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Abstract

The Sustainable Development Goals postulate that “decent work for all” shall be achieved worldwide by 2030. In global textiles and garment production, global and local public, business, and labour stakeholders have implemented efforts to achieve this goal. Nevertheless, indecent work realities persist, especially in textiles and garment supplier firms in the Global South. Previous research showed that a multitude of global and local (glo-cal) influences shape work realities on the factory floor. To better understand the complex problem of ensuring decent work in global garment production, this dissertation, therefore, focuses on the actor in global production networks that stands where the glo-cal influences interact – the local supplier. Three research questions guided the PhD project. First, how do glo-cal influences crossverge at the point of the supplier and motivate (in)decent work outcomes in the global garment production network? Second, how do crossvergence dynamics diffuse across different horizontal nodes and vertical stages of the global garment production network? Third, how do owners-managers of garment supplier firms frame their decent work perspectives?

To answer the research questions, this PhD project investigated the formation of glocal perspectives and decent work practices in the textiles and the garment industries in Egypt and the garment industry in Jordan. The field research included qualitative interviews with 54 owners-managers from 38 factories, 13 industry and labour experts, 27 workers, multiple field observations, and document research. A content analysis of the collected data identified sub-topics that were subsequently analysed in-depth for scientific publication. This final thesis presents four scientific papers highlighting different aspects pertaining to the research questions.

The first paper introduces the notion of crossvergence as a conceptual lens for understanding and analysing the formation of (in)decent work practices in supplier firms. The concept underscores the complicated role of suppliers in ensuring decent work in global production networks. Owners-managers of supplier firms must consider multiple, partially contradicting glo-cal influences when making employment decisions. In particular, they are affected by global competition, global public and private labour regulations, local institutions, local socio-culture, and the local industry environment. Understanding their decisions requires not only an analysis of these glo-cal influences but also an analysis of how suppliers process these influences as active agents.
The second paper investigates the progress towards decent work in the garment industry in Jordan between 2006 and 2018. A qualitative explanatory case analysis served to dissect the glo-cal influences on suppliers that shaped decent work realities in Jordan. The results further refine the crossvergence framework that was developed in the first paper and illuminate the multi-level developments needed to promote decent work in Jordan. Public, business, and labour stakeholders on global, local-industry, and factory levels influenced decent work outcomes in Jordan. The paper shows that decent work progress in Jordan was only possible with a third-party mediator and advisor, Better Work Jordan, which aligned glo-cal stakeholder demands and enabled suppliers to develop decent work capabilities and practices.

The third paper analyses the diffusion of global labour standards in the garment production network. A qualitative multiple-case analysis served to compare glo-cal influences on and working hours practices of tier-1 and tier-2 garment suppliers in Jordan and garment and textiles suppliers in Egypt. The results show that crossvergence dynamics play out differently in different nodes and stages of the garment production network. Aggressive procurement practices, as well as intellectual, financial, and physical resource limitations, drove excessive working hours of lower-tier suppliers. The paper highlights the need for new purchasing strategies in the garment production network, as well as further investments in initiatives that strengthen local resources for decent work practices.

The fourth paper explores cognitive decent work frames of garment factory owners-managers that influence decent work decision-making. A thematic analysis of the collected research data revealed that owners-managers in Egypt and Jordan dominantly frame decent work as a (paternalistic) family responsibility and as a business responsibility. Additionally, owners-managers generally agreed with the imperative of human rights and the protection of basic human needs. The detected frames only partially accorded with global conceptualisations of decent work, thereby raising questions about the universal applicability of global labour standards. The paper suggests including universalistic (human rights-oriented) and particularistic (supplier responsibility-oriented) regulations in global standards to improve their legitimacy and effectiveness.

