

# The new global work policy agenda: against, together with or for neoliberalism?

*A comparison of the ILO Declaration on Social Justice For a Fair  
Globalization (2008) and the ILO Centenary Declaration for the  
Future of Work (2019)*



**LUND**  
UNIVERSITY

Peter Hang

# Abstract

The world of work is central to development, if one defines development as economic and social progress and wellbeing of individuals, families and societies. In the last decades of globalization the International Labour Organization has struggled to retain relevance and ensure “decent work” for all. The introduction of the 2019 *ILO Centenary Declaration for the Future of Work* sets up new guiding principles, organizational innovations and priorities for the global work policy agenda. Does the new agenda constitute a much needed alternative to neoliberalism and business as usual?

In this study, I explore and compare the ILO Declarations of 2008 and 2019 in order to map out how neoliberalism has influenced two Declarations which have the stated purpose to ensure a future with “decent work” for all. Using the method of thematic analysis this thesis derives to the conclusion that the 2019 Declaration does not seem to be the firm step away from neoliberalism and back to the regulated social markets promoted by Karl Polanyi. Conversely, results show increasing tendencies to adapt to neoclassical economic assumptions and the language of neoliberalism.

*Key words: International Labour Organization, social dialogue, decent work, labour rights, neoliberalism, work policy agenda, thematic analysis*

**Words:** 9673

# Table of contents

<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 Background and Significance	5
1.2 Specific Aims and Research Questions	6
1.3 Delimitations	6
1.4 Disposition of thesis	6
<b>2 The ILO and the Decent Work Agenda</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 Peace, dialogue and anti-bolshevism	7
2.3 The Decent Work Agenda	7
<b>3 Theoretical framework</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1. Ideology theory	8
3.2 Polanyian ideology	9
3.2.1 Conceptualizations	9
3.2.2 Core concepts	9
3.3 Neoliberal ideology	9
3.3.1 Conceptualization	9
3.3.2 Core concepts	10
3.4 Mixed ideology	10
3.4.1 Conceptualization	10
3.4.2 Core concepts	10
<b>4 Method</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1 Research design - Thematic analysis	11
4.2 Material and sampling	11
4.2.1 Timeframe of material	12
4.3 Coding design	12
4.3.1 Thematic analysis coding phases	12
4.4 Word occurrence analysis	13
4.4.1 Purpose and functionality	13
4.4.2 Categorization of words	13
4.5 Delimitations	14
<b>5 Thematic Analysis</b>	<b>14</b>
5.1 Construction of themes	14
5.2 Analysis	15
5.2.1 Introduction to the Declarations	16
5.2.2 Theme 1 - Historical continuation and new times	16
5.2.3 Theme 2 - The tools for development	18
5.2.4 Theme 3 - ILO and member state relations	20
5.2.5 Theme 4 - Policies for sustainable growth and development	22

<b>6 Results</b>	<b>24</b>
6.1 Comparative results	25
6.1.1 Theme 1 - Historical continuation and new times	25
6.1.2 Theme 2 - The tools for development	25
6.1.3 Theme 3 - ILO and member state relations	26
6.1.4 Theme 4 - Policies for sustainable growth and development	26
6.2 Summative results	27
<b>7 Conclusion</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>8 References</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Appendixes</b>	<b>33</b>
Appendix 1 - Word categorization of top words	33
Appendix 2 - Statistical word count 2008 Declaration	34
Appendix 3 - Statistical word count 2019 Declaration	37

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Background and Significance

The world of work is central to development, if one defines development as economic and social progress and wellbeing of individuals, families and societies. The UN agency International Labour Organization (ILO) defines “decent” work as the sum of people’s “aspirations for opportunity and income; rights, voice and recognition; family stability and personal development; and fairness and gender equality” (ILO.org, 2021a).

The moral ideas that forged the International Labour Organization are still central to the international efforts for peace and development, driving the Agenda for Sustainable Development and the new consensus on the need for economic development that “leaves no one behind”. In my thesis I will explore the new policy agenda that was published in 2019 by the International Labour Organisation (ILO) as the global institution celebrated its centenary.

At the same time ILO faces severe criticism, whether it actually does have the capacity to ensure a future of “decent work”. Since the introduction of the 2008 *Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization*, the ILO has met criticism to adopt, rather than to challenge and oppose, neoliberal labour policy, declining labour standards and increasing informality with platform employment and “gig” work. The need for international organizations to adapt to the acceleration of technological developments and radical changes in the organization of work and employment, and impacts on social protection systems seems to have continued to increase in relevance. Compared to the founding times of 1919, the ILO finds itself in a global setting where both union membership rates and the willingness from employers to carry on a dialogue about binding standards seems to be on the decline. The aftermath of the global financial crisis of 2008 does not seem to have been the radical shift in political policy that many expected.

In 2019 the Commission of the ILO Future of Work Initiative, chaired by the Swedish prime minister, Stefan Löfven, and the president of South Africa, Matamela Ramaphosa, presented the “Work for a Brighter Future report” to deepen the understanding of the challenges facing the labour market of the future and equip the ILO to tackle them (ILO.org, 2019a). This report then became the basis for the ILO *Centenary Declaration for the Future of Work* (ILO.org, 2019b). Since then the UN General Assembly has endorsed the Declaration and requested UN bodies to integrate the policy contents. Understanding the agenda, role and relevance of the ILO today is important as it can help us deepen the understanding of social dialogue, international trade unionism and the effectiveness of global institutions on expanding workers rights in a 21th century heavily influenced by global hegemonic neoliberalism.

## 1.2 Specific Aims and Research Questions

The purpose of this thesis is to examine what the introduction of the 2019 ILO declaration has meant for the ILO “decent work agenda”, and indirectly for the global work policy agenda. The thesis concerns and is interested in questions surrounding labour rights, global labour institutions like the ILO and political assumptions concerning the connections between economy, development and social rights.

The research questions that will guide this study is the following:

*RQ 1: How does the 2019 ILO Declaration differentiate from the 2008 ILO Declaration?*

*RQ 2: What influences from neoliberalism can be found in the recent ILO agendas?*

## 1.3 Delimitations

With regard to the wide scope of the field of the ILO, the international labour standards and development in institutional structures, this thesis has been delimited to comparing the two most recent ILO Declarations. Debates and connections surrounding the shift to voluntary standards with the 1998 Declaration of core labour standards will largely be excluded and only covered when relevant to situate the reader with the current agenda of the ILO. The academic sources that have been used have been sourced in English and are primarily from publications post-2008 in order to give scholarly perspectives on the ILO post-publication of the Declarations of 2008 and 2019. The research has been gathered through Lubsearch and Google Scholar with the keywords “ILO Decent work agenda”, “2008 Declaration on social justice for a fair globalization”, “2019 ILO Centenary Declaration for the Future of Work” and “ILO and neoliberalism”. After gathering a mass of sources, a selection was done by snowballing key authors cited and discussed in recent works, e.g. with the help of Novitz (2020).

## 1.4 Disposition of thesis

The thesis is divided into eight chapters. Chapter one gives an introduction of the thesis. Chapter two gives a contextual background to how changes in the world of work previously have been met by the ILO and a review of the previous debates surrounding the ILO agenda. Chapter three presents the theoretical framework consisting of neoliberal and polanyian ideological theory. Chapter four describes the methodology of thematic analysis, the material used, coding design, word occurrence analysis and methodological delimitations. Chapter five encompasses the analysis of the two ILO declarations. Chapter six presents and summarizes the findings of the study. Chapter seven consists of a conclusion of the thesis. Lastly, chapter eight covers the references that have been used.

## 2 The ILO and the Decent Work Agenda

### 2.1 Introduction

This chapter will give a contextual background to how changes in the world of work and shifts in the ILO agenda previously have been debated.

### 2.2 Peace, dialogue and anti-bolshevism

The current Director-General of the ILO, Guy Ryder, argues that the founders of the organization did not create the ILO as a reaction to global conflict, but also with “bolsheviks on their mind (Ryder, 2015). The imminent threat of worker revolutions in 1919 appeared clear to capital in Western Europe and there was an urgent need to construct what Ryder (ibid) describes as “a better option: the humanisation of work and a reformist agenda for the world of work”. Industrial capitalism of the early twentieth century had “generated mass poverty that might lead to political and social unrest,” which created a need for social reforms “within the existing political and economic order” (Gironde, Carbonnier and Panizza 2019:23). To address this vision, the ILO formulated three broad goals: adherence to labour conventions, international labor standards, and supervision to monitor adherence to those standards (Helfer, 2019).

