

SOCIAL DIALOGUE AS A DRIVER AND GOVERNANCE INSTRUMENT FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

ILO-ITUC Discussion Note

Maarten Hermans, Huib Huyse, & Jan Van Ongevalle

COMMENTS ARE WELCOME huib.huyse@kuleuven.be

KU Leuven
HIVA RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR WORK AND SOCIETY
Parkstraat 47 box 5300, 3000 LEUVEN, Belgium
hiva@kuleuven.be
www.hiva.be

© 2016 HIVA KU Leuven

No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form, by mimeograph, film or any other means, without permission in writing from the author.

Contents

1 Summary	5
2 Conceptual framework – what are we talking about?	6
2.1 Basic concepts and themes	6
2.2 Link with sustainable development goals	8
2.3 How social dialogue contributes to sustainable development: 3 principles	8
3 Context – what is needed for social dialogue to contribute?	10
4 What is known about the contribution of social dialogue to sustainable development?	13
4.1 Working conditions, workers' rights and equality at work	13
4.2 Access to public goods and redistribution	14
4.3 Growth and innovation	16
4.4 Environment and climate	18
4.5 Governance and participation	20
5 Emerging research agenda – what do we need to know?	22
6 References	24

1 | Summary

This discussion note outlines an initial framework for thinking about, and assessing how social dialogue contributes to sustainable development. The note emerges from observations by the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) that social dialogue, one of the core features of the decent work agenda, is not well-known and understood within the development community, and its potential in contributing to sustainable development and its governance is not sufficiently tapped-into. This is a paradox as the instrument of social dialogue has a lot to offer in terms of realising core-principles of the Development Effectiveness Agenda and in contributing to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, also demonstrated by the international recognition for the central role of the Decent Work Agenda.

By bringing together leading resources on the topics of social dialogue and sustainable development, the note maps and examines what is currently known about the rich relationship between the two themes in a short and summarized way.

The note argues that social dialogue is itself a form of governance that provides specific advantages towards realizing sustainable development. These advantages are linked to the inclusive nature of the social dialogue process and the way interaction is organised. At the same time, for social dialogue to have a positive effect on the realization of sustainable development, an enabling environment is essential, characterized by the will of parties to engage in a dialogue and the supporting role of the state.

Social dialogue is a well-established instrument which is practiced intensively on a daily basis across the world and has been the topic of a growing set of studies worldwide. Some of the roles of social dialogue are well-tested and documented, especially regarding industrial relations in developed economies. This is much less the case for developing economies and fragile states, where roles are still emerging and little is known about the underpinning success factors and how to nurture these roles successfully. Also newer roles of social dialogue in relation to the broader sustainable development agenda are less understood and documented. This analysis is used in chapter 6 to argue for a new and ambitious research agenda to understand much better the many pathways through which social dialogue can optimally contribute to sustainable development.

Throughout the discussion note illustrations are provided of how social dialogue contributes to five key dimensions (thematic clusters) of sustainable development: (1) working conditions, workers' rights and equality at work; (2) access (to public services) and redistribution; (3) growth and innovation; (4) environment & climate; and (5) governance and participation.. The note concludes with a brief outline for future research.

In addition, it is argued that well-executed social dialogue is in line with and re-enforces three core principles of the Development Effectiveness Agenda (Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation¹), more specifically: *democratic ownership*, *inclusiveness* and *accountability* (section 2.3).

¹ Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness Nov – Dec, 2011, Busan, South-Korea
<http://www.oecd.org/development/effectiveness/49650173.pdf>

2 | Conceptual framework – what are we talking about?

2.1 Basic concepts and themes

Three basic concepts – *sustainable development* and its *governance*, and *social dialogue* – are central to this discussion note. While there are many different definitions for the first two concepts, they are well-known to the development field and extensively used in development policy and practice. The concept of social dialogue on the other hand is much less prominent and known in development circles.

Experience has shown that there is no centrally determined blueprint² for the practical implementation of **sustainable development**. Both its content and translation into practice will need to be negotiated or planned through some kind of dialogue and collective discussions, embedded in systems of governance³. Scholars⁴ therefore conclude that **participatory governance** –with social dialogue as a key example of participatory governance- is central to the definition of sustainable development.

Most definitions are building on the Brundtland’s Commission definition of sustainable development, for example as in the landmark Rio Conference of the UNCED in 1992. Also the ILO definition for sustainable development adopted by the ILO at 102nd Session of the International Labour Conference (2013)⁵, and used in this note, is strongly inspired by the Brundtland’s definition: “Sustainable development means that the needs of the present generation should be met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Sustainable development has three dimensions economic, social and environmental which are interrelated, of equal importance and must be addressed together.”

A reference ILO publication of 2006⁶ identifies four returning “..conceptual pillars which lie at its heart and are key for its understanding and effective implementation. These pillars are those of *sustainability*, *inter-generational equity*, *intra-generational equity*, and finally, *public participation*. The first three are substantive features, whereas the fourth constitutes an element of form or procedure.

Sustainability implies a change in the behaviour of consumers based on the awareness of the negative results of unrestrained production and consumption. Intra-generational equity underscores that the elimination of existing inequalities between the “developed” world and the “developing” (but also between the poor and the rich within each country) is an essential condition for a sound implementation of the objective of “sustainability”. The element of *inter-generational equity* refers to the idea that present generations should adjust their behaviour so that the conditions of life of future generations are taken into account. This pillar is closely linked to the previous two elements; since

2 Since the Brundtland report from 1988 (Brundtland, p20), all the way to the adoption of the SDGs in 2015, a clear and immutable meaning of sustainable development remains elusive (Kates, Parris, & Leiserowitz, 2005).

3 (Carter, 2007; Jordan, 2008).

4 Eg. Papadakis (2006)

5 Guidelines for a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all (ILO, 2013)

6 Papadakis (2006, p10-11)

neither sustainability nor equity has any meaning if they are envisaged strictly in the present. Finally, the principle of *public participation* draws on the field of international human rights law (e.g., ICCPR, 1966; ICESCR, 1966) and is considered –together with the sister concepts of “participatory democracy” and “good governance”—as central to the concept of sustainable development. The element of participation would serve to express the idea that disempowered and marginalized groups should be given a voice in determining the extent to which environmental considerations, social justice and respect for human rights should prevail over economic considerations in devising national economic policies or designing specific development projects. “

Social dialogue, according to the definition of the ILO, includes “all types of negotiation, consultation and information sharing among representatives of governments, social partners or between social partners on issues of common interest relating to economic and social policy” (ILO, 2013a). It can take place at national, regional, sectoral or company level. Getting to grips with the specific effects of social dialogue requires further specification according to the form, level, involved actors, processes and topics of social dialogue. Throughout the text, illustrations will be provided of social dialogue for these different levels and settings, although not in an exhaustive way as this would be beyond the scope of this discussion note.

Social dialogue differs from other ways of governing labour relations through the types of outputs it produces and the means to achieve them. Social dialogue creates tangible outputs, such as collective bargaining agreements and social pacts. It can also involve the co-determination of policies, or the tripartite governance of certain policy areas (human resources development, employment policies, ..). Outputs will typically be achieved through negotiations or cooperation between government and social partners (tripartite), or between social partners (bipartite). This is fundamentally different from, for example, unilateral decisions taken by government on labour-issues (eg. labour legislation on minimum wages), or no-go or conflict strategies, such as protests, strikes, or lock-outs.

There is a growing consensus that the four pillars⁷ of the Decent Work Agenda – social dialogue, social protection, rights at work and employment – are indispensable building blocks of sustainable development and must be at the center of policies for strong, sustainable and inclusive growth and development.

Given the conceptual fluidity of sustainable development and its multi-dimensional nature, the note identifies five thematic clusters of goals to which social dialogue has shown to contribute: four clusters relate to core dimensions of sustainable development, one cluster deals with its governance. These clusters were derived in an inductive way, based on an initial mapping of the available evidence on how social dialogue contributes to different dimensions of sustainable development, and then bringing the main mechanisms together in more or less homogeneous categories⁸.

The clusters are used in the remainder of the note to summarize the contribution of social dialogue to the realization and governance of sustainable development. The **five thematic clusters** covering core-dimensions of sustainable development are:

1. Working conditions, workers’ rights and equality at work
2. Access (to public services) and redistribution
3. Growth and innovation
4. Environment & climate
5. Governance and participation

⁷ Here, the word ‘pillar’ is used in a different meaning than the conceptual pillars of sustainable development described in the previous paragraph.