The results of this thesis contribute to the decent work debate in theory and practice. First, the thesis provides the research community with an analytical tool – the crossvergence framework – to capture glo-cal influences on suppliers and to account for supplier agency when discussing decent work outcomes in supplier firms. Second, it
deducts specific propositions for the design and implementation of global labour standards to better account for local needs and value systems. Third, it proposes a redistribution of roles and responsibilities in the quest for decent work in global garment production, captured in a synergistic cooperation paradigm. The paradigm highlights the institutionalisation of glo-cal initiatives, like the Better Work country programs, in local production contexts, as well as the obligation for the global North to ensure responsible purchasing practices of global garment brands and retailers.
Samenvatting

Een van de Duurzame Ontwikkelingsdoelen is 'waardig werk voor iedereen' in 2030. In de wereldwijde textiel- en kledingindustrie hebben werkgevers en werknemers in de publieke en private sector zich op mondiaal en lokaal niveau ingespannen om dit doel te bereiken. Desondanks komt onwaardig werk nog steeds voor, vooral in textiel- en kledingbedrijven in het wereldwijde Zuiden. Uit eerder onderzoek blijkt dat een groot aantal mondiale en lokale (glocal of glokale) factoren de werkomstandigheden in de fabriek beïnvloedt. Om het complexe probleem van het waarborgen van waardig werk in de wereldwijde kledingindustrie beter te begrijpen, ligt de focus van dit proefschrift op de actor in de mondiale productienetwerken bij wie de mondiaal invloeden op elkaar inwerken: de lokale producent. De drie onderzoeksvragen zijn: (1) Hoe convergeren en divergeren (crossverge) glokale invloeden op het niveau van de producent en hoe leiden deze tot (on)waardige arbeidsomstandigheden in het wereldwijde kledingproductienetwerk? (2) Hoe verspreidt deze dynamiek van crossvergence (kruisvergentie) zich over de verschillende horizontale knooppunten en verticale stadia van het wereldwijde kledingproductienetwerk? (3) Hoe formuleren eigenaren-managers van kledingbedrijven hun kijk op waardig werk?

Om de onderzoeksvragen te beantwoorden is onderzoek gedaan naar de vorming van glokale perspectieven en voorbeelden van waardig werk in de textiel- en kledingindustrie in Egypte en de kledingindustrie in Jordanië. Het veldonderzoek omvatte kwalitatieve interviews met 54 eigenaren-managers van 38 fabrieken, 13 deskundigen uit de sector en op het gebied van arbeid, 27 werknemers, diverse observaties in het veld en archiefonderzoek. Uit een inhoudsanalyse van de verzamelde gegevens kwamen subonderwerpen naar voren die vervolgens nader werden onderzocht voor publicatie in wetenschappelijke tijdschriften. In dit proefschrift zijn vier wetenschappelijke artikelen opgenomen waarin verschillende aspecten van de onderzoeksvragen worden belicht.

In het eerste artikel wordt het begrip kruisvergentie gepresenteerd als analytisch kader voor het begrijpen en onderzoeken van de vorming van (on)waardige arbeidsomstandigheden in productiebedrijven. Met dit begrip wordt de gecompliceerde rol van producenten bij het waarborgen van waardig werk in wereldwijde productienetwerken benadrukt. Eigenaren-managers van productiebedrijven moeten rekening houden met verschillende, deels tegenstrijdige glokale invloeden bij het nemen van arbeidsbeslissingen. Zij worden in het bijzonder beïnvloed door mondiaal
concurrentie, mondiale publieke en private arbeidsregelgeving, lokale instellingen, de plaatselijke sociale cultuur en de lokale omstandigheden in de bedrijfstak. Om hun beslissingen te begrijpen is niet alleen onderzoek naar deze glokale invloeden nodig, maar moet ook onderzocht worden hoe producenten als actieve actoren omgaan met deze invloeden.

Het tweede artikel gaat over de vorderingen op het gebied van waardig werk in de kledingindustrie in Jordanië van 2006 tot 2018. De glokale invloeden die hebben gezorgd voor waardige werkomstandigheden in Jordanië zijn in kaart gebracht met een kwalitatieve casestudy. Met de onderzoeksresultaten wordt het kruisvergentiekader uit het eerste artikel verder uitgewerkt. Ook worden de meerlagige ontwikkelingen belicht die vereist zijn om waardig werk in Jordanië te bevorderen. Werkgevers en werknemers in de publieke en private sector hebben op mondiaal, lokaal-sectoraal en fabrieksniveau invloed gehad op het realiseren van waardig werk in Jordanië. In het artikel wordt uiteengezet dat vooruitgang op het gebied van waardig werk in Jordanië alleen mogelijk was met behulp van een derde partij als bemiddelaar en adviseur. Dit was Better Work Jordan en deze organisatie bracht de eisen van de glokale belanghebbenden op één lijn en stelde producenten in staat om waardig werk in de praktijk mogelijk te maken.