### 2.3 The Decent Work Agenda

The ILO’s organizational effectiveness and ability to promote social dialogue and decent work in a world of labor undergoing fundamental change has been a highly discussed matter amongst labour rights scholars. Different perspectives on the introduction of the Decent Work Agenda and the shift towards voluntary standards during the last twenty years of ILO policy agenda and declarations can be identified. The perspectives on the shift in policy practice and discourse can be grouped into the following perspectives:

#### *A necessary and good innovation*

This view is divided into two groups, where one is the neo-classical economic perspectives of Sykes (2013) and Charny (2001) that praise the shift towards increasing flexibility of labour standards. The other is the more pragmatic approach of Maupain (2005) and Langille (2005) that see it as an answer to a call for ILO innovation in order to renew its relevance, believing in a symbiotic, rather than a supervising, relationship of cooperation between the ILO and the nation states,

#### *Another neoliberal adaptation*

This perspective is represented by Standing (2008) and Alston (2004). In their view, the shift meant a discursive change further away from social rights onto more vague principles that

solely concerned political and civil rights. For them this risks undermining the entire regime of labour standards and the new principles were seen as a way for employers and nation states to window-dress, without actually enhancing any labour standards. Instead, Standing (2008) and Alston (2004) argue for real qualitative steps to be taken towards enhancing the supervision and function of follow-up systems and anchoring new declarations to previous labor standards and conventions.

#### *A polanyian navigation of new environment*

A position somewhere in between the two previous positions is taken by e.g. Novitz (2020) which argues for the return to a polanyian balance between the market and the social. Her perspective is that the ILO agenda could still be tweaked to embed the social into the market again and that ILO should fulfill its role as a countermovement to the transformation of the world of work to ensure that labour is differentiated from other commodities.

#### **Recent convergence**

The decent work agenda post-2008 Declaration was later described by Maupain (2013) as “a kind of normative potluck” where anyone could bring anything to the table and walk away with whatever they want, because of its vagueness. The argument has also been made by Standing (2008) that the ILO has spent too much energy on the slogan of “decent work” without focusing on the “need to forge a renewed role for the ILO in responding to the changing world of work”.

## 3 Theoretical framework

This chapter maps out the theoretical framework of ideology theory, polanyianism and neoliberalism that will be used in this thesis. The ideological perspectives will consist of core concepts that will be used in the thematic analysis.

### 3.1. Ideology theory

The concept of “ideology”, according to political scientist Michael Freeden (1996), does not merely describe a belief system but are ‘configurations of decontested meanings of political concepts’ (Freeden, 1996:75). According to Freeden (1996), these concepts can be separated into categories of core concepts (most important) and peripheral concepts (secondary). Within the scope of this thesis, only core concepts will be identified and used for the thesis. These concepts can change and lose importance over time, and can only be understood through their relation to one another.

Freeden (1996:87) argues for “the absence of absolute boundaries” separating ideological systems, which means that different ideologies can share concepts, while attaching different meanings to the same concepts. He argues that as ideologies are modular structures, “it is

useless to entertain the notion of precise ideological boundaries, or of features exclusive to one ideology or the other” (Freeden, 1996:88). The study of ideology, therefore, must be concerned with the semantics and the use of particular words creating meaning in ideological arguments and understandings (Freeden, 1996). In the following section I will present and define the three ideological perspectives that will be used for the study, with their respective key concepts.

## 3.2 Polanyian ideology

I have chosen to identify this ideological perspective as Polanyian. In line with the Swedish proverb “a child that is loved has many names” (my translation), this ideological position could also have been described as embedded liberalism, keynesianism or even social democratic. The comparatively unified components of the “polanyian” perspective and the fact that Karl Polanyi followed and commented on the birth and early years of the ILO also helped to guide the decision.

### 3.2.1 Conceptualizations

In this thesis, Polanyian ideology will primarily be defined by concepts put forward in Karl Polanyi’s book *The Great Transformation* (Polanyi, 1944). In the book, Polanyi (1944) seeks to explain the relationship between ‘productive forces’ and human politics.

### 3.2.2 Core concepts

One of the most central concepts of Polanyian ideology is the classification of human labour as a ‘fictitious commodity’, which should not be directed by market mechanisms (Novitz, 2020). Contrary to neoliberal beliefs of self regulation, Polanyinism argues for the regulation of markets. The second central concept of ‘countermovement’ builds on this notion as it argues for new systems of social protection with every market building or ‘economic reconstruction (ibid). The countermovement can also be defined as the balancing act of navigating conflicting market and social pressures which means ‘re-embedding of society into markets (ibid).

## 3.3 Neoliberal ideology

### 3.3.1 Conceptualization

According to Prügl (2015:617), which draws on the work of both Ferguson (2009) and Larner (2000), the concept ‘neoliberalism’ has different meanings within academia. Firstly, it can understood as a ‘political project’ by capital stemming from the 1980s era of Regan and Thatcher, secondly as a ‘cultural formation’ that utilises government mechanisms and thirdly as an ‘economic doctrine or ideology’ emerging from the Chicago School of Economics (Prügl, 2015:617). The conceptualizations of neoliberalism as a political project Harvey’s (2005) conceptualization of neoliberalism by the organized capital class, as an answer to a crisis of profit quotas and an introduction of accumulation through dispossession, can be of

immense use to understand why the ILO struggles with organizational relevancy. But for this thesis, the concept of neoliberalism will be used as an ideological economic doctrine.

### 3.3.2 Core concepts

Neoliberalism has been defined in many ways, and some argue that it has been reduced to an all-purpose denunciatory category that risks being used to refer to almost any political or economic process that is associated with contemporary capitalism (Flew, 2014). This makes the identification of core concepts of neoliberalism extra important, but also opens up for the possibility of differing core concepts by different researchers. While recognizing the broad availability of concepts, the following concepts will be understood as core neoliberal concepts for this thesis:

1. The central role of multinational corporations in creating development and economic opportunities in national economies (Larner, 2003:509).
2. The transfer of relevance and power from governments, state apparatuses or public holdings to the private sector or other non-state entities (Springer, 2012)
3. A subordination of the principles of social justice to those of perceived economic imperatives (Hay, 2004)
4. Increases in productivity and growth are important and will trickle down and benefit the global economy as a whole (Hay, 2004)

## 3.4 Mixed ideology

### 3.4.1 Conceptualization

As previously argued, ideological systems lack ‘absolute boundaries’ separating them (Freedman, 1996:87). Di Ruggiero (2015) recognises this and argues that neoliberal conceptualizations of decent work can co-exist with a health equity discourse, that calls for action against poor working conditions when it is deemed unfair and therefore not decent. This ideological perspective does not constitute an independent perspective, but rather a middle ground between neoliberalism and polanyianism.

### 3.4.2 Core concepts

As the “mixed ideology” does not represent a defined ideological system, the core concepts stated below have been constructed as identified middle grounds of the previously stated core concepts of polanyianism and neoliberalism:

1. There is a symbiotic relationship between the social and the economic
2. Socially-oriented objectives with market-driven solutions
3. Market-oriented objectives with social solutions

4. Reduced specificity and undefined concepts open for interpretation

## 4 Method

### 4.1 Research design - Thematic analysis

This thesis will compare the ILO declarations of 2008 and 2019. In order to analyse the recent ILO declarations I will apply a thematic analysis following Professor Virginia Braun's and Dr Victoria Clarke's thematic analysis (TA), which focuses on identifying patterned meaning across datasets by constructing themes. Since their publication in 2006 they have evolved their approach and given it a new name: *reflexive thematic analysis* (Braun and Clarke, 2006). The approach has since 2006 changed the understanding that themes '*emerge from the data*' and themes are now seen as active conceptualizations by researchers. A thematic analysis regards themes as primary units of analysis and has a highly inductive and exploratory method of analysis. The method was chosen as the thesis aims to describe the analysed material.

As a comparative thematic analysis of policy agendas, my thesis will focus on the historical, organizational, economic, political themes that can be identified within the two Declarations. Global organisations like the ILO have to balance political, economic and social considerations in setting work policy agendas. As a researcher the aim is to thematize the Declarations in themselves, not deem the positions or policies proposed right or wrong, but to shed light on what is being communicated and to discover the patterns and discrepancies. In my thesis, I examine the stated concepts, assumptions and claims that are used in the policy texts. My analysis tries to connect the elements with the historical and global context in which the texts are generated.

