole range of developed and emerging economies, thus opening up ongoing possibilities for spatial dislocation of jobs and services. Policy and union actors are challenged, but also empowered, in their search for new forms of transnational regulation (Banks, 2011; Daugareilh, 2012; Fairbrother et al, 2013; Lévesque et al, 2017). Competition for jobs is often subnational, with worksites, firms, industries, and regions pushing to engage in various forms of collaboration and community development through ecosystems for skill development, firm upgrading and innovation (Almond et al, 2017; Coe & Yeung, 2015).

5. *Climate crisis and transition*. The global response to climate change entails profound changes in industries and communities, for which the governance of work appears ill equipped (Laurent & Pochet, 2015). This transition creates opportunities for policy innovation, on green jobs, new skills and sustainable communities (Stroud et al, 2015; Klein, 2019). Yet many actors struggle to embrace the possibility of increased, if contested, collaboration to promote decent and socially useful jobs. The institutions and regulatory legacies to facilitate such a dialogue have yet to be invented or are, at best, embryonic. Moreover, as is evident in the case of global production networks, sustainable development cannot be divorced from modes of consumption, the drive for profit extending value chains around the world and the ethical behaviour of firms (Carbo et al, 2014).

6. *Transformations in identity, solidarity and values*. The construction of insiders and outsiders challenges the legitimacy of prevailing institutions in the governance of work. This separates those who benefit from institutional legacies from those who do not, whether generational cohorts, precariousness and intersectional gaps on the margins of the labour market (Prosser, 2015), and exclusion from channels of representation. Yet these shifts are not unidirectional: the purported rise in individualism is also a space for new collective identities (Peetz, 2010); social media is not merely disruptive of solidarities but a medium for new ones (Heckscher, 2015; Wood, 2015). The affirmation of more varied civil society and stakeholder interests moves beyond classic trilogies (worker, employer and government), giving rise to

multiple institutional forums (Murray, 2013; Tapia et al; 2015), challenging social actors on social and ethical issues (Williams et al, 2015), opening up new possibilities for equality (Acker, 2012), and highlighting the role for civic engagement and dialogue (Fung & Olin-Wright, 2003; Della Porta & Rucht, 2013).

Given the impact of the fault lines of change on the regulation of work, social actors are engaged, or likely to be engaged, in a prolonged period of experimentation within and between different arenas for the regulation of work and employment as they seek to respond and rebuild organizations and institutions for the new era.

From Institutional Change to Experimentation

From the mid-1980s, growing interest in the idea of post-Fordism and in identifying more carefully how different forms of work organization were socially constructed and embedded in institutions (e.g. Piore and Sabel, 1984; Sorge and Streeck. 1987; Sabel and Zeitlin, 1997) evolved into an increased effort to understand varieties of capitalism, their capacities for adapting to changes in markets, technologies and regulation including the link between employment systems and embedded institutional legacies.

Over the last decade, this line of research has shifted more explicitly into the analysis of institutional change and, in particular, of the way in which neo-liberalism as an international regime associated with the changing nature of the state, the deregulation of markets, the growing financialization of firms, new technologies and the internationalization of production networks has intersected with and reshaped different forms of capitalism, restructuring work and employment systems and undermining collective bargaining institutions (Baccaro and Howell, 2017; Thelen, 2014).

This agenda has sparked multiple empirical studies of change in the regulation of work and employment across a wide variety of forms of capitalism. However, this literature suffers from three problems. First, it tends to underestimate the degree of crisis and uncertainty and overestimate the coherence, stability and commonalities in the manifestations of of neo-liberalism. Labour is often depicted as either defeated or incorporated into the neo-liberal reform agenda, and the underlying instability of the social and economic order that reflects continuing disruptive change is subordinated to accounts of the triumphant march of neoliberal institutional change. Secondly, while the multiple sources of disruption are spawning a vast array of new forms of social agency, there is insufficient attention to what Hall and Lamont (2013) describe as the 'resilience' of social actors. These actors are seeking out new ways to contend, resist and survive, looking for innovative paths to improve their conditions and working to redefine the organizational and institutional spaces in which they operate. Finally, this literature often minimizes the interplay between agentic and structural power (Culpepper, 2017), where social actors are seeking to renew their power resources and collective capabilities (Lévesque and Murray, 2010).

There is a need to develop a framework that complements previous efforts to understand institutional change but shifts the focus to how actors at different levels, in multiple organizational contexts and institutional arenas (e.g. at local and regional levels, through formal and informal transnational linkages, through exploiting new social media community spaces) are experimenting in response to the disruption of traditional sources and forms of regulation. This involves a shift from an *institutional change* approach (generally

based on the efforts of organized collective actors to rebuild institutions from the top downward in order to shift the established rules of the game more in the direction of their own interests) to an *organizational and institutional experimentation* approach (where social actors experiment with new ways of organizing and sometimes then seek to institutionalize this experimentation into understandings, norms and rules that transcend particular organizations).

This approach to experimentation is not that of classic positivist science, with its emphasis on conducting randomized, controlled experiments to isolate effects. Rather, the focus is on how social actors contend with and respond to uncertainty through the generation of solutions to problems through "a process of iterative adaption to new circumstances and experiences that entails a certain idea of progress… as a continuous reconstruction of experience" (Ansell and Bartenberger, 2016: 65).