Het derde artikel gaat over de verspreiding van wereldwijde arbeidsnormen in het kledingproductienetwerk. Met een meervoudige casestudy is een vergelijking gemaakt tussen eerste- en tweedelijnskledingproducenten in Jordanië en kleding- en textielproducenten in Egypte wat betreft glokale invloeden en gehanteerde werktijden. De dynamiek van kruisvergentie blijkt verschillend uit te pakken op verschillende knooppunten en in verschillende stadia van het kledingproductienetwerk. Agressieve inkooppraktijken en intellectuele, financiële en fysieke beperkingen hebben geleid tot buitensporig lange werktijden van producenten op lagere niveaus in de toeleveringsketen. Dit artikel wijst op de behoefte aan nieuwe inkoopstrategieën in het kledingproductienetwerk, en op verdere investeringen in initiatieven ter versterking van lokale middelen om waardig werk te realiseren.

Het vierde artikel behandelt het denkkader met betrekking tot waardig werk dat eigenaren-managers van kledingfabrieken hanteren en dat van invloed is op hun besluitvorming over waardig werk. Uit een thematische analyse van de onderzoeksgegevens bleek dat eigenaren-managers in Egypte en Jordanië waardig werk overwegend beschouwen als een (paternalistische) verantwoordelijkheid van de familie en als zakelijke verantwoordelijkheid. Daarnaast onderschreven eigenaren-managers
over het algemeen het belang van mensenrechten en de bescherming van elementaire menselijke behoeften. Deze opvattingen kwamen slechts gedeeltelijk overeen met wereldwijde denkbeelden over waardig werk, wat vragen oproept over de universele toepasbaarheid van wereldwijde arbeidsnormen. In dit artikel wordt de aanbeveling gedaan om universele (op mensenrechten gerichte) en specifieke (op de verantwoordelijkheid van de producent gerichte) voorschriften op te nemen in wereldwijde normen om de legitimiteit en effectiviteit ervan te verhogen.

De resultaten van dit onderzoek leveren een theoretische en praktische bijdrage aan het debat over waardig werk. In de eerste plaats wordt in dit proefschrift het kruisvergentiekader gepresenteerd. Hiermee kunnen glokale invloeden op producenten in kaart worden gebracht en kan agency van producenten worden verklaard als het gaat om waardig werk in productiebedrijven. Ten tweede worden in dit proefschrift specifieke voorstellen gedaan voor het ontwerp en de implementatie van wereldwijde arbeidsnormen. Ten derde wordt in een synergetisch samenwerkingsparadigma een herverdeling van rollen en verantwoordelijkheden voorgesteld om te komen tot waardig werk in de wereldwijde kledingindustrie. In dit paradigma ligt de nadruk op de institutionalisering van glokale initiatieven (bijvoorbeeld landelijke Better Work-programma's) in een lokale productiecontext. Ook wordt gewezen op de verplichting van het wereldwijde Noorden om te zorgen voor verantwoorde inkooppraktijken van mondiale kledingmerken en detailhandelaars.
Zusammenfassung


Wettbewerb, globale öffentliche und private Arbeitsstandards, lokale Institutionen, die locale Soziokultur und das lokale Branchenumfeld beeinflusst. Das Verständnis ihrer Entscheidungen erfordert nicht nur eine Analyse dieser globalen Einflüsse, sondern auch eine Analyse der Art und Weise, wie Lieferanten diese Einflüsse als aktive Akteure verarbeiten.