### 4.2 Material and sampling

The analysis is conducted on two documents. The first is the 2008 *Declaration on social justice for a fair globalization* (ILO.org, 2008). The other is the 2019 *ILO Centenary Declaration for the Future of Work* (ILO.org, 2019a). Both documents can be found stated as 'key documents' on the official ILO website (ILO.org, 2021b). ILO produces a range of documents: reports, specific policy papers, legal conventions and declarations. The two declarations fill a specifically important role for the general agenda setting of the ILO and are adopted officially at the ILO conferences by the tripartite body. The cases were selected after consideration of the self-stated importance of the documents and previous literature's consensus that these declarations constitute a central aspect of ILO discourse and the Decent Work Agenda.

### 4.2.1 Timeframe of material

I chose the 2008-2019 timeframe because it includes recent periods both before and after the financial crash of 2008. The relevance of the financial crash of 2008 connects to the hypothesis that documents produced on different sides of such a critical event to economic policy and the world of work would differ. One would arguably expect this to have affected the appreciated validity of hegemonic neoliberalism and business as usual. The timeframe also delimits longer historical development of ILO policy agenda, but facilitates a more in-depth analysis of the two chosen documents given the limitations of this thesis. The previous declarations of the ILO have also been widely researched and debated by e.g. Maupain (2005), Alston (2004) and Standing (2008).

## 4.3 Coding design

In the first coding attempt, the process had an inductive approach and inspired how to employ the theoretical framework in order to create codes, subthemes and themes. The second coding was based on the themes of the first coding attempt, hence done with a more deductive approach.

### 4.3.1 Thematic analysis coding phases

The reflexive TA approach to coding involves six phases described below (Braun and Clarke, 2021). Although these phases are sequential, and each builds on the previous one, the analysis was a recursive process, with movement back and forth between different phases in order to construct codes into subthemes and subthemes into themes. The six phases are as follows:

#### **Familiarisation with the data**

This phase involves reading and re-reading the data in order to become familiar with the data

#### **Coding**

This phase involves generating code labels that identify important features of the data that might be relevant to answering the research questions. It involves coding the entire dataset and then putting all codes together for later stages of analysis.

#### **Generating initial themes**

This phase involves examining the codes to identify significant broader patterns of meaning (potential themes).

#### **Reviewing themes**

This phase involves checking the identified themes against the dataset, to determine that they tell a convincing story of the data, and answers the research question. In this phase, themes are typically refined.

#### **Defining and naming themes**

This phase involves naming and developing a detailed analysis of each theme, working out the scope and focus of each theme, determining the 'story' of each.

## **Writing up**

This final phase involves weaving together the analytic narrative and data extracts, and contextualising the analysis in relation to existing literature

## **4.4 Word occurrence analysis**

### **4.4.1 Purpose and functionality**

In order to support and test the results of the thematic analysis I have conducted two NVIVO word occurrence analyses on both of the Declarations (See Appendix 2 and 3). Meanwhile prevalence or recurrence of words is not the most important criterion when determining what constitutes a theme, as Braun and Clarke (2006) recognises, it can be relevant and significant in order to understand the phenomena of interest and help to answer the research questions. A frequency count of words helps, not only to illustrate how often a concept appears in a policy text, but also to demonstrate how the occurrence of a concept changes over time. However, this does not explain how concepts are conceptualized or used in the context of the policy text and will only be used to support claims of revealed patterns and discrepancies.

The first analysis (See appendix 2) maps out the occurrence of the top 35 most used words of the 2008 Declaration within the 2019 Declaration. The second (See appendix 3) does the opposite, it maps the top words of 2019 within the 2008 Declaration. The words were measured by three indicators: word toplist placement, counts and weighted percentage. Out of these, the weighted percentage was chosen to lead the identification of the changes in occurrence. Weighted percentage represents how much of the total text that the individual word attributes to. An increase of e.g. 0,1% would mean an increase in a word's relative contribution to the text, not that use of the individual word in the document has increased by 0,1%. As the two documents significantly differ in length, this indicator creates a way of comparing word use in a comparable way.

In order to sort out significant changes, only changes with an increase or decrease of 0,3% of weighted percentage were ruled as significant. Only words with significant changes have been used to support and test the results of the thematic analysis.

### **4.4.2 Categorization of words**

The examined top words have also been colorcoded, with the help of the theoretical framework, into four categories: Neoliberal, Mixed, Polyanian and Neutral/Technical (see appendix 1). The coding has primarily been used to identify patterns to help guide the thematic comparison. In order to support the accuracy of the coding, the context where the words appear in the Declarations has been examined. Coding individual words into ideological categories comes with its own risks, thus the validity of the categorization has been approached with caution, and not used in the results. The words which have been coded as "Neutral/Technical" have not been used in the analysis or results.

## 4.5 Delimitations

The method of thematic analysis does not aim to answer questions regarding “why” or but rather describes the “whats” and “hows” of the analysed material. The process of building reflexive themes primarily includes constructing stories and finding patternized meaning. This means that my research is not to be seen as an objective reporter of truth and the constructivist recognition that “language is not simply reflecting the social world but is actively part of constructing it” (Jørgensen & Philips 2000).

As this thesis only compares ILO Declarations, the results have limited if any generalizability to how neoliberalism influences global institutions in general. With that said, as the ILO can be seen as one of the last bastions of promoters of labour rights, it can give clues to the extent of the neoliberal hegemony.

# 5 Thematic Analysis

## 5.1 Construction of themes

A theme captures a common, recurring pattern across a dataset. Braun and Clarke (2019) describe good themes as meaningful on their own. Presented below are the different themes that have been identified and that will be analysed with the help of the theoretical framework. With reflexive thematic analysis this thesis has identified four key themes in both declarations. I argue that these four themes together add up to the most central parts of the declarations and make good units to be used for a comparison of the two declarations.

The keywords presented were selected from the first coding of the declarations. The keywords were chosen based on both recurrence and relevance in the texts and to the research questions. A subtheme shares the same central organising concept as a theme, but focuses on one specific element (Braun and Clarke, 2019). The table below (*table 1.*) presents the keywords that produced the subthemes and themes together with the chosen naming of the respective theme. These themes are used to examine and identify patterns and differentiations within the Declarations.

<b>Theme no.</b>	<b>Keywords</b>	<b>Subthemes</b>	<b>Naming of theme</b>
<b>1.</b>	<i>Tech</i> <i>Future</i> <i>Globalization</i> <i>Transition</i> <i>Philadelphia</i> <i>1944</i>	<b>Adapting to new times</b>  <b>Connecting to the historical</b>	<b>New times and historical continuation</b>

	<i>1998 Principles Declaration</i>		
<b>2.</b>	<i>Social dialogue Decent Objectives Achieving Progress Tripartism Bargaining</i>	<b>Social dialogue “Decent Work”</b>	<b>The tools for development</b>
<b>3.</b>	<i>Agenda Organization Standards Members Country Capacity Responsibility Ratification Cooperation</i>	<b>Organizational innovation  State responsibilities</b>	<b>ILO and member states</b>
<b>4.</b>	<i>Economic Development Employment Sustainable Policies Work Social Growth Opportunities Trade</i>	<b>Social justice and equity  Growth and productivity</b>	<b>Policies for sustainable development</b>

*Table 1*

## 5.2 Analysis

The following section describes the analysis of the empirical material that relates to the 5 constructed themes of the thesis. The section will not present all materials connected to the themes but consist of a summative analysis which describes the content of the two Declarations. In this section quotes that are described coming from the 2008 Declaration are collected from (ILO.org, 2008) and quotes from the 2019 Declaration come from (ILO.org, 2019a).

## 5.2.1 Introduction to the Declarations

### ***ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization 2008***

In the preface of the *ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization* it is stated that the declaration is the third major statement of principles and policies adopted by the ILO, the other two being the 1944 Declaration and the 1998 Declaration. The historical connection is emphasized and it is presented as a “reaffirmation of ILO values”. As the title implies, the stated aim of the 2008 Declaration is “to help to achieve progress and social justice in the context of globalization”. The Declaration consists of three parts; a preface signed by Director-General Juan Somavia, the Declaration text and a ‘follow-up’ annex regarding how the ILO will assist members to fulfill the Declaration.

The Declaration text is in itself grouped into four parts: an introduction recognising the motives, aims and significance of the Declaration, a section named “Scope and Principles” declaring future objectives, a section named “Method of Implementation” stating responsibilities of ILO and member states and a short concluding section called “Final Provisions” stating the organizational paths of implementation and promotion of the Declaration. In the following sections this Declaration will be referenced as ‘the 2008 Declaration’.