This notion of experimentation is rooted in the American pragmatist tradition of social change: faced with challenges to their knowledge and understanding caused by the changing nature of the world and their limited cognitive capacities, social actors seek to alter their practices. These actors must balance between what they thought they knew, what they are capable of doing in the light of existing path dependencies, and what they would like to achieve (Sabel, 2012). The language of experimentation emphasizes tentative moves towards new forms of knowledge and practice, of tentative solutions to practical problems. Actors form strategies and hypotheses (e.g. how x is related to y; or more specifically how setting up a particular organizational form might lead to certain desired social outcomes in the face of disruptions and uncertainties). These hypotheses or strategies may reflect dominant thinking or emergent ideas.

For Dorf and Sabel (1998: 314), experimentalism can be seen as "a form of collective problem solving suited to the local diversity and volatility of problems that confound modern democracies". Sabel and Zeitlin (2012) present experimentalism as a response to strategic uncertainty "where the parties face urgent problems, but know that their preferred problem-solving strategies fail, and therefore are willing to engage in joint, deliberative (potentially preference-changing) investigation of possible solutions." Kristensen and Morgan (2012: 415) point to "the mutual constitution of actors and institutions" in a context of globalization, heightened competition and uncertainty, where actors engage in an "experimental search for new institutions and governance principles".

More recently, a range of authors have identified the importance of experimentation: Stone (2014: 305) on the "green shoots" of policy experimentation in different national settings as globalization's destabilizing tendencies open up space for policy experimentation in the area of employment regulation; Fine (2015) on the emergence of new combinations in the governance of work, where policy entrepreneurship and worker agency are intertwined between different regulatory arenas, which she aptly describes as a "bricolage of organisational forms". Institutional experimentation is certainly not unidirectional: multiple experiments can as often lead to worse outcomes (Peck & Theodore, 2015). Experimentation can also be a transitional strategy, where local experimentation explores alternatives to blockages in laws and policies at other levels (Arthurs, 2014; Dean & Reynolds, 2010; Kallberg, 2011). Kuznetsov and Sabel (2014) emphasize that such re-combinations occur because of the absence of *ex ante* solutions, which means that governance strategies to reshape institutions need to connect existing institutional frameworks with out-of-the-box solutions. Without guarantees of desirable results, such approaches point to the importance of understanding actor strategies in the face of disruption.

Work re-regulation is taking place, at multiple scales, sometimes within a single arena, often, through new combinations of arenas and with intersecting fields in finance, trade, industrial policy and the environment. The literature increasingly highlights the importance of agency as both global and local actors seek to redefine the spaces in which they operate through processes of experimentation. Be it in terms of identities, framing, strategic repertoires, resources, capabilities or skills, the understanding of collective actors is central to understanding the outcomes of such experimentation (Fligstein & McAdam, 2014; Ganz, 2004; Kristensen & Morgan, 2012; Lévesque & Murray, 2010; Mahoney & Thelen, 2010; Turnbull, 2006; Williams et al, 2015).

Processes of Experimentation

How might we characterize such experimentation from the point of view of social actors? Perturbations, such as the fault lines of change we outlined above, disrupt traditional or predominant forms of regulation of work and employment. Actors, facing strategic uncertainty, seek to respond to these challenges to their institutional and regulatory legacies. These responses typically entail a shift in strategic repertoires, often something new or some recombination of the institutional legacies of these actors. The choices may reflect a power struggle among different actors. The strategies may be operative at different levels (workplace, firm or organization, sector or industry, region, society, etc.) and they may take different forms (individual and collective actions, policies, agreements, legislation). The experimentation is typically deliberate but it may also be emergent as actors come to realize in process that they are engaged in such experimentation. The experimentation may be permanent but can also be temporary. It can be a success or a failure or somewhere in between. The experimentation is necessarily deliberative and reflexive where actors are assessing the nature and results of their experimentation and seeking to draw lessons from this process as they face continued uncertainty and perturbation of traditional forms of regulation.

Figure 1 presents a highly idealized version of such a process. Proceeding clockwise from the top, cognitive real-world challenges, as encapsulated by various forms of disruption, prompt social actors to develop new strategies and combinations in the regulation of work. This further requires a search for various organizational and institutional resources and allies in terms of labour, finance, technology, law, etc. that are necessary to carry out their experiment. Such resources may not be available and experiments may collapse very early due to institutional constraints; just as institutional resources may enable experimentation. If, however, resources are available, then actors put them together in new ways or add new resources from elsewhere to create a process of entrepreneurship and bricolage. This is the phase of experimentation, which may be deliberate, but it might also be emergent in that the nature of the experimentation only emerges in the process of generating and implementing the experiment. The next stage concerns seeing whether the new strategies and forms of regulation produce the outcomes desired (or not). Experimentation therefore requires a final stage of monitoring and assessing outcomes, reflecting on them and learning about how to modify or abandon the new strategies or seek to overcome obstacles, institutional and other, in the pursuit of the experiment.