Der vierte Artikel untersucht die kognitiven Bezugsrahmen („Frames“), die das Verständnis von menschenwürdiger Arbeit der Entscheidungsträger*innen in der Textil- und Bekleidungsindustrie prägen. Eine Themenanalyse zeigt, dass Entscheidungsträger*innen in Ägypten und Jordanien menschenwürdige Arbeit überwiegend als eine (paternalistische) Familienverantwortung und als eine
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1 Introduction

1.1 Research problem: Decent work in garment production – a remote prospect

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) postulate that “decent work for all” shall be achieved worldwide by 2030 (United Nations [UN], 2015). In the global garment production network (garment GPN)\(^1\), policy-makers, industry organisations, worker organisations, and global garment brands have invested in achieving this goal (Lebaron, 2020, p. 11; Reinecke et al., 2019, p. 7). International organisations endorse global public labour standards to promote minimum standards of employment worldwide (Hendrickx et al., 2016, p. 343), global brands demand that their suppliers comply with private labour standards (Yawar & Seuring, 2017, p. 626), and multi-stakeholder initiatives (MSIs) support standard setting and implementation (Baumann-Pauly et al., 2017, p. 772). Despite these efforts, indecent work realities persist (Anner, 2019, p. 706; Reinecke et al., 2019, p. 7), especially but not exclusively in the Global South (Crane et al., 2019, p. 101). Examples of these realities include textiles and garment workers being unable to cover their living expenses with their salaries (Ford & Gillan, 2017, p. 904), working more than 60 hours per week (Smyth et al., 2013, p. 383), lacking meaningful (union) representation (Anner, 2018, p. 75), and facing physical and verbal abuse to reach productivity targets (Anner, 2019, p. 706).

The Covid-19 pandemic magnified the fact that functional solutions to prevent indecent working conditions have not yet been implemented (Amengual & Kuruvilla, 2020, p. 809; Crane & Matten, 2021, p. 282; Kabir et al., 2021). Majumdar et al. (2020) show for South Asia that the negative effects of the pandemic trickled down to suppliers

---

\(^1\) The chains of companies arising and interacting across the globe to produce and sell a product are alternatively captured under the terms “global production networks” (GPNs), “global value chains” (GVCs), “global commodity chains” or “global supply chains” (Coe and Yeung, 2015, p.1). The alternative terms characterise the same phenomenon, but they highlight different understandings concerning the relationships among and value of the stakeholders involved in a supply chain (Wright and Kaine, 2015, p. 485-486). This dissertation primarily uses the term “global production network”, highlighting the complexity of and multi-actor involvement in today’s trade relationships. Coe and Yeung (2015, p. 2) “define a GPN as an organizational arrangement, comprising interconnected economic and non-economic actors, coordinated by a global lead firm, and producing goods or services across multiple geographical locations for worldwide markets.”
and caused massive layoffs and wage cuts that threw workers into severe poverty. Suppliers simultaneously faced order cancellations and payment cuts from buyers, struggled with disruptions in raw material supply, had to comply with local lockdowns and health protocols, and were directly responsible for the survival of their workers (International Labour Organization [ILO], 2020, p. 1; Majumdar et al., 2020, p. 151). Public and private stakeholders at global and local levels could not prevent such challenges in Indonesia, and the Ministry of Industry estimates that 30% of workers lost their jobs in the garment and footwear industry at the beginning of the pandemic (ILO, 2020, p. 10). For Bangladesh, Anner (2020a, p. 2) reports the same phenomenon and highlights that 70% of furloughed or terminated workers were not paid. In the face of these developments, it remains questionable whether the goal of achieving decent work for all textiles and garment workers worldwide can be met by 2030.

Against this background, my dissertation was driven by the interest to better understand the complex problem of ensuring decent work in global production and the wish to contribute to finding functioning solutions. I proceeded as follows. First, the research subject decent work and its codification in global labour standards were defined and delimitated from related concepts (see section 1.2). Second, I reviewed existing literature to gain a better understanding of the research problem, identify research gaps, and define the research questions that guided the PhD project. Based on the literature review, I decided to focus on the perspective of suppliers in the Global South and to analyse how global and local (glo-cal) influences shape their decent work perceptions and decisions (see section 1.3). Third, the study was framed theoretically. Within this dissertation, I combine three perspectives: a GPN lens² (Coe & Yeung, 2015) on GPN dynamics, a crossvergence lens (Ralston, 2008) on how suppliers within one industry process glo-cal demands, and a cognitive framing lens (Cornelissen & Werner, 2014; J. P. Walsh, 1995) on decision-making within supplier firms (see section 1.4). Fourth, I specified the context for the empirical analysis: the export-oriented textiles and garment industries in Egypt and Jordan (see section 1.5). Fifth, a qualitative multiple case study research design was defined, empirical data were collected and analysed, and the quality