### ***ILO Centenary Declaration for the Future of Work***

The *ILO Centenary Declaration for the Future of Work* differs from the 2008 Declaration as a document in structure. Except for being a much shorter document with 8 pages, less than half the size of the 22-page-long 2008 Declaration, it lacks the General-Director signed preface and the annex. In the following sections this Declaration will be referenced as ‘the 2019 Declaration’.

## 5.2.2 Theme 1 - Historical continuation and new times

This theme provides an answer as to how the ILO situated the Declarations with previous documents and the stated most central challenges of the time; e.g. would a clear distancing from earlier positions or main challenges be a telling sign of a change in discourse?

### **2008 Declaration**

The 2008 Declaration references its historical connections in five sections and explicitly states the connection to previous declarations already in the preface:

*“It builds on the Philadelphia Declaration of 1944 and the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work of 1998.”*

The Declaration is stated to build on these historical values and principles and aims to reinforce them to meet the challenges of the 21st century. The declaration is seen to be a powerful affirmation of ILO’s historical values. At the same time the Declaration presents itself as a renewal of the organization:

*“The Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization marks the most important renewal of the Organization since the Declaration of Philadelphia.”*

The need for renewal is argued to connect to the development of a widespread uncertainty in the world of work, with widespread rights abuses and concerns raised concerning the effects of globalization. As the name “*ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization*” might indicate to readers, the Declaration presents globalization as the key contemporary challenge to focus on. The ILO conceptualizes “globalization” as “growing interdependence” and the “internationalization of production” with the following words:

*“characterized by the diffusion of new technologies, the flow of ideas, the exchange of goods and services, the increase in capital and financial flows, the internationalization of business and business processes and dialogue as well as the movement of persons”*

Globalization is stated as the context where the Organization aims to achieve “improved and fair outcomes for all” which is what is needed in order to make it into “fair globalization”. At the same time the Declaration defines globalization as having both “opportunities and challenges”.

### **2019 Declaration**

The Declaration explicitly references the importance of all of the three other central declarations of 1944, 1998 and 2008. Just like the 2008 Declaration, the Declaration of 2019 states that it constitutes a reaffirmation of previous declarations. The 2019 Declaration references its history in seven different sections and has also added references to the founding visions of 1919:

*“efforts to achieve social justice and universal and lasting peace to which they agreed in 1919 and 1944”*

*“Moved by the imperative of social justice that gave birth to the ILO one hundred years ago [...] and shape a future of work that realizes its founding vision”*

I deem it plausible that this connects with the fact that the 2019 Declaration has a centenary character, which makes it more imperative to add a connection with the start of the Organization one hundred years ago.

Like in 2008, this Declaration also argues for the need for adaptation to contemporary challenges. Unlike the previous, the contemporary challenge with a capital C is not described as “globalization” but as “a time of transformative change in the world of work” driven by:

*“technological innovations, demographic shifts, environmental and climate change, and globalization, as well as at a time of persistent inequalities, which have profound impacts on the nature and future of work, and on the place and dignity of people in it.”*

This profound transformation is argued to include grand contextual changes which makes it imperative to “act with urgency” and where globalization is only one of these. The context of technological progress, digitalisation and productivity growth is argued to need to be addressed and steered for a “just sharing of the benefits of all”. The new global context is described here and the aim of the ILO and constituents should be to promote:

*“policies and measures that[...] respond to challenges and opportunities in the world of work”*

Unlike 2008, the Declaration of 2019 mainly appears to promote how to respond and adapt to the new context, rather than raising specific critiques towards the current trends.

### 5.2.3 Theme 2 - The tools for development

This theme provides an answer to the tools of social dialogue and the “Decent work agenda” that the ILO uses to realize its visions. The method of social dialogue has defined the ILO since the start but the presentation of the form and what is emphasized in the tripartite process can be telling signs of changes in perspectives.

#### **2008 Declaration**

In the preface of the Declaration the ILO argues for the need to recall the strength of social dialogue in a world “where dialogue has become so difficult”. I would argue that this sentiment, when describing the political sphere, has increased in popularity since 2008, especially with the rise of right-wing populism, but does not seem to seamlessly fit with the state of industrial relations. Contrastingly, according to OECD statistics, industrial conflicts in the OECD were already becoming increasingly rare in 2005 with 3551 registered strike days per 1000 employees in 2000 and 1477 strike days in 2005 compared to the 968 strike days in 2010 (OECD, 2017). If the quote aims to refer to the development of the hardship of making employer organisations engage in dialogue, it seems to make more sense, but it is questionable if that is the case as that matter is not discussed in the Declaration.

The social dialogue model and tripartite consultations that the ILO offers is stated in the Declaration as central to achieving the set goals of “progress and social justice in the context of globalization” and build social cohesion:

*“social dialogue and the practice of tripartism between governments and the representative organizations of workers and employers within and across borders are now more relevant to achieving solutions and to building up social cohesion and the rule of law through, among other means, international labour standards”*

The centrality of social dialogue together with “decent work” is repeated continuously to define the ILO. Just like social dialogue, the conceptualization of the “Decent Work agenda” is presented quite straightforwardly. It is stated, as developed in 1999, to be at the core of ILO policies to reach objectives of social justice. The agenda is argued to the central ILO agenda with four equally important strategic objectives:

*“employment, social protection, social dialogue, and rights at work. [...] a holistic and integrated approach by recognizing that these objectives are “inseparable, interrelated and mutually supportive”*

Contrary to a purely neoliberal economic model, where well-functioning markets would allow for desirable things such as social protection, the Decent Work Agenda argues for a direct interconnectivity between the social and the economical:

*“to place full and productive employment and decent work at the centre of economic and social policies [...] translating economic development into social progress, and social progress into economic development [...] The failure to promote any one of them would harm progress towards the others”*

### **2019 Declaration**

The concept of social dialogue is still central in the 2019 Declaration. Social dialogue is still presented as key to the social cohesion but also starkly argued to connect to economic success:

*“Recognizing that social dialogue contributes to the overall cohesion of societies and is crucial for a well-functioning and productive economy”*

*“[...] in the conviction that such representation and dialogue contribute to the overall cohesion of societies and are a matter of public interest, and are crucial for a well-functioning and productive economy.”*

Reading the Declaration, the reader clearly gets the impression that social dialogue is highly emphasized. Except for creating productive economies, the model of social dialogue is argued to achieve wanted outcomes of “safe and productive workplaces”, “collective bargaining”, “better work–life balance” and help “the development of strong representative social partner organisations”.

Just as social dialogue, “decent work” is a highly used concept in the 2019 Declaration. It occurs in over 15 sections but compared to the 2008 Declaration it lacks an explicit definition. The concept is presented as a highly desirable outcome of social dialogue that is connected to, but not the same as, “shared prosperity”, “productive employment” or “improved living standards for all”:

*“a fair, inclusive and secure future of work with full, productive and freely chosen employment and decent work for all.”*

*“in order to generate decent work, productive employment and improved living standards for all”*

The Declaration aims to tightly connect decent work with sustainable and productive development and argues for relevance of “decent work” in a broader developmental context:

*“decent work is key to sustainable development, addressing income inequality and ending poverty, paying special attention to areas affected by conflict, disaster and other humanitarian emergencies”*

Compared to the 2008 Declaration the wording makes stronger and more recurring arguments for the need for social dialogue and decent work. One could imagine explaining this fact with different answers; one hypothesis would be that the ILO thinks that social dialogue is more important than it was before whereas another one could be that social dialogue has lost its natural role in a context of weakened social partner organizations, non-formal employment and trade union decline, hence the need for strong argumentation. But at the same time, the lack of clear definitions risks promoting what McNaughton and Frey (2018) a “soft-law version of ‘decent work’ that fails to challenge neoliberalism”.

#### 5.2.4 Theme 3 - ILO and member state relations

This theme describes the proposed organizational path and the way that the organization perceives member states in the declarations.