⁸ It has to be noted that alternative classifications are possible. In Chapter 6 it is suggested to test the relevance of the framework and fine-tune the clusters in follow-up research activities.

2.2 Link with sustainable development goals

The note describes how social dialogue relates to sustainable development beyond the specific targets set in international frameworks such as the **sustainable development goals (SDGs)**, themselves an outcome of collective discussions on sustainable development. The five thematic clusters identified cover most of the focus targets of the ILO (ILO, 2015) for the 17 SDGs, with each cluster contributing to several SDGs. The relationship between the five thematic clusters and the 17 SDGs was established by reviewing which of the five thematic clusters contributed to one or more of the 169 targets. The focus of this exercise is on the strongest links between a cluster and different SDGs, rather than on an exhaustive mapping of the smaller or more indirect relationships. For example, for the thematic cluster on *growth and innovation*, it is especially the contribution of social dialogue to SDG8 (decent work & economic growth) and SDG9 (industry, innovation and infrastructure) that stands out, while of course not ignoring other more indirect links with other SDGs. Figure 1 visualizes how the five thematic clusters (on top of the table) broadly relate to the 17 SDGs (numbered from 1 to 17). To avoid repetition in the report, in chapter 4 the link with the SDGs will be illustrated shortly for each of the five thematic clusters.



Figure 1: Grouping the 17 SDG into five thematic clusters

2.3 How social dialogue contributes to sustainable development: 3 principles

Aside from the five main thematic mechanisms through which social dialogue contributes to different objectives of sustainable development, three core principles underpinning social dialogue have specific relevance in view of the development effectiveness agenda (Busan Partnership for Effective

Development Co-operation⁹, more specifically the principles of **democratic ownership**, **inclusiveness** and **accountability**. The Busan declaration of 2011 is the outcome of the fourth high level forum on development effectiveness, and is a reflection of the gradual expansion in thematic scope (from ‘aid’ to ‘development’) and in the variety of stakeholders that it engages (from the traditional bilateral OECD-DAC aid community, to emerging economies, the private sector and civil society).

Through these three development effectiveness principles, social dialogue in itself offers both an instrument and a form of governance to contribute to the achievement of social and economic development objectives.

Table 1 summarizes how the three principles are operationalized in this note.

Principle	Explanation
Inclusiveness	<p>Social dialogue promotes inclusiveness as representative and independent workers’ and employers’ organisations alongside government seek solutions to issues of common concern. Given their nature of representative organizations, social partners bring together the points of view of a multitude of employees and employers. In the case of trade unions, through their democratic structures and elected leadership this is further re-enforced up to the workers’ level. In developing countries, there are indications that informal workers and their organisations are increasingly represented through the trade union representation in social dialogue structures¹⁰. In the academic literature, this is described as providing <i>voice to key stakeholders</i> by providing channels/levels for participation in decision making processes.</p> <p>As part of this principle, social dialogue is particularly competent in tackling <i>collective action problems</i>, a specific type of development problem of which leading research institutes¹¹ are concluding that most traditional development programmes are failing to solve them. A collective action problem arises when the members of a group fail to act together to secure an outcome that has most potential to benefit the group¹². Social dialogue has been found to be capable of solving collective action problems in the area of decent work and beyond, for example by stimulating solutions which go beyond a pure-market-logic and which avoid environmental damage or the loss of jobs. In similar ways, social dialogue can set common standards or wage-levels in a region or sector, thus removing to some degree these elements from competition and so reducing the chance of a downward spiral on labour and environmental conditions¹³.</p>
Democratic ownership	<p>Social dialogue, through its main processes of information-sharing, consultation, negotiation and joint decision-making, allows the social partners to share their views on and influence policies or measures that affect them. These are important ingredients of democracy and can improve the chances of democratic ownership and effective implementation of those policies or measures by public authorities and social partners (ILO, 2013a).</p>
Accountability	<p>In addition, social dialogue provides various opportunities for strengthening transparency and accountability among the various actors involved. In the case of consultations for example, government is supposed to provide feedback to the social partners on the follow-up. In some countries such feedback is legally required</p>

⁹ Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness Nov – Dec, 2011, Busan, South-Korea

<http://www.oecd.org/development/effectiveness/49650173.pdf>

¹⁰ Dialogue with other groups of civil society (in case of tripartite-plus) allows for the inclusion of a wider perspective and consensus on specific issues beyond the labour agenda. See, for example: <http://www.solidaritycenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Rutgers.Trade-Union-Organizing-in-the-Informal-Economy.pdf>

¹¹ See for example: <https://differenttakeonafrica.files.wordpress.com/2012/04/joint-statement.pdf>

¹² Collective action problems cover a wide range of topics, ranging from climate change, or ending the race to the bottom on working conditions and tax competition, and curbing corruption. The dilemma arising from these type of problems is described by one author as the problem of standing up at football matches: “if everyone sits down, they could all see just as well, but how do you get everyone to sit down?”.

¹³ See (Kleinknecht, 1998)

through institutionalized tripartite structures. Also the participation of social partners as representatives of workers and employers in the boards of social security institutions can help to make management of those institutions more accountable (ILO, 2013a). In the academic literature this is described as *counterbalancing asymmetric social relations*, ranging from participation to social dialogue processes to industrial actions of various forms.

Table 1: Clarifying three underlying principles/mechanisms of how social dialogue contributes to sustainable development

Through the above outlined core principles, social dialogue is able to provide alternative governance mechanisms that are not available in institutional contexts where governance is only determined by the market or the State (Keune, 2015).

3 | Context – what is needed for social dialogue to contribute?

Before exploring the multiple ways that social dialogue can contribute to sustainable development and the SDGs in chapter 4, this chapter looks at the conditions that need to be in place for this to happen. Research has found that the degree to which social dialogue can be an effective instrument is highly influenced by the context. There is therefore a need to specify in which settings and under what type of preconditions social dialogue can contribute optimally to social, economic and environmental goals.

This influence of context factors on the effectiveness of social dialogue is explored in two steps, addressing two central questions (1) What factors determine the effectiveness of social dialogue in general; and (2) What additional preconditions need to be in place for social dialogue to contribute to the broader sustainable development agenda?

Context factors when social dialogue focuses on the traditional labour agenda

Studies continue to confirm the existence of a limited set of preconditions that determine the effectiveness of social dialogue at company level, sectoral level, national level or international level. While the relative importance of specific preconditions will also depend on historical patterns of labour relations in a given country¹⁴, the missing of several of these preconditions, which is common in times of crisis or in developing countries, will significantly limit the effectiveness of any social dialogue process.

¹⁴ For differences within the EU, see for example the Eurofound (2013) typology on different types of industrial relations.

The literature on the effectiveness of social dialogue distinguishes between different types of social dialogue, depending on the level (workplace, sectoral, national, inter-professional, regional, ..) and the actors (tripartite, bipartite, tripartite-plus). The section below looks at national tripartite social dialogue and workplace social dialogue¹⁵.

For the **national level**, ILO (2013d), based on its long expertise in this area, identified six preconditions for successful tripartite social dialogue, in line with the relevant International Labour Standards. The preconditions include first and foremost (1) the democratic space and freedom of association and collective bargaining, allowing social partners to organize and express themselves freely. (2) The social partners themselves should be strong, representative workers' and employers' organizations, with appropriate competence and the capacity to (make their members) comply with commitments. (3) There should be sufficient political will and a sense of responsibility of all parties to engage in social dialogue. (4) Adequate institutionalization, through funding and well-defined legal mandates, which ensures continuity of operations during political change. And finally, (5) the availability of experience in breeding trust as well as negotiation and cooperation skills, together with (6) accurate information and sound information exchange.

These general preconditions are confirmed in various studies. For example, one study found that freedom of association is a necessary condition for a social dialogue response at the national level to emerge in the case of the economic and financial crisis of 2008. Another study by ILO brings forward the paramount importance of political and social stability determining the success of social dialogue reforms. In Indonesia, as is the case in many developing economies, low unionization levels amongst the growing group of informal economy workers seriously limits the coverage of existing social dialogue processes. In Ghana, as the agenda of national tripartite dialogue is restricted to minimum wage determinations, the government uses ad-hoc multi-stakeholder dialogues to consult civil society partners on economic and social policies. A recent study by the Ghanaian Labour Research and Policy Institute concludes that a lack of institutionalization of these multi-stakeholder dialogues leads to weak outcomes with few structural opportunities for social partners to influence and contribute to policy development and implementation, and therefore also limited ownership.