[Figure 1 about here]

Alongside such organizational experimentation, actors may also engage with a second level of experimentation, i.e. whether there needs to be *institutional experimentation* to facilitate new organizational practices and forms. Do new institutions need to be created or

old ones reconfigured in order to make the organizational experiments more feasible? Do formal/informal rules need to change? Do new understandings of relationships need to be formulated and communicated? Do new types of organizations and technologies need to be brought into the action field? The key insight of this approach is therefore that the impetus for experimentation at the organizational level which derives directly from actors' experience of disruption and their resilience in responding to this is likely to draw them into a wider effort to rewrite institutional rules and create new frameworks for understanding at the institutional level. In turn, this brings them into confrontation with other actors defending the existing institutions or aiming to reshape them in different ways. So organizational and institutional experimentation takes place within a context of power dynamics and conflicting interests at multiple levels and can be identified at multiple levels as described below in this article.

Both types of experimentation require meticulous analysis of how actors mobilize their resources and capabilities, of their strategies to maintain, disrupt and transform organizations and institutions at different levels, arenas and contexts, and of what we can learn from them. It also raises the question of cross-cutting variables that might influence the importance of specific capabilities in particular contexts. These capabilities might vary by social, regional and urban locations (hence the importance of an analysis that is comparative across countries but also across locations within countries and that considers the intersection of multiple social constituencies), by organizational context (hence the analysis of different types of organizations), by institutional context (hence the analysis of different types of institutional configurations, notably emerging versus developed economies, and liberal-market versus coordinated economies), by the specificity of particular regulatory arenas (hence the need to take account of different regulatory traditions) and, by the attributes and identities of different collective actors who might prove to be more or less adept in these experimentation processes.

It is clear that in the current environment, a first and often predominant type of experimentation can be identified with the extension of neo-liberalism, marketization, outsourcing and the individualization of employment as extensively discussed (e.g. Peck, 2010; Thelen, 2014; Baccaro and Howell, 2017; Greer and Doellgast, 2016). First movers in processes of organizational experimentation have often been entrepreneurs taking advantage of deregulation, changing production networks and new technologies to establish new and highly exploitative forms of work and employment. However, our main focus is on a second type of experimentation, namely responses and resistances to neo-liberalism which are characterized by much greater diversity or as Peck describes it 'irreducible complexity, limitless variety, grassroots creativity and effervescent potential'. We label this provisionally as 'hybrid experimentation' to emphasize the notion that these efforts often involve a process of bricolage and building, bringing new and old elements together as previously discussed. Hybrid experiments involve efforts to create new forms of organizations and work that mitigate neoliberal pressures and instead offer the possibility of rewarding and fruitful work conditions that recognize aspects of the changed environment but aim to reshape them for meaningful and decent work. Table 1 presents examples of this distinction to better draw out the dual distinction: first, between neoliberal and hybrid experimentation; second, between organizational and institutional experimentation.

[Table 1 about here]

In what follows we concentrate on what we term hybrid experimentation at both organizational and institutional levels.

Hybrid Experimentation at the Organizational and Institutional Levels

Hybrid experiments are developed in relation to the disruptions occasioned by the fault lines of change outlined above. Following Figure 1, organizational experimentation identifies the cognitive mismatch and real-world challenges emerging in particular arenas. It is focused on how social actors look to develop new forms of organization and organizing in order to respond to disruptive challenges. It is possible to imagine a wide range of organizational experiments in different institutional arenas for the regulation of work and employment. Such experimentation
varies across social spaces within and across national contexts. Political agency (including the nature of political parties and local political governance structures in relation to national governance systems), diversity of populations, existing cluster and agglomeration effects embedded in local institutions are obvious factors to consider. Some institutional settings encourage more experimentation and/or allow more diversity than others, depending on which arena we are examining. Some environments may facilitate the creation of more autonomous and experimenting social actors and groups. Table 2 suggests a two-dimensional model of experimentation depending on the degree of autonomy and capacity to engage in experimentation on the part of social actors and the extent to which the institutional contexts enable or constrain organizational experimentation.

[Table 2 about here]

A key issue is how these processes of organizational experimentation translate into institutional experimentation. Whilst the mechanisms of institutional experimentation may be broadly similar to organizational experimentation, this move to the institutional level requires a change in scale as the level of analysis shifts to the shared understandings, norms and rules that formally and informally shape actor and organizational behaviour. Institutions may enable or constrain the experimentation undertaken by social actors. Organizational experiments can work singly without necessary recourse to institutional experimentation but actors may feel that they can work better and their experiments spread if enabling institutions are developed and/or constraining ones loosened or changed. Whereas organizations are centres of decision-making and accountability and therefore can be defined in terms of a distinctive and defined governance structure and a life cycle from start-up to dissolution or absorption into another organization, institutions are more diffuse, their effectiveness can ebb and flow, and there is no centralized decision-making authority. Whilst the concept of institutionalization suggests a degree of embeddedness and fixity of understandings, norms and rules (Scott, 2008), the movement from organizational to institutional experimentation is fluid, uncertain, contested and often subject to failure. Yet, we believe that it is essential for the understanding of social actors engaged in experimentation.