##### **2008 Declaration**

In the 2008 Declaration the capacity of the ILO is a highly discussed matter. The Declaration aligns with a lot of the academic literature (Standing, 2008; Maupain 2013) on the need for review and adaptation of institutional practices:

*“The Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization marks the most important renewal of the Organization since the Declaration of Philadelphia. It gives us a historic opportunity and responsibility to reinforce the capacity of the ILO.”*

Organizational innovation is recognized as important and the Declaration states different aspects of its capacity that must be sharpened, such as “strengthen the ILO’s capacity to assist its Members’ efforts”, “better understanding its Members’ needs” and “promote the objectives of the Declaration and implement its commitments in the most effective and efficient way”. Another innovation has to do with the cooperation with other international organizations in related fields that can make “important contribution” when it comes to promotion of decent work:

*“The ILO should invite them to promote decent work, bearing in mind that each agency will have full control of its mandate”*

The Declaration also calls for developing new partnerships with non-state entities and economic actors, such as multinational enterprises and trade unions operating at the global level, to enlist support for and promote the ILO objectives. This development aligns with the increasing focus on voluntary compacts, as opposed to binding labour conventions, which

arguably can be compared to a strategic approach of “whatever works works”. This mentioned, the Declaration still clearly emphasizes the importance of member states’ responsibility in the implementation of the national labour standards:

*“Members have a key responsibility to contribute, through their social and economic policy, to the realization of a global and integrated strategy for the implementation of the strategic objectives, which encompass the Decent Work Agenda”*

It seems plausible that the recent criticism (Standing, 2008) about being eurocentric has encouraged the declaration to also clearly state the need for national adaptation in the implementation of the declaration:

*“it will be for member States, in consultation with the representative organizations of workers and employers, to determine how to discharge that responsibility”*

*“How Members achieve the strategic objectives is a question that must be determined by each Member subject to its existing international obligations”*

### **2019 Declaration**

The 2019 Declaration takes ILO innovation very seriously and offers a plethora of proposed enhancements and changes ranging from internal administrative capacities, to labour standards to date, effective supervision, and responding to the criticism of being biased to the global north (Standing, 2008):

*“Democratize ILO governance by ensuring a fair representation of all regions and establishing the principle of equality among member States” [...] attention to, their diverse circumstances, needs, priorities and levels of development, including through expanded South–South and triangular cooperation.”*

The Declaration also puts forward a focus on multilateral cooperation with the hope of winning the agenda setting in cooperation with international institutions, sustainable enterprises and social partners:

*“intensifying engagement and cooperation within the multilateral system with a view to strengthening policy coherence in pursuit of its human-centred approach to the future of work, recognizing the strong, complex and crucial links between social, trade, financial, economic and environmental policies”*

The inclusion of new non-state actors can be seen as well needed innovation but also hints at a shift towards valuing voluntary cooperation in a higher fashion, stating “the needs of sustainable enterprises” as important. The Declaration does however discuss the importance of member states’ ratification and implementation, but language of “key responsibility” cannot be found and seems to be replaced with softer language:

*“All Members should work towards the ratification and implementation of the ILO fundamental Conventions and periodically consider, in consultation with employers’ and workers’ organizations, the ratification of other ILO standards”*

The assumption that the Declaration will emphasize, like the case with social dialogue, the parts that seem to be in decline does not seem to be the case with member state responsibility and national implementation.

## 5.2.5 Theme 4 - Policies for sustainable growth and development

This theme describes the proposed policy agenda and their framing in the declaration.

### **2008 Declaration**

The policy agenda in the 2008 Declaration aims to place “employment at the heart of economic policies”. The document acknowledges that global economic integration has caused major challenges of income inequality and growth of unprotected and informal work. In a section it even quotes the Polanyian perspective explicitly:

*“affirms that labour is not a commodity and that poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere”*

The responsibility of the ILO is to examine and consider all international economic and financial policies in the light of the fundamental objective of social justice, meaning that economic policy should be made to fit social justice, not the other way around. Several rights such as freedom of association and right to collectively bargain is explicitly mentioned as fundamental rights and the recognition of formal employment as a legal protection for workers is emphasized greatly:

*“the importance of the employment relationship should be recognized as a means of providing legal protection to workers”*

The 2008 Declaration makes a clear case for social justice as the leading principle, with social outcomes as the main objectives of ILO activity:

*“the International Labour Organization has a key role to play in helping to promote and achieve progress and social justice in a constantly changing environment [...] the ILO has the solemn obligation to further among the nations of the world programmes which will achieve the objectives of full employment and the raising of standards of living”*

At the same time, the Declaration argues for sustainable development which brings together social, economic and environmental objectives, in a way that seems to tell a more symbiotic tale of the relationship between the social and the economic. The fundamental values of freedom, social justice and non-discrimination are argued for through the argument of being “essential for sustainable economic and social development and efficiency”, hence social

justice is also good business. The Declaration offers other clear expressions of this symbiotic view of the social and the economic:

*“productive, profitable and sustainable enterprises, together with a strong social economy and a viable public sector, are critical to sustainable economic development and employment opportunities”*

Sustainable development is stated to be the result of both social economics and profitable enterprises. In one section globalization is argued on the one hand to have created challenges and on the other to have yielded direct positive results such as “high rates of economic growth and employment creation”, via absorbing the “rural poor into the modern urban economy”, advancing “developmental goals” and fostering “the innovation in product development”. This section differs from other sections, but functions more as a contextualization rather than a grander argument that contradicts the challenges of globalization.

### **2019 Declaration**

This theme describes the proposed policy agenda and the framing of it in the declaration.

Just like the 2008 Declaration, the 2019 Declaration reaffirms that “labour is not a commodity” and the need for sustainable development that *“puts an end to poverty and leaves no one behind”*. The Declaration also presents a new key concept that is argued to align with sustainable development; the “human-centered approach”:

*“developing its human-centred approach to the future of work, which puts workers’ rights and the needs, aspirations and rights of all people at the heart of economic, social and environmental policies.”*

This human-centered approach is stated to recognize the seemingly symbiotic interlinkages between the social and the economic. What new substance the human-centered approach brings to the table, compared to “decent work” for instance, is not defined very clearly. Just as in the 2008 Declaration, the grand vision still stays the same: “social justice, democracy and the promotion of universal and lasting peace” and the concept of “decent work” and “sustainability” occurs more often than in the previous declaration.

Connecting to contemporary transitions like the digital transformation of work, the Declaration also reaffirms the respond to the re-informalization of employment raised in 2008, explicitly referencing “platform work” and reaffirming the employment relationship:

*“reaffirming the continued relevance of the employment relationship as a means of providing certainty and legal protection to workers [...] the need to ensure effective action to achieve transition to formality.”*

Argued to be one of the key issues concerning work today (Novitz, 2020), one would expect that the question and language of employment would be a more major theme in the 2019

Declaration, but that does not seem to be the case. Where the 2008 Declaration primarily used “full and productive employment”, the 2019 Declaration seems to use “world of work” and while employment connects to the social relation between workers and employers in the former, work is a broader and more abstract term in the latter.

In the understanding of a social and economic symbiosis, the Declaration also argues that workers’ rights is “a key element for the attainment of inclusive and sustainable growth”, it is a tool to attain another wanted outcome - good business. The aim of policies is stated to both promote the social agenda of decent work, and enhance the economic productivity:

*“trade, industrial and sectoral policies that promote **decent work**, and **enhance productivity**; policies and incentives that promote sustainable and inclusive economic growth,”*

The language of productivity and economic growth is more prevalent in the 2019 Declaration. Sustainable development is still central but sustainable enterprises play a more vital role as generators of employment and promoters of innovation and decent work.

While the 2008 Declaration stated the equal “together with”-relationship between the private sector and the public and social economy, the 2019 Declaration sets an order of importance:

*“the private sector as a principal source of economic growth and job creation by promoting an enabling environment for entrepreneurship and sustainable enterprises [...] the role of the public sector as a significant employer and provider of quality public services”*

The role of productivity and economic growth is presented as an enabler of the wanted social goals. Even if the Declaration’s demands for *“policies and incentives that promote sustainable and inclusive economic growth, the creation and development of sustainable enterprises, innovation”* always include the aspect of sustainability and inclusiveness, the emphasis on productivity and growth seem to have increased, compared to the 2008 Declaration.

## 6 Results

The following section will present the results of the thematic analysis supported by the word analysis. When discussing increases and decreases in word occurrence, the weighted percentage of the 2008 Declaration is referencing Appendix 2 and the 2019 Declaration is referencing Appendix 3. The concluding part of the section consists of a summary of the results in the form of a list of identified patterns and a table summarizing results concerning each subtheme.