At **workplace level**, a wide range of preconditions are mentioned in the literature ranging from conditions around (1) effective information and consultation; (2) a conducive regulatory framework and dispute-settlement system; (3) a labour inspectorate; (4) necessary negotiation structures and basic rights of workers' representatives; and (5) proven skills and training.

The importance of the presence of these basic preconditions is seen in a recent ILO study as an explanation why ILO, as one of the leading agencies working on strengthening social dialogue, has initiated substantially more projects on social dialogue in Latin America and Europe compared to Africa and Asia, where more preconditions will not be met.

The observation on the one hand of the potential of social dialogue for sustainable development, but the critical preconditions that need to be in place on the other hand for it to be an effective instrument, raises the question of what can be done fulfill some of the necessary preconditions. There are no silver bullet solutions in how to turn such settings into more conducive environments, but the insights are growing steadily. For example, the 2013 ILO synthesis review of ten years of ILO social dialogue projects identifies a number of critical success factors to strengthen social dialogue

¹⁵ Tripartite national dialogue will involve high level policy makers and the leadership of workers' and employer organisations. They will typically discuss national economic and social policies, such as labour market management and reform, employment promotion, productivity, income distribution and poverty reductions, pension reform, etc. Collective bargaining at workplace level on the other hand will mainly deal with the terms and condition of employment, and will most often involve a representative on the employer side and local workers' representatives. No research on success factors for social dialogue at international level was found.

related to (1) the design of the interventions (long term support, involvement of social dialogue actors); (2) capacity building (integrative approaches); and (3) strengthening labour laws (towards a more efficient labour administration).

Additional preconditions to contribute to broader sustainable development issues

There is a growing group of examples of social dialogue contributing to goals related to sustainable development beyond the pure labour agenda, both in workplace level dialogues as in national tripartite dialogues.

However, even in settings that are generally conducive to social dialogue, social partners might not be directly involved in, or contributing to broader sustainable development issues. There are arguably at least three contextual factors that determine if social dialogue can effectively contribute to the broader sustainable development agenda, beyond labour issues.

Firstly, social dialogue actors need to have the societal legitimacy to be engaged in these topics. This is not a formal or technical consideration, but a politico-ideological one. In which topics does the state want to grant social partners a larger role? To what degree is it, for a given topic, considered acceptable that social dialogue actors make (centralized) agreements, rather than relying on market forces or the actions of individual employers and workers? Do (unionized) workers consider certain topics valid for their representatives to engage on—perhaps they are hesitant to spend bargaining energy on topics that are less relevant to their particular and direct interest?

This ‘distribution of legitimacy’ for a given topic is mostly the result of historical debates and struggles, and to a large degree subject to institutional inertia and self-reinforcing dynamics. For example, by being involved in social dialogue around a certain topic due to an agreement, social dialogue actors gain legitimacy and experience, which strengthens their legitimacy and chances of being involved in future agreements, etc.

Secondly, the issues under consideration need to be ‘within the reach’ of tripartite structures of social dialogue—not just formally, but also in practice. For example, if certain social, labour, ecological, etc. regulation issues are linked to international agreements, but national tripartite actors are not capable to weigh on its’ content or national translation—due to limited experience, little relative influence, or insufficient embeddedness in the correct networks—it is not correct to simply consider the outcomes of the national social dialogue dynamic on these issues as ineffective.

Finally, social dialogue actors need to have the skills and expertise to credibly and effectively engage in broader socio-economic topics of sustainable development. These topics are further removed from the ‘bread-and-butter issues’, typically centered around individual and collective labour relations and their (redistributive) conflicts.

This is an area where the actual practice on the ground is running ahead of research activities. Up to now research efforts have focused largely on the expanding agenda of social dialogue in European countries, and much less is known on what is happening in other continents, and on how this can be supported.

This section builds on findings from the following sources (Falleti & Lynch, 2009; Melloni, Pesce, & Vasilescu, 2016) (Alemán, 2010) (Baccaro & Heeb, 2011) (ILO, 2013a) (Labor Institute Indonesia, 2015) (Labour Research and Policy Institute Ghana, 2015) (Van Geys et al., 2015; Elen, 2010) (ILO, 2013a) (Alexander, 1999)

4 | What is known about the contribution of social dialogue to sustainable development?

This chapter provides an overview of how social dialogue contributes to five thematic clusters as defined in chapter 2, illustrated with examples from the literature. The idea is not to be exhaustive but to present the key mechanisms at play in the five thematic clusters, but also to explain how the three principles (democratic ownership, inclusiveness and accountability) from the development effectiveness agenda are operationalized in social dialogue, and, finally, point at gaps in the body of knowledge.

4.1 Working conditions, workers' rights and equality at work

This note jointly considers working conditions and workers' rights, together with equality at work in this thematic cluster, as debates on decent work and the (unequal) distribution of benefits arising from economic activity are deeply entwined. In this way, social dialogue contributes to SDG1 (ending poverty), SDG 5 (achieving gender equality), SDG 8 (promoting inclusive and sustainable economic growth and decent work), and SDG 10 (reducing inequality).

This cluster is the most self-evident area of contributions of social dialogue to social and economic development, as working conditions (wage setting, other benefits, non-discrimination, career promotion, ..), workplace democracy (workers' rights) and therefore the fair redistribution of company benefits, are the core drivers of social dialogue. At national level social dialogue translates, for example into tripartite negotiations on national socio-economic policies and basic working conditions¹⁶. In many countries, wage levels and other working conditions are negotiated at the sectoral, regional or company level through collective bargaining (bipartite). An example of the developmental impact of such bipartite negotiations is provided in Box 1.

Box 1 | – Sectoral national employment councils in Zimbabwe

Although Zimbabwe has been repeatedly under international scrutiny for more than two decades for violations against trade union rights, and its national tripartite structures have been rather dormant, there is a long tradition of bipartite social dialogue negotiations, mostly achieved through the system of sectoral national employment councils (NEC), in which employer representatives and workers' representatives negotiate on working conditions and wage levels. The system was functioning relatively well over the last two decades although the economy has been almost constantly shrinking over the same period (with a short upheaval in the period 2012-2013). A recent national CBA audit by the research institute LEDRIZ (2015) has shown that through annual wage negotiations at the sectoral level, the gap with the living wage (poverty datum line) decreased substantially in the period 2012-2014 (in the formal sector)¹⁷. This example shows that bipartite negotiations can form a complementary mechanism to work on decent work conditions under difficult circumstances, especially in contexts where the government is hostile towards organised labour.

Since the 2008 financial crisis, interest in the inequality-reducing impact of social dialogue has picked-up, especially in developed economies. Research—mainly in OECD-countries—demonstrates

¹⁶ Depending on the context, the setting of minimum wages by the government can be either a decision taken unilaterally outside social dialogue negotiations, or may have been negotiated in tripartite social dialogue.

¹⁷ However, more recently this has changed. Starting from 2015, employers refused to negotiate further because of the continued deterioration of the economy. In addition, the political influence on the judiciary has been increasing over the last few years, making dispute mechanisms less effective.

various ways in which social dialogue brings more equality in wage-setting, resulting in (1) a larger share of earnings for middle- and low income workers, (2) less income inequality with the top of the wage distribution, and (3) higher shares of income from labour in countries' gross domestic product (GDP).

Aside from realising more equal wage outcomes for an overall category of workers, social dialogue can also contribute to reducing wage inequalities for specific disadvantaged sub-groups of workers. In this way, the positive impact of social dialogue extends to addressing societal inequalities, such as the gender pay gap, which would otherwise remain unaddressed through the normal wage formation process. For example, as women are overrepresented in precarious, low-waged work with lower coverage of firm-level collective bargaining, centralized tripartite social dialogue instruments -such as minimum wages- are sometimes used to correct market forces. Moreover, the same instrument can also increase the participation rates of women to the labour market, as raising wages at the lower end of the income distribution increases the opportunity cost of taking-up a job. In realizing this full potential of social dialogue for gender equality, there needs to be however more attention to gender concerns in collective bargaining.

addition to the instrument of minimum wage, there is also a growing body of evidence that points towards the potential of national tripartite social dialogue and collective bargaining in addressing broader gender issues at national and company levels. Box 2 illustrates how gender issues were addressed through a European-wide framework agreement with a multinational company (Areva Group).