Imagining Institutional Experimentation

We briefly highlight two examples to illustrate the complexities of this process where organizational experimentation runs up against the limits and potentialities of institutional experimentation. These are co-working and new forms of collective representation.[1]

As argued above, the unbundling of the firm in combination with the emergence of digital platform technologies capable of controlling, allocating and monitoring work at a distance have led to a process of neoliberal experimentation in the fissuring of standard employment. In its place, we have seen the growth of a wide range of employment and self-employment based on the individual organizing his/her own work and work time. Such tasks are accomplished within constraints set by platform companies and where trade unions and collective bargaining are almost non-existent and so too the social protections associated with salaried work. They often lead to low wages, irregular work, limited social protection and low self-esteem.

However, this individualization of work has been accompanied by a counter-movement, a form of hybrid organizational experimentation, involving new forms of collective organization and capabilities. Many workers in the gig economy want some form of sociability in work and are not content to work singly at home or in a café. They want to go out somewhere, to put boundaries around working life and to interact with people in similar circumstances. Co-working spaces have thus grown rapidly in many urban spaces characterized by high levels of self-employed freelancers. Some co-working spaces are just an office; but others offer forms of sociability and identity through the location and design, of the space, through the organization of activities and by curating connections to develop new projects and technological communities. Some collaborative self-organizations such as the SMART model originating in Belgium have developed new forms of collective employment and social insurance for freelance workers as well as establishing co-working spaces (see Charles, Ferreras & Lamine, 2020, in this issue).

Co-working spaces are also affected by entrepreneurial actors. Some are merely a new breed of property managers seeking to replace the previous tenants, such as firms and offices, who have been unbundled. Others, notably local governments, see co-working as integral to urban regeneration, utilizing spaces in the inner city and encouraging a new workforce to revive older areas. Still other actors, notably community groups, see the potential for collective organization and the development of collective capabilities in the new individualized work context by overcoming exclusions through technologies, advice, networks and support for disadvantaged groups. Efforts to link these co-working spaces and the individuals in them to trade unions and or other forms of collectivity are also appearing in these types of experiments. Some of these organizational experiments spectacularly over-reach as in the case of WeWork; others evolve and grow. Barely a decade old, and despite the constant churn, this movement is transforming urban spaces and the possibilities of work.

What does it mean to look at this from the point of view of institutional experimentation and not just in terms of the formation of new types of organizations? Scott's (2008) threefold characterization of institutions points to cognitive, normative and regulative institutional pillars within which action is enabled and constrained.

---

[1] These two particular examples draw on empirical research conducted by the co-authors in the United Kingdom and the United States in the context of the *CRIMT Partnership Project on Institutional Experimentation for Better Work* (see Acknowledgements).

First, the concept of 'co-working space' has become a broadly understood and recognized cognitive frame, a shared understanding, that is ripe for diffusion and incorporation into a range of policy discourses about how to manage the new urban space and the new world of work characterized by contractors, freelancers and the self-employed in digital, media, creative industries especially.

Secondly, normatively, co-working can offer a seemingly attractive combination of structure and freedom for this new freelance workforce: the collective nature of co-working fulfills the 'need' for the sociability lost to recent changes in the nature of firms, technology and work; it provides some sort of structure to the work day but a structure decided on by the individual who can decide when to go to the space, when to leave, how much interaction to have etc.

Thirdly, cognitive and normative expectations are connected to regulative institutions. For co-working spaces, crucial regulative institutions concern city planning (building use), fiscal incentives (land use versus financial speculation) and community development. How far these cognitive and normative frames on co-working become routinised will depend on particular regulative contexts, their resistance to other forms of collective organization (for example, trade unions) and their openness to narratives that embed the idea of co-working spaces as solutions to a range of contemporary problems regarding work, autonomy, sociability and life style. On this basis, and hence the transition to forms of institutional experimentation, they seek to reshape regulative institutions to further facilitate these alternative models. The hybrid experimentation undertaken by a city such as Barcelona in its development of co-working spaces reflects a political, economic and cultural trajectory. Indeed, this particular initiative reflects a wider understanding of changing cognitive, normative and regulative assumptions about the evolution of the world of work. Some, of course, will yearn for a return to the regulative assumptions of standard employment; but the direction of hybrid institutional experimentation is to search for institutional arrangements likely to enable further organizational experimentation and the development of collective capabilities and actor agency in this new context.

Another example of the potential transition from organizational to institutional experimentation is illustrated by UE (United Electrical Workers) Union Local 150 in North Carolina. As a right-to-work state characterized by ferocious employer opposition and multiple legal obstacles to unionization, North Carolina has one of the lowest levels of unionization in any state in the United States (just 2.3 per cent of workers were union members in 2019). The traditional model of majority collective representation with exclusive bargaining rights, as nominally exists under US collective bargaining law, is not realistically available to North Carolina workers. It might be argued that the institutional framework is so constraining in terms of traditional trade union repertoires centered on achieving union certifications and collective agreements, that it has actually contributed to hybrid organizational experimentation. It is an example of where collective actors on behalf of workers are able to develop new capabilities, despite these institutional constraints.