## 6.1 Comparative results

### 6.1.1 Theme 1 - Historical continuation and new times

#### **Historical references**

Both Declarations showed a high level of historical references to previous ILO documents and explicitly reaffirmed their continuous validity. The 2019 Declaration added a centenary aspect and referenced the founding visions of 1919 to a higher degree. It seems plausible that this is the case because of the centenary character of the 2019 Declaration, making it more imperative to add a connection with the start of the Organization one hundred years ago. This is marked by a dramatic increase in the word “centenary” of 0,54% which represents a 7 counts increase from 0 counts in the 2008 Declaration, which is not very surprising (See Appendix 3.2). Another significant difference compared to the 2008 Declaration was the introduction of “future” which increased with 1,09%, representing an 14 counts increase from 0 counts in the 2008 Declaration. This section does not seem to connect to any of the ideological core concepts in the theoretical framework.

#### **Contemporary Challenges**

In the 2019 Declaration, globalization as the main contemporary challenge, has been replaced by a more general “profound transformation of the world of work”. Instead of forming a “fair globalization” the objective now is stated to respond to the “challenges and opportunities” of the new context, where globalization is just one aspect. The word analysis confirmed the decrease of importance of the concept of “globalization” (-0,48%) in the 2019 Declaration. This section indicates a shift towards a less critical perspective which includes a more general description, but does not directly match any of the stated ideological core concepts.

### 6.1.2 Theme 2 - The tools for development

#### **Social dialogue and “Decent Work Agenda”**

The 2019 Declaration seems to symbolise a firm confirmation of the concepts of social dialogue, the “Decent Work Agenda” and perspective of labour as a fictitious commodity. The concept of “decent work” lacks a definition in the 2019 Declaration but the Declaration makes stronger and more recurring arguments for the need for social dialogue and decent work compared to the 2008 Declaration. This is confirmed by the word analysis with an increase of the words “social” (+0,32%), “decent” (+0,34%), “equal” (+0,54) and “workers” (+0,34%) in the 2019 Declaration.

There are several possible explanations for this fact; one hypothesis would be that the ILO thinks that social dialogue is more important than it was before and another would be that weakened social partner organizations, non-formal employment and trade union decline, has increased the need for clear reaffirmation in the importance of the two. The theme indicates a strong connection to the polanyian core concept of labour as ‘fictitious commodity’.

### 6.1.3 Theme 3 - ILO and member state relations

#### **ILO innovation**

The two Declarations share many similarities and the recurring challenges for global institutions like the ILO of capacity building and agenda promotion is highly present in both documents. The academic consensus for ILO's need for organizational innovation (Standing 2008, Maupain 2013, Novitz 2020) seems to also be reflected in the 2019 Declaration.

The 2019 Declaration offers a plethora of proposed enhancements and changes, such as updated labour standards and a fair representation of regions. The most clear shift seems to be the focus on multilateral cooperation with both other global institutions and non-state actors. The increased focus of non-state actors share similarity with the neoliberal core concept of "the transfer of relevance and power from governments, state apparatuses or public holdings to the private sector or other non-state entities" (Springer, 2012). But as the Declaration does not argue for a shift, but rather a widened inclusion, the section does not seem to match flawlessly with the concept.

#### **State responsibility**

The emphasis on voluntary multilateral cooperation aligns with the lessened focus given to the "key" responsibility of member states and national implementation of labour standards. The word analysis seems to support this claim and shows a significant decrease from 2008 to 2019 in the words "members" (-0,48%), "global" (-0,35%), "efforts" (-0,3%) "national" (-0,6%), "implementation" (-0,42%). Contrary to the previous subtheme, I would argue that the weakened importance of the member state responsibility and implementation matches with the neoliberal core concept of a transfer of relevance to the private sector.

### 6.1.4 Theme 4 - Policies for sustainable growth and development

#### **Social justice and equity**

Both Declarations reaffirm the importance of the fundamental rights to collectively bargain and freedom of association. The Declarations also discusses sustainable development in a very similar fashion: it is a development that "leaves no one behind", there is a symbiotic relationship between the social and the economic and social justice is also good business. This part of the theme seems to completely match with the polanyian core concept of a countermovement balancing social rights with the market.

The 2019 Declaration introduced the concept of a "human-centered approach" which, though lacking its own definition, seems to align, if not directly reflected, with the concept of what the ILO deems as sustainable development and decent work. The thematic analysis hints to an increased importance of sustainability in the 2019 Declaration, which is supported by the word analysis that showed a significant increase in the use of "sustainability" (+0,58%). I would argue that this part of the theme connects with the mixed ideological core concept of reduced specificity as it opens up for non-polanyian assumptions and interpretations.

#### **Business and productivity**

The urgent issue of formal employment in a time of profound transformations is mentioned

in the 2019 Declaration, but contrary to the author's expectation it does not constitute a major theme. Where the 2008 Declaration primarily used “full employment”, the 2019 Declaration seems to use “world of work” and while employment connects to the social relation between workers and employers, work is a broader and more abstract term. This identified pattern is also supported by the word analysis which shows a decrease in the use of the word “employment” (-0,32%) and a significant increase of the word “work” (+3,14%), which also is the most used word in the whole 2019 Declaration. Like in the previous theme, I would argue that this part connects with the mixed ideological concept of reduced specificity and is of certain relevance due to the central position in the Declaration.

The last identified pattern concerns the use of economic language. The symbiosis of the social and the economic is prevalent in both Declarations but the 2019 Declaration arguably takes the argument one step further. Both Declarations have sections that show alignment with the mixed ideological core concept of symbiosis of the social and the market.

According to the thematic analysis the 2019 Declaration seems to have put a stronger emphasis on decent work as good business. The private sector is deemed as the “principal source of economic growth” and the importance of sustainable enterprises in achieving sustainable development has increased. The 2019 Declaration presents, to a higher degree, productivity and economic growth as important enablers to the wanted social goals and the importance of “opportunities” seems to have taken the place of the previous focus of “outcomes”. This claim is supported by the word analysis which shows that the economic language was significantly lower in the 2008 Declaration looking at the words “productive” (-0,49%), “growth” (-0,36%) and “opportunities” (-0,64%). The language of “economic growth” and “productive” within the Decent Work agenda mirrors the definition of neoliberalism in the theoretical framework and has also previously been argued to align with a neoliberal approach (McNaughton and Frey, 2018). I also argue that this shift in language matches the neoliberal core concept of increased productivity and growth as important and that leads to a trickle down-effect.

## 6.2 Summative results

This section consists of a summary of the identified patterns and table 2 summarizes the identified differentiations between the two declarations, grouped by subtheme.

### **Identified patterns**

*The 2019 Declaration talks:*

More about opportunities, productive, and growth

Much more about work and less of employment

More about sustainable

More about the future

More about social dialogue and decent work

Less about about globalization, member states, efforts and national implementation

<b>Subtheme</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>Comparison</b>
<b>Historical references</b>	Yes	Yes. And focus on founding.	More in 2019 arguably because of centenary character
<b>Contemporary challenge</b>	Globalization	Transformation of world of work	Globalization is just one part of the challenge  Objective context instead of a main challenge
<b>Social Dialogue</b>	Social cohesion	Social cohesion  Productive economy	More emphasis
<b>Decent work</b>	Defined  Leads to good economy	Not defined  Part of sustainable development  Occurs often	Importance of “Decent work” concept increased
<b>ILO Innovation</b>	Capacity building  Cooperation with non-state entities  Member-need focus  Promotion of objectives	Capacity building  Updated labour standards  Fair representation of regions  Multilateral cooperation	Similarities  Development of non-state actors  More cooperation
<b>State responsibility</b>	Members’ key responsibility  National adaptation	Members’ contribution	Less on responsibility and national implementation
<b>Social justice and equity</b>	Social rights  Symbiotic relationship  Social over economic	Social rights  Symbiotic relationship  Human-centered approach	More focus on the symbiosis of the social and economic
<b>Business and productivity</b>	Employment  Outcomes	Work  Sustainability	Exchanged wording to work and opportunities

	Globalization has also created some opportunities	Opportunities Productivity Growth	Increased focus on productivity, growth and opportunities
--	---	---	---

Table 2

## 7 Conclusion

In this paper, I have examined and compared the two most recent ILO Declarations, the *Declaration on social justice for a fair globalization* from 2008 and the *ILO Centenary Declaration for the Future of Work* from 2019. The purpose of this thesis was to analyse how the two Declarations differ and which influences of neoliberalism can be found in the recent ILO agendas.

The thematic analysis supported by a word analysis has shown that the main challenge has changed from ‘globalization’ to a ‘transformation in the world of work’. It showed that the concepts of social dialogue and decent work have increased in importance. The analysis has also shown that the use of sustainable development has increased and been connected to the new concept of ‘human centered-approach’. However, I argue that the lack of clear definitions and the claimed shift from ‘employment’ to ‘work’ risk weakening the policy agenda and opening up for outside ideological definitions.