Box 2 | Addressing gender issues in a multinational through social dialogue.

In 2006, the Areva management, the European Works Council and the European Metalworkers' Federation signed the European framework agreement on equal opportunities within the Areva Group in Europe. It covers non-discrimination at the recruitment stage, equal access to career promotion for all employees, as well as equal access to pay and training. It also establishes a Women's Forum which includes a hundred women from all areas and positions who will meet twice a year. The agreement is not a mere declaration of intent but expresses a commitment on the part of the signatories to improve standards of equal opportunities for men and women and for the professional integration of disabled people within all the structures of the Areva Group in Europe. (Briskin & Muller, 2011, p.6).

*Social dialogue can contribute to the specific SDGs in this cluster in a way that three key **Busan development effectiveness principles** are re-enforced. When working conditions are set and monitored through a negotiated and transparent process which includes social partners and the government, three development effectiveness principles are actually at play at the same time: the governance process (1) is inclusive and addresses collective action problems, avoiding a race to the bottom through competitive pressures; (2) creates ownership of the social dialogue actors; and in addition (3) the different stakeholders are held accountable to each other.*

This section builds on findings from the following sources (Van Gyes et al., 2015; Kristal, 2010; Shin, 2014; Volscho & Kelly, 2012; Jaumotte & Buitron, 2015; Hayter, 2015; Gammage, 2015; Pillinger, 2014; Briskin & Muller, 2011)

4.2 Access to public goods and redistribution

Social dialogue is a key instrument for influencing the orientation of socio-economic policies, for example on social protection, towards more inclusiveness and a more comprehensive coverage for low income households, while at the same time contributing to redistribution, evidence shows. This effect of social dialogue touches on all references to (equal) access in various SDGs, and is strongly

linked to the provision of public goods in the area of health (SDG3), education (SDG4), clean water and sanitation (SG6), and housing (SDG11). This thematic cluster also contributes to SDG1, as poverty is influenced by better access to public services and by redistribution through taxation.

The contribution of social dialogue to improved access to public goods and redistribution emerges from a wide range of research sources. Research has for example identified the positive role played by social partners in social dialogue in improving access for workers to social protection schemes and other social services, as well as increasing public spending on these domains. Social dialogue can therefore be instrumental in supporting the shift in thinking, from evaluating public services mainly on costs and efficiency, to evaluating it on criteria such as access and impact on equality. Box 3 provides an example of such a process in Uruguay.

Box 3 | Social security provisions through national dialogue in Uruguay (Cuesta Duarte Institute, 2016)

The *National Dialogue on Social Security* (NDSS, 2007-2012) brings together a broad range of societal actors in the discussion on changes to the social security system. These actors include representatives of workers, pensioners and employers, civil society organizations, government and academic institutions, etc.

The outcomes of the first round (2007-2008) of NDSS were highly promising, with a redesign and extension of the unemployment benefits. The second round was held between late 2010 and 2012 with the more ambitious goal of addressing outstanding and more contentious issues such as permanent disability benefits and wage guarantee funds, but resulted in more limited outcomes.

The process is an example of how channels can be provided for the participation of employee and employer organizations. At the same time, it illustrates that in settings where instructional features are less extensive, social dialogue provides a flexible 'space of governance' which can accommodate a broad range of actors (cf. section **Error! Reference source not found.**).

Strengthening the provision of public services through social dialogue is also beneficial from the point of view of redistribution, as the (cash) value of public services forms a relatively larger and sizable part of lower income households. In other words, public services financed through taxation of the overall population have an important redistributive effect because these services would otherwise take a large portion of the income or even be unaffordable for lower income households. Similar mechanisms are visible for workers in the informal economy, research evidence shows. An increased provision of public services frees up some of the income of these workers, especially relevant as they are often unable to contribute towards contributory social security systems. A notable example is the case of Indonesia where a large coalition of trade unions and other civil organisations managed to pressurize the government into the signing a new law that mandated (through a progressive implementation) the extension of social security coverage to the whole population in the categories of health, work injury, old age, and death of the breadwinner, and the tripartite governance is extended to the actual implementation with social partners represented in the social security's tripartite supervisory body.

*From the viewpoint of the **development effectiveness agenda** (Busan, 2011), at least two principles are mobilized in this mechanism. Bringing together a broad range of societal actors in the discussions and consultations on changes to social security systems, for example, mobilizes the inclusiveness principle, at the same time tackling collective action problems around redistribution, all highly sensitive and political issues. The fact this is done with representative actors increases the democratic ownership of the process.*

This section builds on findings from the following sources (Hayter, 2015) (Hermann, 2014) (van Ginneken, 1999) (Cuesta Duarte Institute, 2016) (Labor Institute Indonesia, 2015).

4.3 Growth and innovation

This section covers the evidence of social dialogue contributing to improved productivity and economic growth on the one hand, and the stimulation of innovation during economic activity on the other hand. Through its contribution towards economic growth and innovation, social dialogue can contribute to SDG8 (decent work & economic growth) and SDG9 (industry, innovation and infrastructure).

The contributions of social dialogue to growth and innovation, can be summarized into four effects: (1) creating incentives to invest in professional development of employees through instruments such as pooled training funds; (2) stimulating firm competition on basis of product and process innovation rather than a race to the bottom in working conditions; (3) pushing for sustainable macroeconomic and development policies; and (4) creating social stability by moving contentious industrial relations issues to higher levels of governance.

The four main mechanisms in this cluster all involve the leveling of the playing field for firms, in this way stimulating competition based on innovation and growth, rather than forms of competition which lead to the erosion of social or ecological standards.

The first mechanism involves the creation of incentives for companies to invest in a skilled labour force through training and skills-matching, by correcting failures of the free market and inadequacies of mere government policy in education and training. In a competitive labour market, individual firms have a disincentive to invest in workers beyond directly required and firm-specific skills because of fears of staff turn-over through the poaching of freshly trained workers, leading to an under-provision of training and lagging aggregate skill-levels. This market failure—which leads to lower levels of innovation and growth—can be corrected through bipartite or tripartite social dialogue, which then removes the market-based disincentive by creating agreements and pooled funds for training. For example, an individual firm might be hesitant to train employees which might be poached by another firm, but when many firms in a sector have agreed to provide training through a sectoral fund, this reluctance decreases.

Through the second mechanism, bi- or tripartite bargaining imposes minimum wage levels and other minimal working conditions on companies in a given sector or area, leading again to healthy forms of competition¹⁸. In unregulated competitive settings, firms are forced to compete on ‘low-route strategies’—at the cost of social and environmental concerns, and even their own long-term survival. For example, a firm might want to compete on product innovation while paying decent wages, but is under pressure from other firms who focus on keeping down wage costs. When multi-employer wage agreements fix wages to some degree, competing on product innovation becomes a more viable route, and low-wage, less innovative firms face increasing pressure from creative destruction. Social dialogue therefore removes these issues partially from competition, thus regulating firm behavior towards growth and innovation-oriented ‘high-route strategies’ of competition.

Box 4 | Tripartite-guided industrial policy in Brazil

The *Plano Brasil Maior* (PBM, 2011-2014) is a set of industrial policies, developed in the wake of the financial crisis and fierce import-competition, and focused on the local aggregation of value added through innovation. The goals of PBM are divided in three dimensions (competences, structural change and efficiency, and market expansion) that contribute to the overall target of sustainable development.

The multi-layered governance structure of the PBM contains tripartite structures on various levels, from the Industrial Development Council at the strategic level, to the Sectoral Competitiveness Councils on the articulation and policy formation level. This configuration and the resulting debate and interaction among stakeholders is identified as essential to the effectiveness of PBM (Ferraz et al., 2014).

¹⁸ This mechanism is called ‘beneficial regulations’ in the specialised literature.