Faced with terrible working conditions, the Housekeepers' Union at the University of North Carolina began organizing in the 1990s. With the help of Black Workers for Justice, an organization focused on improving the fate of poor minority workers, the predominantly black and female housekeepers won a significant settlement in a discrimination lawsuit. This

led to ongoing organizational experimentation whereby a local union ran against the grain in not aspiring to either certifications or collective agreements but simply to represent workers who needed such representation. As one of the key UE veteran organizers reflected on the experience: "Having a union doesn't mean you have to have a majority of workers or a union contract ... A union exists whenever workers come together to form an organization to build power" (Saladin Muhammad, co-founder of the Southern Workers Assembly, cited in Elk, 2017)

Faced with tremendous adversity, UE Local 150 well illustrates how social actors recombine resources and repertoires, most often experimentally, to solve pragmatically some of problems they face. UE organizers and Local 150 leaders did not report any deliberate intention or well-thought-out plan to engage in this experimentation – it simply emerged from the necessity of action to make common cause with these workers. This organizational experimentation has been facilitated by various resources and the development of collective capabilities Drawing on civil rights traditions and the Moral Mondays Movement launched in 2013 to protest against Republican legislation in North Carolina, they were also able to use civil disobedience as part of a wide range of tools in their repertoire to fight for justice in the workplaces where they were present. In some locations, they were able to use Section 7 rights from the National Labor Relations Act a form of minority unionism which allows representative organizations to petition and be heard by the employer. All of this was done in the absence of formal collective bargaining rights and with the continued support of the United Electrical Workers.

It is again possible to identify cognitive, normative and regulative dimensions of this attempt to institutionalize this form of collective representation.

Cognitively, there is a shared understanding, a taken-for-grantedness, to borrow Scott's term (2008: 53), that the old model of collective representation no longer works in a context like that of North Carolina. There are isomorphic pressures to adapt and other organizations begin to mimic models pioneered by organizations like UE Local 150.

Normatively, these organizations espouse traditional values, sometimes in novel ways, and norms about how actors in this kind of organization should behave. To cite one example, and drawing on repertoires from the civil rights movement, in the light of the illegitimacy of regulative frameworks on collective representative, civil disobedience becomes an accepted tool. The new experimental models are strongly informed by a moral code about the plight of workers and particularly those who have deep historical grievances about discrimination at work and in their communities.

But this institutional experimentation runs into regulative obstacles. There are few effective legal supports, notably in the form of labour legislation. With the exception of the Section 7 right to petition, the institutional framework is altogether constraining. Nor have the internal rules of union organizations been recast to support these new models, which must operate with limited financial resources. Yet the cognitive and normative case for such experimentation is compelling - to the extent that many union and collective organizations are experimenting with the institutionalization of this model that speaks to larger disruptive fault lines in the organization of work.

These two examples illustrate the uncertain nature of attempts to move from organizational to institutional experimentation. The process is by no means linear and there is no final destination. Rather, we observe a variety of trajectories, sometimes interacting with each other through learning, through diffusion and through global corporate strategies (as in the case of the WeWork phenomenon). The frontiers between organizational and institutional experimentation are fluid and often more evident in hindsight. It is a case of collective actors exploring the frontiers of their uncertainty in reaction to real problems they face. Nor is the hybrid nature of such experimentation immune from neoliberal encroachment. The aspiration to collective capabilities for co-working can collapse or morph into a business model driven primarily by financial objectives, driving out the social elements. Not all pillars necessarily support the movement from organizational to institutional experimentation. Organizational experimentation can fail because of the lack of institutional supports and it may prove impossible to develop new supportive institutions or turn older institutions into less constraining structures. Yet our two cases illustrate a common movement where organizational experimentation tends to seek a firmer footing through institutional experimentation.

This means that, in terms of institutional experimentation, the interplay between emerging normative informal rules (understandings, norms and expectations) and regulative formal rules (hard law and soft law) will be central to understanding how processes of institutional experimentation emerge, are reinforced or weakened so as to enable or constrain the social actors engaged in experimentation. Collective actors might be seeking more institutional support for their organizational experiments or they may want to get rid of constraints on their experimentation.

As illustrated by Table 3, a working hypothesis might suggest that the more emerging informal and formal rules reinforce each other, the stronger the framework for *institutional experimentation* and the greater likelihood of moving towards some form of institutional embeddedness. But it is as likely that informal and formal rules are in tension, giving rise to a messier and uneven process of change. Further, as Streeck and Thelen (2005) discuss, it may be easier to adapt institutions gradually and incrementally, turning them into enabling supports rather than to get rid of institutions which are perceived to be constraining.

[Table 3 about here]

This points to a need for a sharper understanding of the temporal dimension of these processes of institutional experimentation. An idealized timeline might be conceived as the movement from o*rganizational experiments to institutional experimentation to some form of institutional embedding*. However, such a process is likely to be quite uneven, can break down at any point, and might follow a reverse logic where institutional experimentation spawns organizational experimentation, including in unanticipated ways. Nor should the spatial dimension be discounted where experiments produce better results in some locations to the detriment of others (Castree et al. 2004).