² The term GPN refers not only to the actual trade networks but also to a theoretical approach for analysing them. In this dissertation, italics are used for demarcating the theoretical approach.
of the conducted research was evaluated (see section 1.6). Sixth, selected research findings were presented at scientific conferences and/or published in peer-reviewed journals (see section 1.7 and chapters 3–5). Seventh, overall conclusions of this research project were drawn and their implications for theory and practice discussed (see chapter 6).

1.2 Research subject: Decent work and global labour standards in GPNs

1.2.1 Decent work

This dissertation uses the term “decent work” to describe the research topic. It was coined by the ILO in 1999 and is defined by the ILO on a macro-economic level:

Decent work sums up the aspirations of people in their working lives. It involves opportunities for work that is productive and delivers a fair income, security in the workplace and social protection for families, better prospects for personal development and social integration, freedom for people to express their concerns, organize and participate in the decisions that affect their lives and equality of opportunity and treatment for all women and men. (ILO, 2022, first paragraph)

The concept gained recognition when it was included in the SDGs in 2015. Since then, it has been increasingly used in the debate on working conditions in GPNs to characterise the desired outcome (e.g. Anner, 2020b; Hasle & Vang, 2021; Soundararajan et al., 2021). In this context, however, it loses its macro-economic operationalisation and is used on an organisational level to describe work realities in supplier firms. It is thereby often used as an umbrella term (Soundararajan et al., 2021, p. 4) for different related concepts, rather than a stand-alone concept with a single conceptualisation. This allows linking the debate on working conditions in GPNs, which uses a multitude of other concepts (see paragraph after next), to an internationally recognized terminology and the SDGs.

The ILO’s conceptualisation of decent work was developed on a global level. The definition shows that the concept is about work-related aspirations of people and clarifies which aspirations are to be included. The listed aspirations and their operationalisation (ILO, 2013) are not uncontested though. In the context of developing country supplier firms, it has previously been shown that local stakeholders do not necessarily share global understandings of what makes a workplace decent (Bae et al., 2021; de Neve, 2014;
Flanigan, 2018; Fontana & Egels-Zandén, 2019). This dissertation therefore considers the listed aspirations to be one important global understanding – among other understandings – of what makes a workplace decent. Instead of pre-defining aspirations that make a workplace decent, it follows the proposition of Blustein et al. (2016, p. 4) and links the concept of decent work to positive health and well-being outcomes for workers. Decent work is therefore understood in this dissertation to capture the aspirations of people in their working lives that positively affect their health and well-being, plus work-related aspirations that prevent detrimental effects. Part of this dissertation is based on analysing decent work frames of owners-managers of supplier firms in the research contexts and comparing them with global understandings (see chapter 5).

Multiple other concepts address the quality of work in GPNs (Berliner et al., 2015, p. 194). Decent work is commonly discussed as a “social issue” (Yawar & Seuring, 2017, p. 625) under the headings of “corporate social responsibility” (CSR) (Fontana & Egels-Zandén, 2019; Lund-Thomsen et al., 2016a), “social sustainability” (Koberg & Longoni, 2019; Soundararajan et al., 2021), or “social upgrading” (Barrientos et al., 2016). Works addressing the human dimension more specifically additionally refer to “human rights” (Lebaron, 2021), “workers’ rights” (Anner, 2020b), or “labour issues” (S. H. Lee et al., 2019) in GPNs. While the different concepts imply different understandings of what is considered decent (see chapter 5), a common theme is that they address (among other aspects) the quality of employment in supplier firms (Berliner et al., 2015, p. 195; Soundararajan & Brown, 2016, pp. 85–86). This dissertation therefore considers all publications that address questions related to decent work in GPNs, independent of the terminology they use.