The third mechanism shows how social dialogue as a governance instrument can avoid elite capture of macro-economic policies in developing countries, in this way safeguarding their original orientation towards growth and innovation. Macro-economic policies are central to sustainable growth in developing countries, with industrial policy having a prominent role in stimulating growth and innovation. Given the shift away from the non-interventionist line of industrial policy of the eighties, governments have looked for ways to promote and stimulate innovation and economic growth through different policy measures. Research has found that policy measures which are co-designed and monitored through social dialogue tend to have a higher chance of sticking to the original goals. This mechanism is increasingly relevant in the case of developing countries, given the higher risk of (regulatory) capture of the weak state structures by private actors. Tripartite social dialogue and partnership approaches are necessary to counter this state capture, and keep policies on the intended course¹⁹.

The final effect is linked to the representative nature of social partners and to their bargaining role. By lifting industrial relation disputes, for example on wages, from the firm-level to sectoral or national levels, social dialogue creates stability at the firm level and spaces for more cooperative and innovation-supporting dynamics.

In addition to these four general effects, there are indications that social dialogue can contribute to growth by strengthening productivity and innovation at the enterprise level (see 4.2 on access and inequality). These issues are however difficult to research, context-dependent, and findings tend to be less consistent in the literature.

Improved access to public services such as education has complementary effects in this cluster. For example, strengthening the access to further education and improving female labor market participation creates in the medium-term the necessary conditions for economic growth in sectors requiring sufficient higher-educated workers. Secondly, there is also growing awareness and empirical evidence that increasing inequality is harmful for growth. For example, the share of the income from labour-related activities in the national income (GNP) compared to income from capital show a downward trend for most large economies, depressing household consumption and aggregate demand and leading to both low global economic growth and inequality between wage-earners and those with capital-based incomes. Similarly, increases in income for the top 20% of the income distribution are negatively associated with overall economic growth, while increases for the bottom 20% positively correlate with growth. In reducing these types of inequality, social dialogue is also contributing to the basis for growth.

*In terms of the **development effectiveness agenda** it is especially the principle of inclusiveness, and more specifically the ability to solve collective action problems, which contributes to the effectiveness of social dialogue in this area.*

This section builds on findings from the following sources (Addison, 2009; Marsden & Canibano, 2010) (Menezes-Filho & Van Reenen, 2003) (Van den Berg, Grijt, & Van Witteloostuijn, 2011) (Ferrás, Kupfer, & Marques, 2014) (Hall & Soskice, 2001; McLaughlin, 2013) (Keune, 2015; Streeck, 1997) (Kleinknecht, 1998) (Salazar-Xirinachs, Nübler, & Kozul-Wright, 2014) (Ferrás et al., 2014; Stiglitz, 1998) (Finnestrand, 2011; Hermans & Ramionl, 2016) (ILO, 2015) (Dabla-Norris, Kochhar, Suphaphiphat, Ricka, & Tsounta, 2015).

¹⁹ This is linked to the monitoring function of social dialogue, on which we expand in section 4.5 on governance.

4.4 Environment and climate

Prominent examples of sustainable and future-oriented environmental policy-initiatives in the context of labour, are the *Green Jobs* initiative set up in 2008 by ILO, UNEP, ITUC and IOE, as well as the *Green Jobs Programme* launched by ILO in 2009. These programs recognize social dialogue as instrumental for deliberating on and building support for the implications of new environmental policy initiatives on labour issues.

The supportive role of social dialogue as a form of governance for the deliberation on and the implementation of ecological policies extends however beyond the labour-ecology nexus. The international trade union confederation (ITUC) has called for a ‘just transition’, which uses social dialogues as a governance instrument for climate action, and which leads to decent jobs and overall social progress. Promoting consensus building and cooperation among government and social partners through social dialogue is seen as essential given the profound changes in production, consumption, technologies and jobs that comes with a transition to a greener economy. This section describes various examples of the use of social dialogue in transition processes towards a green economy. Social dialogue can contribute to a range of environment and climate-related SDGs, ranging from SDG 6 & 7, up to SDGS 11, 12,13, 14 and 15.

Firstly, social dialogue around environmental policy allows the inclusion of different viewpoints in the assessment of environmental issues and sustainable development. This has shown to promote a better understanding among social dialogue actors of each other’s opportunities, challenges and needs. Such understanding can help to build consensus and ownership of policies which can in turn positively contribute to their implementation. Evidence also shows that the formalization of social dialogue may further increase the chance that the resulting agreements and recommendations are translated into specific policies that get implemented. A notable example is provided by the trade union-proposed social dialogue round tables that were established by law in Spain in 2005, allowing the participation of social partners in the design as well as the monitoring of the national emission allocation plan (NEAP), evaluated positively in a 2010-overview study²⁰. Also in developing countries there are examples of tripartite-plus governance structures, such as in Senegal and Sierra Leone, who have national climate committees with a representation of employers, unions and other civil society organisations. The Green Accord in South Africa is another example, described in Box 5.

Box 5 | The Green Accord in South Africa

In South Africa the “Green Economy Accord” was signed in 2011 by the government, with the backing of employers, three labour federations (COSATU, FEDUSA and NACTU, accounting for more than 2 million workers) and other CSOs. The tripartite-plus accord represents a comprehensive social partnership (government, employers, trade unions and civil society organisations) that aims at developing the green economy aspect of South Africa's New Economic Growth Path which targets the creation of 5 million additional jobs by 2020.

The Green Economy Accord contains 12 commitments and identifies the practical steps that each partner must take to achieve the creation of 300'000 new green and decent jobs within the next 10 years. It is a formal agreement endorsed by different constituencies that sets: 1) quantifiable targets; 2) the time frame for achieving those targets; and 3) the mechanisms for evaluation and monitoring to make sure that the goals are reached.

The Accord is a direct outcome of the national social dialogue on South Africa's New Economic Growth Path which targets the creation of 5 million additional jobs by 2020. This social dialogue is managed by South Africa's national tripartite body NEDLAC (GJI & ILS, 2012; ILO, 2012).

²⁰ The impact of climate change on employment: management of transitions through social dialogue: Case study of Social Dialogue Roundtables on the effects of compliance with the Kyoto Protocol on competitiveness, employment and social cohesion in Spain (ILO, 2010)

Formalized social dialogue can also help avoid powerful lobbies seeking to block the implementation of ecological regulations. For instance, Belgian social dialogue actors are part of the Federal Council of Sustainable Development²¹ whom the government has to inform yearly on the implementation of its recommendations. In the same vein, there are also various instances where social dialogue has been able to ensure that labour standards are respected or improved in the context of greening initiatives. In Brazil for example, tripartite social dialogue resulted in 2009 in the establishment of a tripartite ‘national commission for dialogue and evaluation of the National Commitment regarding labour conditions in the biofuel industry’.

Furthermore, there is evidence that greening initiatives rooted in processes of social dialogue can contribute towards reducing production costs and to influence green policy reforms in such a way that new jobs are created and obsolete jobs are re-oriented. A notable example is the “better not cheaper” approach of the metal workers’ union IG Metall in Germany who, through works councils, pushed for greening activities that would improve resource efficiency, hence increasing competitiveness and job security. In the USA, strategic alliances between unions and environmental organisations, such as the BlueGreen Alliance and Green for All have become strongly influential in the national debates about sustainability transitions and greening of the economy, in this way pushing for large investments in green industries and successfully advocating for the extension of fiscal benefits for green energy producers. Another example from Italy is provided in Box 6.

Box 6 | Social dialogue to facilitate greening of the production process in Italy

During renewal of the complementary corporate agreement at the site of Almagia Spa (IT division) in the region of Lazio (Italy), negotiations stalled due to the company having insufficient economic means to meet the financial demands of the company union representative bodies (RSU).

As a way of finding the resources to renew the salary component of the corporate agreement, the RSU proposed to implement measures to improve the energy efficiency of the company processes. The RSU’s proposal was met favorably by the company management, which had already begun working on its own environmental sustainability strategy.

The developments in the talks led to the signature of the trade-union/company agreement on 3 July 2009 and development of the Almagia Green project. This development has furthermore contributed to a ‘qualitative’ leap in Industrial relations in the company. (CSIL, 2015)

Finally, social dialogue has shown to be able to contribute towards enhancing collective learning about technical environmental issues. A notable example of this are the numerous environment conferences in Brazil from 2003 till 2008 at local, regional and national level in order to enhance public participation in the generation of recommendations for mainstreaming environment in different policy sectors. Social dialogue actors can also help the identification of skills needed for a green economy, hence facilitating labour demand and supply matching, as is illustrated by the multi-stakeholders taskforce on green jobs and climate change in India (2009), which included carrying out studies on employment aspects of renewable energy.