It might also follow that efforts to provide a more comprehensive institutional footing for hybrid experimentation will be a key task in understanding these processes of experimentalism. Of course, many critics of neo-liberalism will suggest that this cognitive frame has long been available, but the search for an encompassing discursive clarity in so many experiments suggests that the emergence of such a narrative is part of the sense-making

pursued by resilient actors, thus undermining claims by some as the ready availability of an overarching counternarrative. Some of the pillars are readily identifiable: sustainability; dignity, fairness and equality; autonomy; citizenship and democracy. But we argue that this is a task for reading across cases of experimentation and the detailed work of social actors seeking to construct that narrative.

The idea of hybrid organizational experimentation as distinctive from neoliberal organizational experimentation replicates itself here. At the cognitive level, the origins of neoliberalism and how it has evolved as a relatively coherent but evolving system of thought has been discussed in many sources, e.g. Peck, 2010; Harvey, 2005; Stedman Jones, 2011), as has the cognitive basis of Keynesianism (Hall, 1993). However, the cognitive basis for hybrid institutions appears much looser. Thus, whereas neo-liberalism can present a coherent explanation as to what links shareholder-driven firms, the shrinking of the state, the decline of collective representation, the regulation and deregulation of markets, these are only loosely connected in any alternative or hybrid account. These loose connections are part derived from a return to Keynesian ideas but also from a wide range of social movements and a more limited range of social theories concerned with the impact of globalization, inequality, sustainability, climate change, human rights etc. This means that most efforts at institutional experimentation tend to draw on more local and specific cognitive frames rather than advancing 'one big idea'. This tends to weaken such efforts because they face a dominant 'no alternative to neoliberalism' approach. Whilst there may be coherent cognitive and ideational at the levels of specific institutional experimentation, they can be undermined by the lack of a bigger picture embedded in a generally accepted framework.

Finally, there is a need for a better understanding of how these experiments might alter both the power resources of actors and the structural power of business, the state and labour within the political, economic and social fields of capitalist economies. Some experiments might well increase labour's power resources without altering the structural domination and subordination of labour. Other experiments might affect such structural domination. Yet others might both weaken labour power resources and enhance structural domination. The combined effects of such organizational and institutional experimentation are likely to be central to an understanding of the re-ordering of the regulation of work and employment.

Conclusion

The experimentation taking place in both organizations and institutions is at the contested centre of the shape of work for the future. In an era of persistent disruption of existing forms of regulation of work and employment, new middle range theories focusing on actor strategies are required. Building on existing institutional analysis, we suggest that the move from institutional change to institutional experimentation supplies a new comparative focus that picks up on: (a) the continuing crisis-ridden nature of neoliberalism; (b) the persistent and growing resilience of social actors, even in constrained institutional settings, to experiment with new organizations; and c) the need to inform actor strategies in efforts to engage in organizational experiments, to develop institutional experiments likely to open up space for further experimentation and, ultimately, to embed new institutions founded on an emerging discourse on equality, democracy, citizenship and emancipation.

There has been no systematic analysis of such experiments and even less exploration of their implications. Peck and Theodore (2015: 238) rightly point to the need for a social infrastructure that "sustains rather than saps cumulative forms of progressive experimentation and which prioritizes alternative methods for marrying radical designs to redistributive and emancipatory strategies". Drawing on traditions of deliberation and reflexive problem-solving, the approach outlined here provides one way for thinking about how social actors contend with and strategize around disruption and seek to build a better future for work and all those who perform it. That is a compelling and transformative research agenda for progressive scholarship and, in tumultuous times, one that is likely to connect researchers and social actors in thinking about pathways to a better future.

References

Acker, Joan. 2012. Gendered organizations and intersectionality: problems and possibilities. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal 31(3): 214-224.

Almond, Phil, Maria C. Gonzalez, Jonathan Lavelle, and Gregor Murray. 2017. The Local in the Global: Regions, Employment Systems and Multinationals. Industrial Relations Journal 48 (2): 115-132.

Almond, Phil, Maria Gonzalez Menendez, Patrick Gunnigle, Jonathan Lavelle, David Luque Balbona, Sinead Monaghan, and Gregor Murray. 2014. Multinationals and Regional Economies: Embedding the Regime Shoppers? Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research 20 (2): 237-253.

Ansell, Christopher F. & Martin Bartenberger. 2016. Varieties of Experimentalism. Ecological Economics 130: 64-73.

Appelbaum, Eileen, and Rosemary Batt. 2014. Private Equity at Work: When Wall Street Manages Main Street. New-York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Arthurs, Harry W. 2012. Labour Law as the Law of Economic Subordination and Resistance: A Thought Experiment. Labour Law and Policy Journal 34 (1): 585-605.

Baccaro, Lucio, and Chris Howell. 2017. Trajectories of Neoliberal Transformation: European Industrial Relations Since the 1970s. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bach, Stephen, and Rebecca Kolins Givan. 2011. Varieties of New Public Management? The Reform of Public Service Employment Relations in the UK and USA. The International Journal of Human Resource Management 22 (11): 2346-2366.

Banks, Kevin. 2011. Trade, Labor and International Governance: An Inquiry into the Potential Effectiveness of the New International Labor Law. Berkeley Journal of Employment & Labor Law 32 (1): 45-142.