The analysis has also shown a tendency to argue for decent work with economic arguments, as good business. The view of a symbiosis between social goals and economic progress is still the ruling perspective, but descriptions of growth as the enabler of social good have increased in the 2019 Declaration. The results of the analysis suggest that economic language of growth, productivity and opportunities has become more present. To conclude, the 2019 Declaration does not seem to be a firm step away from neoliberalism and back to Polanyian social markets. Conversely it shows tendencies to adapt to the neoclassical economic assumptions and language of neoliberalism.

I believe that study of policy agendas of international institutions and organizations is an important field of study as it can have fundamental consequences for policy and development ‘on the ground’. I argue that assumptions that labour rights advocates can rely on global institutions should be made cautiously and continue to be empirically tried.

While the findings may have limited generalizability to other contexts, they provide a sense of the recent development within ILO policy texts. There is a need for further research that extends our understanding of how such complex phenomena as decent work are discursively shaped and what assumptions surrounding it are promoted by global institutions in the world of work.

## 8 References

Alston, P., 2004. 'Core Labour Standards' and the Transformation of the International Labour Rights Regime. *European Journal of International Law*, 15(3), pp.457-521.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V., 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), pp.77-101.

Braun, V. and Clark, V., 2019. Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis, *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 11:4, 589-597, DOI: 10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806

Braun, V. and Clark, V., 2021. Thematic analysis - The University of Auckland. [online] Psych.auckland.ac.nz. Available at: <<https://www.psych.auckland.ac.nz/en/about/thematic-analysis.html#af953c2f208a5c63944b74a75e437ba5>> [Accessed 27 April 2021].

Bryman, A. 2012. *Social research methods 4e*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Charny, D., 2001. Regulatory competition and the global coordination of labor standards. *Journal of International Economic Law*, 3(2), pp.281-302.

Di Ruggerio, E. 2015. Agenda Setting in Global Policy Development: The Case of the International Labour Organization Decent Work Agenda. PH.D. University of Toronto

Ferguson, J. 2009. The Uses of Neoliberalism. *Antipode* 41, S1: 166-184.

Freeden, M., 1996. *Ideologies and Political Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gironde, C., Carbonnier, G. and Panizza, U., 2019. *The ILO @ 100: Addressing the Past and Future of Work and Social Protection*. Brill.

Harvey, D. 2005. *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Hay, C., 2004. The normalizing role of rationalist assumptions in the institutional embedding of neoliberalism, *Economy and Society*, 33:4, 500-527

Helfer, L., 2019. The ILO at 100: Institutional Innovation in an Era of Populism. *SSRN Electronic Journal*

ILO.org, 2008. [online] Ilo.org. Available at: <<https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---cabinet/documents/genericdocum>

ent/wcms\_371208.pdf> [Accessed 20 May 2021].

ILO.org, 2019a. Centenary Declaration for the Future of Work [online] Ilo.org. Available at: <[https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/@ed\\_norm/@relconf/documents/meetingdocument/wcms\\_711674.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/@ed_norm/@relconf/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_711674.pdf)> [Accessed 20 May 2021].

ILO.org, 2019b. Work for a Brighter Future. [online] Available at: <[https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---cabinet/documents/publication/wcms\\_662410.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---cabinet/documents/publication/wcms_662410.pdf)> [Accessed 18 March 2021].

ILO.org, 2021a. Decent work in Arab States (Arab States). [online] Ilo.org. Available at: <<https://www.ilo.org/beirut/country/lang--en/index.htm>> [Accessed 20 May 2021].

Ilo.org, 2021b. Key documents. [online] Available at: <<https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:61:0::NO:::>> [Accessed 28 April 2021].

Langille, B., 2005. Core Labour Rights – The True Story (Reply to Alston). *European Journal of International Law*, 16(3), pp.409-437.

Larner, W. 2000. Neo-liberalism: Policy, Ideology, Governmentality. *Studies in Political Economy* 63 (Autumn): 5-25.

Larner, W. 2003. Neoliberalism? *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 21: 509-512.

Maupain, F., 2005. Revitalization Not Retreat: The Real Potential of the 1998 ILO Declaration for the Universal Protection of Workers' Rights. *European Journal of International Law*, 16(3), pp.439-465.

Maupain, F., 2013. *The Future of the International Labour Organization in the Global Economy*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Macnaughton, G., & Frey, D. (2018). Challenging Neoliberalism: ILO, Human Rights, and Public Health Frameworks on Decent Work. *Health and human rights*, 20(2), 43–55.

Novitz, T. 2020 Past and Future Work at the International Labour Organization: Labour as a Fictitious Commodity, Counter-movement and Sustainability

OECD, 2017. Industrial Disputes. [online] Oecd.org. Available at: <<https://www.oecd.org/els/emp/Industrial-disputes.pdf>> [Accessed 17 May 2021].

Polanyi, K., 1944. *The great transformation*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc.

Potter, R., Binns, T., Elliott, J. and Drakakis-Smith, D. (2008). *Geographies of development*.

3rd ed. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Ryder, G., 2015. The International Labour Organization: The next 100 years<sup>1</sup>. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 57(5), pp.748-757.

Springer, S., 2012. Neoliberalism as discourse: between Foucauldian political economy and Marxian poststructuralism. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 9(2), pp.133-147.

Standing, G. (2008). The ILO: An agency for globalization?. *Development and Change*, 39(3), pp.355--384.

Sykes, A., 2003. International Trade and Human Rights: An Economic Perspective. SSRN Electronic Journal,

Springer, S. 2012. Neoliberalism as discourse: between Foucauldian political economy and Marxian poststructuralism, *Critical Discourse Studies*, 9:2, 133-147

Winther J, M. and Phillips, L., 2000. *Diskursanalys som teori och metod*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

# Appendixes

## Appendix 1 - Word categorization of top words

Neoliberal	Mixed	Polanyian	Neutral Technical
Opportunities	Work	Social	ILO
Productive	Future	Decent	Labour
Economic	World	Employment	International
Growth	Sustainable	Members	Objectives
Economy	Globalization	Needs	Organization
	Economic	Standards	Strategic
	National	Justice	Organizations
	Global	Principles	Conference
	Progress	Workers	Appropriate
	Cooperation	Equal	Policies
		Fundamental	Implementation
		Rights	May
		Dialogue	Offi
		Full	Promote
		Protection	Role
			Promoting
			Effective

## Appendix 2 - Statistical word count 2008 Declaration

Word 2008	Place 2008	Count 2008	(%) 2008	Place 2019	Count 2019	(%) 2019	Difference place	Difference Count	Difference %	+/-
ilo	1	58	2.07	2	25	1.94	-1	-33	-0.13	Lower
international	2	43	1.53	8	10	0.78	-6	-33	-0.75	Lower
declaration	3	42	1.50	10	8	0.62	-7	-34	-0.88	Lower
social	4	39	1.39	3	22	1.71	1	-17	0.32	Higher
objectives	5	37	1.32	17	1	0.08	-12	-36	-1.24	Lower
labour	6	36	1.28	4	16	1.24	2	-20	-0.04	Lower
work	6	36	1.28	1	57	4.42	5	21	3.14	Higher
employment	7	24	0.86	11	7	0.54	-4	-17	-0.32	Lower
organization	7	24	0.86	13	5	0.39	-6	-19	-0.47	Lower
decent	8	23	0.82	5	15	1.16	3	-8	0.34	Higher
strategic	8	23	0.82	17	1	0.08	-9	-22	-0.74	Lower
globalization	9	20	0.71	15	3	0.23	-6	-17	-0.48	Lower
members	9	20	0.71	15	3	0.23	-6	-17	-0.48	Lower
economic	10	19	0.68	10	8	0.62	0	-11	-0.06	Lower
national	10	19	0.68	17	1	0.08	-7	-18	-0.60	Lower
organizations	11	18	0.64	15	3	0.29	-4	-15	-0.35	Lower
conference	12	17	0.61	9	9	0.70	3	-8	0.09	Higher
appropriate	13	16	0.57	16	2	0.16	-3	-14	-0.41	Lower
policies	14	15	0.54	10	8	0.62	4	-7	0.08	Higher
development	15	14	0.50	10	8	0.62	5	-6	0.12	Higher
implementation	15	14	0.50	17	1	0.08	-2	-13	-0.42	Lower
may	15	14	0.50	18	0	0.00	-3	-14	-0.50	Lower
needs	15	14	0.50	12	6	0.47	3	-8	-0.03	Lower
offi	15	14	0.50	18	0	0.00	-3	-14	-0.50	Lower
standards	15	14	0.50	12	6	0.47	3	-8	-0.03	Lower
efforts	16	13	0.46	16	2	0.16	0	-11	-0.30	Lower
fair	16	13	0.46	15	3	0.23	1	-10	-0.23	Lower
progress	16	13	0.46	13	5	0.39	3	-8	-0.07	Lower
effective	17	12	0.43	8	10	0.78	9	-2	0.35	Higher
global	17	12	0.43	17	1	0.08	0	-11	-0.35	Lower
justice	17	12	0.43	12	6	0.47	5	-6	0.04	Higher
principles	17	12	0.43	15	3	0.23	2	-9	-0.20	Lower
promote	17	12	0.43	13	5	0.39	4	-7	-0.04	Lower
sustainable	17	12	0.43	7	13	1.01	10	1	0.58	Higher