*The **development effectiveness principles** of inclusiveness and democratic ownership are put into action when social actors, who may hold very different viewpoints and interests, are involved in structured consultations and negotiations regarding greening initiatives.*

This section builds on findings from the following sources (ILO, 2013b) (ITUC, 2015) (ILO, 2012b) (ILO, 2012a) (Creten et al., 2014) (Van Gyes et al., 2015; CISL, 2015)

²¹ FRDO-CFDD, <http://www.frdo-cfdd.be/en/the-council>.

4.5 Governance and participation

In the previous sections it was argued that social dialogue, as a form of governance, can contribute to the realization of specific objectives of sustainable development (4.1 to 4.4). At the same time, strengthening governance and participation of sustainable development processes is in itself one of the global challenges, identified for example in the sustainable development goals SDG 16 (Promote just, peaceful and inclusive societies) and SDG 17 (Revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development). This also resonates with a wider trend whereby social dialogue, which has traditionally been associated with employment and labour related issues, is increasingly seen as an instrument to promote democracy and ‘good’ governance at various levels. This section explores how and why social dialogue can complement or strengthen existing systems of governance in the context of sustainable development.

A core function of social dialogue is exactly to provide an alternative governance structure beyond the individual employee-employer relationship. It can address the democratic deficit or imbalance of power within that relationship. A regime of collective bargaining can for example help to institute a system of checks and balances which can prevent unilateral actions from the employer. Experience in Europe shows that well-structured social dialogue that makes the results of bargaining processes publically available and brings various positions into the open (accountability and inclusiveness), has a high chance of leading to results in terms of decent work and possibly in the area of productivity. Various authors also refer towards ethical arguments in favour of social dialogue and workplace democracy. Some see them as processes that are rooted in essential human rights and liberty. Others refer to the citizenship argument pointing out that “experiencing participation and control in the workplace can contribute towards developing the values and skills of citizenship and produce social capital”.

Another feature of social dialogue is the advantages it entails for reaching agreements in the face of crisis or political and economic transitions. Notable examples include South-Africa during its transition from apartheid as well as Tunisia during the democratic transition after its revolution in 2011 and the signing of a tripartite social contract in 2013 (see Box 7). Tripartite social dialogue was also successfully used as a mechanism to enable economic and political transformation from communist rule to democracy in former Soviet countries in Europe such as Hungary in 1988 and later in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic and Poland. In these cases, social dialogue was seen as a mechanism that could strengthen cooperation between the actors of labour relations and within society in general.

Box 7 | Tunisia – 2013 tripartite social contract

In Tunisia, a tripartite “Social Contract” was concluded on 14 January 2013. This agreement, which benefited from strong support from the ILO, was signed on the day of the second anniversary of the events that led to the Arab Spring uprisings, first in Tunisia and then in the region. The Social Contract is the result of long and difficult negotiations between the most representative organizations of workers and employers, and the government. In the context of the political transition in Tunisia, the Social Contract aims at paving the way for improvements in areas such as labour legislation and industrial relations, employment policies, social protection and vocational training, as well as balanced regional development. It also calls for the establishment of a National Council for Social Dialogue to ensure its implementation. The draft law on the council was approved by cabinet in June 2015. (ILO, 2013d)

An example of the role of social dialogue in economic transitions is provided by tripartite “deliberation councils” in East Asian countries during the crippling financial crisis of 1997. These were established in order to facilitate consultation and information-sharing between the government and social partners and to gain the cooperation of economic elites. In the Republic of Korea, such council contributed to the development of a first-ever social pact allowing the tripartite partners to negotiate the fundamental reforms needed on key labour market issues. Similarly, social and economic councils were found to play an important role in numerous countries worldwide in enabling

broad support for tailor-made policy measures in response to the global financial crisis of 2008. The positive role of social dialogue in these examples is possibly due to the fact that social dialogue consultation, through the principle of democratic ownership, can help overcome resistance to change by promising stakeholders a say in how that change is achieved.

Furthermore, evidence shows that alternative tripartite-plus structures can (temporarily) complement the existing social dialogue structures when the state is not playing its role sufficiently. It also allows for the inclusion of other stakeholders in global supply chains, such as international buyers and other civil society organisations, when relevant. An example is the *Better Factories Cambodia* project (cf. Box 8), where the working conditions in the garment sector are monitored by independent auditors, under the coordination of ILO. The reports are transmitted to international buyers which buy from the respective suppliers that are audited. The programme covers a large majority of the export-oriented garment companies. A tripartite-plus structure with local trade unions and some other stakeholders is monitoring the implementation of the programme.

Box 8 | Labour standards compliance in the Cambodian garment sector

In 1999 in response to consumer concerns about poor working conditions in the garment sector, the United States came to an agreement with Cambodia through a Bilateral Textile Trade Agreement, to increase import quotas in exchange for concrete efforts to bring working conditions in line with international labor standards. An important condition was the willingness of Cambodian factories to allow routine independent monitoring by the *Better Factories Cambodia* (BFC) project which was established by the ILO. The agreement created positive incentives for compliance and led to a gradual improvement in working conditions and yearly increases in quota of up to 14%. Interestingly in 2006, about two years after the agreement came to an end, tripartite partners requested for a continuation of the monitoring of working conditions by the BFC project, given that improved working conditions were going hand in hand with productivity improvement and increased factory profits. However, after 2006, monitoring reports were no longer made public. This resulted in rates of compliance to stagnate and even to decrease, except for factories that were selling to "reputation-sensitive" buyers. Also penalization by government inspectors of companies with low compliance was not happening. In addition to pressure from local unions, other CSOs and international buyers also played an essential role to campaign for a re-establishment of the public disclosure mechanism. When this mechanism was returned, compliance started increasing again from 2014 onwards (ILO, 2014; ILO & IFC, 2015; World Bank, 2015; Byiers et al., 2016).

With the globalisation of the economy, decision-making on topics affecting labour relations are gradually shifting beyond the national level, resulting in an increasing need for tripartite dialogue structures at the regional and international level. The EU has the most extensive structures and procedures to organise social dialogue at the regional level and trans-national level, for example through the European Works Councils (EWCs), but much less present in other regional bodies. Some examples do exist. Box 9 provides an example of the negotiations of a progressive labour & employment protocol in Southern Africa.

Box 9 | Successful social dialogue at the regional level

In August 2014 a progressive Labour & Employment Protocol was signed by a majority of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) heads of states in which a small technical support programme ANSA of the Southern African Trade Union Co-ordination Council (SATUCC), played a key role. The protocol had to act as a counter-balance against the wave of deregulation policies being launched by governments in the region. The protocol covers 16 themes, with reference to core international standards and a lot of labour-friendly clauses, related to *basic human rights, freedom of association and collective bargaining, equal treatment, employment and remuneration, improvement of working and living conditions, decent work for all, social protection, occupational health and safety, health care, retirement, unemployment and under-employment, maternity and paternity, people with disabilities, protection of children and young people, labour migration and migrant workers, informal employment and rural workers, and education & training and skills development.*

The following learning points emerge from this case study: (1) the importance of investing both in a broad internal support base for large scale policy influencing processes at the regional level, in addition to influencing external stakeholders; (2) the potential of working with power brokers, champions and windows of opportunity in difficult operating environments; (3) the relevance of intermediary support structures such as

ANSA in policy influencing, but at the same time working on their financial and institutional sustainability; (4) the relevance of long term flexible support; and (5) the need to document policy influencing experiences to increase learning and maintain internal and external support. (FOS, 2016)

Finally, the inherent nature of trade unions as democratic membership organizations can lead them to provide a qualitatively different contribution to governance networks, than actors that operate on a different mobilization logic. For instance, civil society actors such as NGOs are more confronted with the perennial problem of democratically legitimating themselves through public campaigns, etc. Strengthening the involvement of trade unions in the governance of sustainable development processes, such as the SDGs, might help in overcoming some of the shortcomings of mainstream human rights discourse and practice and in responding to the need for effective bottom-up influence in partnerships and governance (e.g. SDG17).