Bergvall-Kåreborn, Birgitta, and Debra Howcroft. 2014. Amazon Mechanical Turk and the Commodification of Labour. New Technology, Work and Employment 29 (3): 213-223.

Bittman, Michael, Judith E. Brown, and Judy Wajcman. 2009. The Mobile Phone, Perpetual Contact and Time Pressure. Work, Employment and Society 23 (4): 673-691.

Blasi, Joseph R., Richard B. Freeman, and Douglas L. Kruse. 2014. The Citizen's Share: Reducing Inequality in the 21st Century. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Bonner, Chris, and Françoise Carré. 2013. Global Networking: Informal Workers Build Solidarity, Power and Representation through Networks and Alliances. WIEGO Working Paper 13: 1-31.

Bourguignon, François. 2015. The Globalization of Inequality. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bowman, Andrew, Julie Froud, Sukhdev Johal, John Law, Adam Leaver, Mick Moran, and Karel Williams. 2014. The End of the Experiment? From Competition to the Foundational Economy. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Burston, Jonathan, Nick Dyer-Witheford, and Alison Hearn. 2010. Digital Labour: Workers, Authors, Citizens. Special Issue, Ephemera: Theory and Politics in Organization 10 (3/4): 214-221.

Campbell, John L. 2004. Institutional Change and Globalization. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Carbo, Jerry, Ian M. Langella, Viet Dao, and Steven Haase. 2014. Breaking the Ties That Bind: From Corporate Sustainability to Socially Sustainable Systems. Business and Society Review 119 (2): 175-206.

Castree, Noel, Neil Coe, Kevin Ward and Michael Samers (eds). 2004. Spaces of Work: Global Capitalism and Geographies of Labour. London: Sage.

Charles, Julien, Isabelle Ferreras and Auriane Lamine. 2020. A Freelancers Cooperative as a Democratic Institutional Experimentation for Better Work: A case study of SMart-Belgium. Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research 26 (2): … [Insert pages in this issue]

Clauwaert, Stefan, and Isabelle Schömann. 2012. The Crisis and National Labour Law Reforms: A Mapping Exercise. European Labour Law Journal 3 (1): 54-69.

Coe, Neil M., and Henry Wai-Chung Yeung. 2015. Global Production Networks: Theorizing Economic Development in an Interconnected World. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Connell, Raewyn W. 2011. Confronting Equality: Gender, Knowledge and Global Change. 1st ed. Cambridge: Polity.

Crouch, Colin. 2005. Capitalist Diversity and Change: Recombinant Governance and Institutional Entrepreneurs. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crouch, Colin. 2014. Introduction Labour Markets and Social Policy After the Crisis. Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research 20 (1): 7-22.

Culpepper, Pepper D. 2017. Structural Power and Political Science in the Post-Crisis Era. Business and Politics 17 (3): 391-409.

Daugareilh, Isabelle. 2012. Le dialogue social dans les instances transnationales d'entreprises européennes. Bordeaux: Presses Universitaires de Bordeaux.

Daugareilh, Isabelle, Degryse, Christophe et Philippe Pochet, eds. 2019. The Platform Economy and Social Law: Key Issues in Comparative Perspective. ETUI Working Paper 2019.10.

Della Porta, Donatella, and Dieter Rucht. 2013. Meeting Democracy: Power and Deliberation in Global Justice Movements. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elk, Mike. 2017. The Rise of Minority Unionism in the South. The Payday Report. 28 April. http://paydayreport.com/payday-in-the-guardian-the-rise-of-minority-unionism-in-the-south/

Fairbrother, Peter, Christian Lévesque, and Marc-Antonin (eds.) Hennebert. 2013. Transnational Trade Unionism: Building Union Power. London: Routledge.

Fligstein, Neil, and Doug McAdam. 2014. The Field of Theory. Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews 43 (3): 315-318.

Ford, M. 2015. The Rise of the Robots: Technology and the Threat of Mass Unemployment. New York: Basic Books.

Fung, Archon, and Erik Olin Wright. 2003. Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance. London: Verso.

Ganz, Marshall. 2004. "Why David Sometimes Wins. Strategic Capacity in Social Movements." In Jeff Goodwin and James Jasper (Eds.), Rethinking Social Movements. Structure, Meaning and Emotion, pp. 177-198. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Greer, Ian, and Virginia Doellgast. 2016. Marketization, Inequality, and Institutional Change: Toward a New Framework for Comparative Employment Relations. Journal of Industrial Relations 59 (2): 192-208.

Haiven, Larry. 2006. Expanding the Union Zone: Union Renewal through Alternative Forms of Worker Organization. Labor Studies Journal 31 (3): 85-116.

Hall, Peter A, and Michèle Lamont. 2013. Social Resilience in the Neoliberal Era. Cambridge Cambridge University Press.

Hauptmeier, Marco, and Glenn Morgan. 2014. "Ideas and Institutions: The Evolution of Employment Relations in the Spanish and German Auto Industry." In Marco Hauptmeier and Matt Vidal (Eds.), Comparative Political Economy of Work, pp. 162-185. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Heckscher, Charles. 2015. The Reorganization of Work. Emerging Trends in the Social and Behavioral Sciences: An Interdisciplinary, Searchable, and Linkable Resource. 0 (0): 1-11.