### 2.2 Ranked results 2008 (On difference in weighted percentage)

Word 2008	Difference place	Difference Count	Difference %	More or Less	Significant (+/- 0.3)
objectives	-12	-36	-1.24	Lower	X
declaration	-7	-34	-0.88	Lower	X

international	-6	-33	-0.75	Lower	X
strategic	-6	-22	-0.74	Lower	X
national	-2	-18	-0.6	Lower	X
may	4	-14	-0.5	Lower	X
offi	6	-14	-0.5	Lower	X
globalization	-3	-17	-0.48	Lower	X
members	-2	-17	-0.48	Lower	X
organization	-4	-19	-0.47	Lower	X
implementation	4	-13	-0.42	Lower	X
appropriate	2	-14	-0.41	Lower	X
organizations	1	-15	-0.35	Lower	X
global	13	-11	-0.35	Lower	X
employment	-3	-17	-0.32	Lower	X
efforts	10	-11	-0.3	Lower	X
fair	12	-10	-0.23	Lower	
principles	17	-9	-0.2	Lower	
ilo	-1	-33	-0.13	Lower	
progress	15	-8	-0.07	Lower	
economic	4	-11	-0.06	Lower	
labour	2	-20	-0.04	Lower	
promote	4	-7	-0.04	Lower	
needs	11	-8	-0.03	Lower	
standards	13	-8	-0.03	Lower	
justice	19	-6	0.04	Higher	
policies	9	-7	0.08	Higher	
conference	8	-8	0.09	Higher	
development	10	-6	0.12	Higher	
social	1	-17	0.32	Higher	X
decent	5	-8	0.34	Higher	X
effective	21	-2	0.35	Higher	X
sustainable	10	1	0.58	Higher	X
work	6	21	3.14	Higher	X

### 2.3 Top words of 2008 with significant *less* in 2019

Neutral / Technical	Mixed	Polanyian
objectives	national	members
declaration	globalization	employment
international	efforts	
strategic	global	
may		
offi		
organization		
implementation		
appropriate		
organizations		

**2.4 Top words of 2008 with significant *more* in 2019**

Neutral / Technical	Mixed	Polanyian
effective	work	social
	sustainable	decent

## Appendix 3 - Statistical word count 2019 Declaration

Word 2019	Place 2019	Count 2019	(%) 2019	Place 2008	Count 2008	(%) 2008	Difference place	Difference Count	Difference %	+/-
work	1	57	4.42	6	36	1.28	-5	-21	-3.14	Lower
ilo	2	25	1.94	1	58	2.07	-6	33	0.13	Higher
social	3	22	1.71	4	39	1.39	-26	17	-0.32	Lower
labour	4	16	1.24	6	36	1.28	-14	20	0.04	Higher
decent	5	15	1.16	8	23	0.82	-12	8	-0.34	Lower
future	6	14	1.09	29	0	0	-11	-14	-1.09	Lower
world	6	14	1.09	18	11	0.39	-11	-3	-0.7	Lower
sustainable	8	13	1.01	17	12	0.43	-17	-1	-0.58	Lower
effective	9	10	0.78	17	12	0.43	-3	2	-0.35	Lower
international	9	10	0.78	17	12	0.43	-9	2	-0.35	Lower
opportunities	9	10	0.78	25	4	0.14	-14	-6	-0.64	Lower
conference	10	9	0.7	12	17	0.61	-9	8	-0.09	Lower
including	10	9	0.7	18	11	0.39	7	2	-0.31	Lower
productive	10	9	0.7	23	6	0.21	-5	-3	-0.49	Lower
workers	10	9	0.7	19	10	0.36	0	1	-0.34	Lower
declaration	11	8	0.62	3	42	1.5	-3	34	0.88	Higher
development	11	8	0.62	15	14	0.5	-18	6	-0.12	Lower
economic	11	8	0.62	10	19	0.68	-10	11	0.06	Higher
policies	11	8	0.62	14	15	0.54	4	7	-0.08	Lower
centenary	12	7	0.54	29	0	0	-17	-7	-0.54	Lower
cooperation	12	7	0.54	21	8	0.29	-9	1	-0.25	Lower
employment	12	7	0.54	7	24	0.86	-12	17	0.32	Higher
equal	12	7	0.54	29	0	0	-8	-7	-0.54	Lower
fundamental	12	7	0.54	21	8	0.29	-11	1	-0.25	Lower
F	12	7	0.54	24	5	0.18	-10	-2	-0.36	Lower
rights	12	7	0.54	20	9	0.32	-9	2	-0.22	Lower
dialogue	13	6	0.47	23	6	0.21	-13	0	-0.26	Lower
economy	13	6	0.47	22	7	0.25	-6	1	-0.22	Lower
full	13	6	0.47	21	8	0.29	-4	2	-0.18	Lower
growth	13	6	0.47	26	3	0.11	-2	-3	-0.36	Lower
iii	13	6	0.47	19	10	0.36	-10	4	-0.11	Lower
justice	13	6	0.47	17	12	0.43	-8	6	-0.04	Lower
needs	13	6	0.47	15	14	0.5	-2	8	0.03	Higher
protection	13	6	0.47	23	6	0.21	13	0	-0.26	Lower
role	13	6	0.47	21	8	0.29	13	2	-0.18	Lower
standards	13	6	0.47	15	14	0.5	13	8	0.03	Higher

### 3.2 Ranked results 2008 (On in difference weighted percentage)

Word 2019	Difference place	Difference Count	Difference %	More or Less	Significant (+/- 0.3)
work	-5	-21	-3.14	Lower	<b>X</b>
future	-11	-14	-1.09	Lower	<b>X</b>

world	-11	-3	-0.7	Lower	X
opportunities	-14	-6	-0.64	Lower	X
sustainable	-17	-1	-0.58	Lower	X
centenary	-17	-7	-0.54	Lower	X
equal	-8	-7	-0.54	Lower	X
productive	-5	-3	-0.49	Lower	X
promoting	-10	-2	-0.36	Lower	X
growth	-2	-3	-0.36	Lower	X
effective	-3	2	-0.35	Lower	X
international	-9	2	-0.35	Lower	X
decent	-12	8	-0.34	Lower	X
workers	0	1	-0.34	Lower	X
social	-26	17	-0.32	Lower	X
including	7	2	-0.31	Lower	X
dialogue	-13	0	-0.26	Lower	
protection	13	0	-0.26	Lower	
cooperation	-9	1	-0.25	Lower	
fundamental	-11	1	-0.25	Lower	
rights	-9	2	-0.22	Lower	
economy	-6	1	-0.22	Lower	
full	-4	2	-0.18	Lower	
role	13	2	-0.18	Lower	
development	-18	6	-0.12	Lower	
iii	-10	4	-0.11	Lower	
conference	-9	8	-0.09	Lower	
policies	4	7	-0.08	Lower	
justice	-8	6	-0.04	Lower	
needs	-2	8	0.03	Higher	
standards	13	8	0.03	Higher	
labour	-14	20	0.04	Higher	
economic	-10	11	0.06	Higher	
ilo	-6	33	0.13	Higher	
employment	-12	17	0.32	Higher	X
declaration	-3	34	0.88	Higher	X

### 3.3 Top words of 2019 with significant *less* in 2008

Neoliberal	Neutral / Technical	Mixed	Polanyian
opportunities	centenary	work	equal
productive	international	future	decent
growth	including	sustainable	workers
	promoting	effective	social

### 3.4 Top words of 2019 with significant *more* in 2008

Neoliberal	Neutral / Technical	Mixed	Polanyian
------------	---------------------	-------	-----------

---

declaration

employment