This section builds on findings from the following sources (Fasboyin, 2004; ILO, 2013b) (Davidov, 2004) (Van Gyes et al. 2015) (Budd & Bhawe, 2008) (Fiorito & Jarley, 2008; Foley & Polyani, 2006) (Webster & Joynt, 2014) (Fasboyin, 2004, Héthy 2001) (Campos and Root, 1996; Campbell, 2001) (Choi, 2000) (ILO, 2013c) (Vitols, 2011) (stammers, 2009)

5 | Emerging research agenda – what do we need to know?

This discussion note has illustrated with concrete examples the role social dialogue can play in working towards a more inclusive and sustainable world, both by contributing to specific goals and by providing a governance framework which brings together government, employers, workers, and in some cases, even a broader segment of stakeholders. The note is not exhaustive in its analysis, but has picked out findings from key sources to explore the social dialogue – sustainable development nexus.

Social dialogue has turned out to provide concrete and tested tools to bring key principles of the development effectiveness agenda into practice, especially through its attention for democratic ownership, inclusiveness and accountability. In addition, there is strong evidence that social dialogue is an excellent approach to tackle collective action problems in labour issues and beyond, something which very few governance systems have managed to achieve up to now.

What also emerges from reviewing the literature is that social dialogue as a mechanism can play a role in different contexts, from stimulating economic growth and redistribution in developed economies up to contributing to reconciliation and confidence building in fragmented societies. Some of the roles of social dialogue are well-tested and documented, other roles are still emerging and little is known about the underpinning success factors and how to nurture these roles successfully.

There is a need for an ambitious interdisciplinary research agenda that starts to address some of the key gaps in the body of knowledge which prevent social dialogue from reaching its full potential so as to better promote sustainable development. Aside from a better understanding of how social dialogue works in different contexts and settings, more efforts should go into understanding how the necessary preconditions can be established through targeted support efforts for social dialogue to be more effective in terms of contributing to sustainable development.

Table 2: Overview of research agendas to push social dialogue to the next level

Research agenda	Themes	Research questions
Covering new ground & exploring missing links	<i>Social dialogue in the informal economy</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are effective strategies to extend the coverage of social dialogue to workers in the informal economy?
	<i>Social dialogue in fragile states / developing countries</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the most appropriate and realistic forms of social dialogue for settings in which the preconditions for successful social dialogue are only weakly present? • How can the necessary preconditions for social dialogue be nurtured without requiring complex and unrealistic exercises of institution building?
	<i>Social dialogue at regional level</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can the role of regional groupings, such as SADC, MERCOSUR, etc. in social dialogue be strengthened?
	<i>Good practices on social dialogue & gender</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are ways of strengthening the attention for gender concerns in collective bargaining?
	<i>Implications of new trends in the world of work</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent is social dialogue sufficiently adapted to global changes in the organisation of work & production?
The link with the SDGs	<i>Mapping the contribution of social dialogue to the SDGs</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can the impact of social dialogue on sustainable development be mapped most effectively? • Can the framework based on five thematic areas and three principles presented in this note be operationalized as the basis for an M&E framework?
	<i>Making social dialogue work beyond the labour agenda</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the theories of change underpinning the contribution of social dialogue to sustainable development beyond the labour agenda? What are the critical success factors to do so and how can such processes be strengthened? • How can the social partners be capacitated in technical areas beyond the labour agenda? • To what extent can a tripartite-plus approach, with the cooperation of a broader set of stakeholders, further increase the development effectiveness of social dialogue?
Adapting to local contexts & needs	<i>Learning about what works for whom in which context</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the most effective instruments for social dialogue in different regional settings?

Different research questions will require different research methodologies, research institutes and stakeholders to participate.

6 | References

- Alemán, J. A. (2010). *Labor Relations in New Democracies. East Asia, Latin America, and Europe*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Baccaro, L., & Heeb, S. (2011). *Social dialogue during the financial and economic crisis (Employment Working Papers No. 102)*. Geneva: ILO.
- Berg, J. (2015). Labour market institutions: the building blocks of just societies. In J. Berg (Ed.), *Labour Markets, Institutions and Inequality* (pp. 1–35). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Briskin, L., Muller, A. (2011) *Promoting gender equality through social dialogue: Global trends and persistent obstacles*. Industrial and Employment Relations Department. ILO, Geneva.
- Byiers, B., Große-Puppenthal, S., Huyse, H., Rosengren, A., Vaes, S. (2016) *Principles for public-private partnerships – towards sustainability? Lessons from SAGCOT, healthcare in Lesotho, and Better Factories Cambodia*, Working Paper ECDPM – HIVA-KU Leuven.
- Campbell, D. (2001). Social dialogue and labor market adjustment in east Asia after the crisis. In G. Betcherman & R. Islam (Eds.), *East Asian labor markets and the economic crisis: Impacts, responses and lessons* (pp. 423–465). Washington, D.C. / Geneva: World Bank / ILO.
- Campos, J. E., & Root, H. L. (1996). *The key to the Asian miracle: Making shared growth credible*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.
- Carter, N. (2007). *The Politics of the Environment* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Creten T., Happaerts S., Bachus K. 2014. *Duurzaamheid in de vakbondswerking: nood aan een transitie!*. De Gids op Maatschappelijk Gebied. vol.105 (4) , pp. 36-41
- Cuesta Duarte Institute. (2016). *The Impact of Social Dialogue on development and social inclusion in Uruguay*. Brussels: Trade Union Development Cooperation Network.
- Dabla-Norris, E., Kochhar, K., Suphaphiphat, N., Ricka, F., & Tsounta, E. (2015). *Causes and Consequences of Income Inequality: A Global Perspective* (IMF Staff Discussion Notes No. SDN/15/13). Washington.
- Evans, M. (2015). Trade Unions as Human Rights Organizations. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 7(3), 466–483. <http://doi.org/10.1093/jhuman/huv009>
- Falletti, T. G., & Lynch, J. F. (2009). Context and Causal Mechanisms in Political Analysis. *Comparative Political Studies*, 42(9), 1143–1166. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0010414009331724>
- Fashoyin, T. (2004). Tripartite cooperation, social dialogue and national development. *International Labour Review*, 143(4), 341–372. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1564-913X.2004.tb00553.x>
- Ferras, J. C., Kupfer, D., & Marques, F. S. (2014). Industrial policy as an effective development tool: Lessons from Brazil. In J. M. Salazar-Xirinachs, I. Nübler, & R. Kozul-Wright (Eds.), *Transforming economies: Making industrial policy work for growth, jobs and development* (pp. 291–305). Geneva: International Labour Organisation.
- Finnestrand, H. O. (2011). *The Role of the Shop Steward in Organizations using High Involvement Workplace Practices* (Doctoral thesis). Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim.
- FOS. (2016). *External Evaluation of the Policy Influencing Activities of the Belgian NGO FOS, ACE-Europe and HIVA-KU Leuven*.
- Freeman, R. B., & Medoff, J. L. (1984). *What do unions do?* New York: Basic Books.