Klein, Naomi. 2019. On: The Burning Case for a Green New Deal. Toronto: Alfred A. Knopf Canada.

Kristensen, Peer Hull, and Glenn Morgan. 2012. From Institutional Change to Experimentalist Institutions. Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society 51 (1): 413-437.

Laurent, Éloi, and Philippe Pochet. 2015. Towards a Social-Ecological Transition. Solidarity in the Age of Environmental Challenge. ETUI: European Trade Union Institute: 1-40.

Lévesque, Christian, Marc-Antonin Hennebert, Gregor Murray, and Reynald Bourque. 2016. Corporate Social Responsibility and Worker Rights: Institutionalizing Social Dialogue Through International Framework Agreements. Journal of Business Ethics: 1-16.

Lévesque, Christian, and Gregor Murray. 2010. Understanding Union Power: Resources and Capabilities for Renewing Unin Capacity. Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research 16(3): 333-350.

MacDonald, Ian Thomas. 2014. Towards Neoliberal Trade Unionism: Decline, Renewal and Transformation in North American Labour Movements. British Journal of Industrial Relations 52 (4): 725-752.

Mahoney, James, and Kathleen Thelen. 2010. "A Theory of Gradual Institutional Change." In James Mahoney and Kathleen Thelen (Eds.), Explaining Institutional Change: Ambiguity, Agency, and Power, pp. 1-37. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marchington, Mick, Damian Grimshaw, Jill Rubery, and Hugh Willmott. 2005. Fragmenting Work: Blurring Organizational Boundaries and Disordering Hierarchies. Oxford Oxford University Press.

Mazzucato, Mariana. 2018. The Value of Everything: Making and Taking in the Global Economy. London: Public Affairs.

Murray, Gregor. 2013. Can Multiple Weak Ties Reverse the Social Regulation Deficit-Multinational Companies and Labor Regulation. Comparative Labor Law and Policy Journal 33 (4): 715-747.

Peck, Jamie. 2010. Constructions of Neoliberal Reason. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Peck, Jamie, and Nik Theodore. 2015. Fast Policy: Experimental Statecraft at the Thresholds of Neoliberalism. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Peetz, David. 2010. Are Individualistic Attitudes Killing Collectivism? Transfer: European Review of Labour Research 19 (3): 383-398.

Piore, Michael J., and Charles F. Sabel. 1984. The Second Industrial Divide: Possibilities for Prosperity. New York: Basic Books.

Prosser, Thomas. 2016. Dualization or Liberalization? Investigating Precarious Work in Eight European Countries. Work, Employment and Society 30 (6): 949-965.

Rodrik, Dani. 2014. Green Industrial Policy. Oxford Review of Economic Policy 30 (3): 469-491.

Sabel, Charles F. 2012. Dewey, Democracy and Democratic Experimentalism. Contemporary Pragmatism 9 (2): 35-55.

Sabel, Charles F., and Jonathan Zeitlin. 1997. World of Possibilities: Flexibility and Mass Production in Western Industrialization. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Salais, Robert, and Robert Villeneuve. 2004. Europe and the Politics of Capabilities. Cambridge: CUP.

Scott, W. Richard. 2008. Institutions and Organizations: Ideas and Interests, 3rd edition. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Sorge, Arndt, and Wolfgang Streeck. 1987. Industrial Relations and Technical Change: The Case for an Extended Perspective. Vol. 81. Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin.

Streeck, Wolfgang, and Kathleen Ann (eds) Thelen. 2005. Beyond Continuity: Institutional Change in Advanced Political Economies. Oxford Oxford University Press.

Stroud, Dean, Peter Fairbrother, Claire Evans, and Joanne Blake. 2015. Governments Matter for Capitalist Economies: Regeneration and Transition to Green and Decent Jobs. Economic and Industrial Democracy 0 (0): 1-22.

Tapia, Maite, Christian L. Ibsen, and Thomas A. Kochan. 2015. Mapping the Frontier of Theory in Industrial Relations: The Contested Role of Worker Representation. Socio-Economic Review 13 (1): 157-184.

Thelen, Kathleen (ed.). 2014. Varieties of Liberalization and the New Politics of Social Solidarity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Turnbull, Peter. 2006. The War on Europe's Waterfront: Repertories of Power in the Port Transport Industry. British Journal of Industrial Relations 44 (2): 305-326.

Wainwright, Hilary. 2009. Reclaim the State: Experiments in Popular Democracy. Revised Edition ed. London: Seagull Books.

Weil, David. 2014. The Fissured Workplace: Why Work Became So Bad for So Many and What Can Be Done to Improve It. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Williams, Steve, Brian Abbott, and Edmund Heery. 2015. Civil Governance in Work and Employment Relations: How Civil Society Organizations Contribute to Systems of Labour Governance. Journal of Business Ethics 0 (0): 1-17.

Wood, Alex J. 2015. Networks of Injustice and Worker Mobilisation at Walmart. Industrial Relations Journal 46 (4): 259-274.

Zuboff, Shoshana. 2019. The Age of Surveillance Captialism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power. New York: Public Affairs.