- Gallas, A., Herr, H., Hoffer, F., & Scherrer, C. (Eds.). (2016). *Combating Inequality. The Global North and South*. London: Routledge.
- Gammage, S. (2015). Labour market institutions and gender equality. In J. Berg (Ed.), *Labour Markets, Institutions and Inequality* (pp. 315–339). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- GJI, & ILS. (2012). *Working towards Sustainable Development: Opportunities for decent work and social inclusion in a green economy*. Geneva: International Labour Organisation.
- Gough, I. (2004). Welfare Regimes in Developing Contexts: A Global and Regional Analysis. In I. Gough & G. Wood (Eds.), *Insecurity and Welfare Regimes in Asia, Africa, and Latin America: Social Policy in Development Contexts* (pp. 15–48). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, P. A., & Gingerich, D. W. (2009). Varieties of Capitalism and Institutional Complementarities in the Political Economy: An Empirical Analysis. *British Journal of Political Science*, 39(3), 449–482. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123409000672>
- Hall, P. A., & Soskice, D. W. (2001). *Varieties of capitalism*. Oxford University Press.
- Hayter, S. (2015). Unions and collective bargaining. In J. Berg (Ed.), *Labour Markets, Institutions and Inequality* (pp. 95–122). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Hermann, C. (2014). The role of the public sector in combating inequality. *International Journal of Labour Research*, 6(1), 113–128.
- Hermans, M., & Ramioul, M. (2016). *Representative employee participation in industrial innovation processes. EUROWIN country case rapport*. Leuven: HIVA - KU Leuven.
- ILO. (2010). *Case study of Social Dialogue Roundtables on the effects of compliance with the Kyoto Protocol on competitiveness, employment and social cohesion in Spain*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- ILO. (2012). *Social dialogue for sustainable development. A review of national and regional experiences*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- ILO. (2013a). *Social dialogue interventions: what works and why? A synthesis review 2002-2012*. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- ILO. (2013b). *Sustainable development, decent work and green jobs*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- ILO. (2013c). *The role and Impact of Economic and Social Councils and Similar Institutions (ESC-Sis) in the Response to the Global, Financial, Economic and Jobs Crisis*. Presented at the ILO-AICESIS Conference.
- ILO. (2013d) *National Tripartite Social Dialogue – An ILO guide for improved governance*. International Labour Organisation, Geneva (pp. 1- 306)
- ILO. (2014). *World of Work Report 2014: Developing with jobs*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- ILO. (2015). *2030 Development agenda: ILO Focus targets*. Retrieved 1 July 2016, from <http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/sdg-2030/targets/lang--en/index.htm>
- ILO, & IFC. (2015). *Better Factories Cambodia: Garment Industry 32nd Compliance Synthesis Report (Information Note)*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- ILO. (2015). *Global Wage Report 2014/15. Wages and income inequality* (pp. 1–132). Geneva.
- ITUC. (2015). *Frontlines Briefing – Climate Justice: Paris and Beyond*. October 2015. ITUC
- Jaumotte, F., & Buitron, C. O. (2015). *Inequality and Labor Market Institutions (IMF Staff Discussion Notes No. SDN/15/14)*. Washington.
- Jordan, A. (2008). The Governance of Sustainable Development: Taking Stock and Looking Forwards. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 26(1), 17–33. <http://doi.org/10.1068/cav6>
- Kates, R. W., Parris, T. M., & Leiserowitz, A. A. (2005). What Is Sustainable Development? *Environment*, 47(3), 8–21.

- Kelley, J. G., & Simmons, B. A. (2015). Politics by Number: Indicators as Social Pressure in International Relations. *American Journal of Political Science*, 59(1), 55–70. <http://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12119>
- Kelly, P. (2002). Promoting democracy and peace through social dialogue: A study of the social dialogue institutions and processes in Indonesia (InFocus Programme on Strengthening Social Dialogue No. 7). Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- Keune, M. (2015). The effects of the EU's assault on collective bargaining: Less governance capacity and more inequality. *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research*, 21(4), 477–483. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1024258915603571>
- Kleinknecht, A. (1998). Is labour market flexibility harmful to innovation? *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 22(3), 387–396.
- Koch-Baumgarten, S., & Kryst, M. (2015). Trade unions and collective bargaining power in global labor governance. In A. Marx, J. Wouters, G. Rayp, & L. Beke (Eds.), *Global Governance of Labour Rights* (pp. 150–169). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Kooiman, J. (2003). *Governing as Governance* (1 edition). London: SAGE Publications.
- Kristal, T. (2010). Good Times, Bad Times Postwar Labor's Share of National Income in Capitalist Democracies. *American Sociological Review*, 75(5), 729–763. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0003122410382640>
- Labor Institute Indonesia (2015). The reform of social security in Indonesia. (<http://www.ituc-csi.org/the-reform-of-social-security-in>)
- Labour Research and Policy Institute Ghana (2015). Developmental relevance of social dialogue in Ghana. Labour Research and Policy Institute - Ghana TUC.
- Marginson, P., Keune, M., & Bohle, D. (2014). Negotiating the effects of uncertainty? The governance capacity of collective bargaining under pressure. *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research*, 20(1), 37–51. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1024258913514356>
- Marx, A., Wouters, J., Rayp, G., & Beke, L. (Eds.). (2015). *Global Governance of Labour Rights. Assessing the Effectiveness of Transnational Public and Private Policy Initiatives*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- McLaughlin, C. (2013). The role of productivity coalitions in building a 'high road' competitive strategy: The case of Denmark and Ireland. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 19(2), 127–143. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0959680113482245>
- Melloni, E., Pesce, F., & Vasilescu, C. (2016). Are social mechanisms usable and useful in evaluation research? *Evaluation*, 22(2), 209–227. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1356389016643900>
- Ness, I. (2016). Reconstitution of the International Working Class (CLR News No. 2/2016) (pp. 28–32). Brussels: European Institute for Construction Labour Research.
- Pawson, R., & Tilley, N. (1997). *Realistic Evaluation*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Pillinger, J. (2014). Bargaining for equality. How collective bargaining contributes to eliminating pay discrimination between women and men performing the same job or job of equal value. Brussel: ETUC.
- Rutherford, T. D., & Holmes, J. (2007). 'We Simply Have to Do that Stuff for our Survival': Labour, Firm Innovation and Cluster Governance in the Canadian Automotive Parts Industry. *Antipode*, 39(1), 194–221. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2007.00512.x>
- Salazar-Xirinachs, J. M., Nübler, I., & Kozul-Wright, R. (2014). Industrial policy, productive transformation and jobs: Theory, history and practice. In *Transforming Economies. Making industrial policy work for growth, jobs and development*. Geneva: International Labour Organisation.
- Schmitter, P. C., & Lehbruch, G. (1979). *Trends toward corporatist intermediation*. London: Sage Publications.
- Schurman, S. J., & Eaton, A. E. (2012). *Trade Union Organising in the Informal Economy: A Review of the Literature on Organising in Africa, Asia, Latin America, North America and Western, Central and Eastern Europe*. New Jersey: Rutgers University.

- Shin, T. (2014). Explaining Pay Disparities between Top Executives and Nonexecutive Employees: A Relative Bargaining Power Approach. *Social Forces*, 92(4), 1339–1372. <http://doi.org/10.1093/sf/sou004>
- Sørensen, O. H., Doellgast, V., & Bojesen, A. (2015). Intermediary cooperative associations and the institutionalization of participative work practices: A case study in the Danish public sector. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 36(4), 701–725. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X14533735>
- Stammers, N. (2009). *Human Rights and Social Movements*. London: Pluto Press.
- Stiglitz, J. (1998). Towards a new paradigm of development. Speech presented at the 9th Prebisch Lecture, Geneva.
- Streeck, W. (1997). Beneficial Constraints: On the Economic Limits of Rational Voluntarism. In J. R. Hollingsworth & R. Boyer (Eds.), *Contemporary Capitalism: The Embeddedness of Institutions* (pp. 197–219). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van Ginneken, W. (1999). Social security for the excluded majority: Case studies of developing countries. Geneva: International Labour Organisation.
- van Ginneken, W. (2003). Extending social security: Policies for developing countries. *International Labour Review*, 142(3), 277–294. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1564-913X.2003.tb00263.x>
- Van Gyes, G., Vanderkerckhove, S., Van Peteghem, J., & De Spiegelaere, S. (2015). Conditions and Criteria for Social Dialogue in Europe - the Workers' Perspective. Aachen: Shaker Verlag.
- Vitols, S. (2011). Strengthening cooperation between NGOs and trade unions in the interests of sustainability. In S. Vitols & N. Kluge (Eds.), *The Sustainable Company: a new approach to corporate governance* (Vol. 1, pp. 185–198). Brussels: European Trade Unions Institute.
- Volscho, T. W., & Kelly, N. J. (2012). The Rise of the Super-Rich Power Resources, Taxes, Financial Markets, and the Dynamics of the Top 1 Percent, 1949 to 2008. *American Sociological Review*, 77(5), 679–699. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0003122412458508>
- Webster, E., & Morris, C. (2015). Trade unions and the challenge of economic inequality: an unresolved debate. In A. Gallas, H. Herr, F. Hoffer, & C. Scherrer (Eds.), *Combating Inequality. The Global North and South* (pp. 45–49). London: Routledge.
- World Bank. (2015). *Interwoven : How the Better Work Program Improves Job and Life Quality in the Apparel Sector*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Xhafa, E. (2014). Trade unions and economic inequality. Perspectives, policies and strategies. *International Journal of Labour Research*, 6(1), 35–56.