1.2.2 Global labour standards

In the debate on decent work in GPNs, global labour standards play a central role in combatting labour abuse in supplier firms (Amengual & Kuruvilla, 2020, pp. 809–810). These standards manage market access and convey an understanding of what is decent or

---

3 Klassen and Vereecke (2012, p. 103) define social issues in global production “as product- or process-related aspects of operations that affect human safety, welfare and community development.”
fair to suppliers in the Global South (Dolan, 2010, p. 41; F. R. Khan & Lund-Thomsen, 2011, p. 87). As they are repeatedly referred to throughout this dissertation, they are introduced here, along with the distinction between public standards and private standards.

**Public global labour standards:** Global and regional institutions define labour standards to harmonise national institutional frameworks and to inform the definition of private global standards. A prominent actor on the global level is the ILO (Hendrickx et al., 2016, p. 343) which defines “international labour standards” with the aspiration to “represent the international consensus on how a particular labour problem could be addressed at the global level” (ILO, 2019a, p. 17). Member states must consider integrating ILO conventions into their national legal systems. Additionally, international institutions, workers’ organisations, NGOs, and multinational enterprises (MNEs) use ILO conventions as a baseline for lobbying local governments. A second prominent global reference for labour standards is the OECD’s “Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises”. The guidelines are intended to stimulate CSR of MNEs, and they specifically include the responsibility for working conditions in a company’s supply chain (OECD, 2011, pp. 19–20). On a regional, bi-lateral, or multi-lateral level, trade agreements furthermore define labour standards that need to be adhered to for market access. Within the European Union (EU), the European Social Charter defines fundamental social and economic rights that businesses operating in the EU need to comply with (Council of Europe, 2015). Additionally, bilateral trade concessions are only granted to countries complying with the ILO’s core labour standards. Similarly but less pronounced, the North American Free Trade Agreement contains a side agreement that addresses labour issues, and preferential trade treaties specify minimum standards for working conditions and labour rights (Compa, 2001). Regional trade agreements and associations in the Global South have made the first steps in the direction of joint standards in the form of recommendations rather than legal obligations (Briscoe & Schuler, 2004, p. 195).

**Private global labour standards:** MNEs entered the debate on labour standards in the 1990s. Levi Strauss and Nike were among the first companies that, in response to adverse publicity, imposed private regulatory policies on their suppliers (Briscoe & Schuler, 2004, p. 184). Currently, a multitude of regulatory systems have arisen that differ in their definition of labour standards as well as their monitoring regimes. Nadvi and Wälttring (2002) differentiate between various generations of private labour standards, including
individual company codes of conduct defined by MNEs (e.g. Nike or Levi Strauss), industry standards agreed upon by different business actors (e.g. Responsible Care of the Chemicals Industry), industry standards agreed upon by business and civil society actors (e.g. the Common Code for the Coffee Community), and generic, multi-stakeholder, standards agreed upon by public, business and civil society actors (e.g. Ethical Trading Initiative [ETI]; Fair Labor Association [FLA]; Social Accountability International [SAI]). The first two generations were monitored by MNEs, and industry associations and the newer generations of labour standards now rely on market-based independent certification bodies to monitor compliance. In 2021, 196 standards addressing labour issues in the context of global production could be identified (International Trade Center [ITC] Standards Map).

In the research contexts of this dissertation, the research interviews and the document review showed that the following global labour standards were relevant for suppliers: the International Labour Standards of the ILO, five generic private standards (amfori BSCI, 2018; ETI, 2014; FLA, 2011; Sedex, 2017; SAI, 2014), and selected individual company codes of conducts (e.g. Nike, Adidas). The standards converge with regard to general principles such as prohibitions on child labour, forced labour, excessive working hours, and discrimination, as well as protection of the right to organise and the rights to occupational health and safety and to security. Nevertheless, differences in the concrete specification of the general principles prevail. For example, while the ILO refers to local legislation to limit overtime hours, Nike’s Code of Conduct prohibits excessive hours exceeding 60 hours per week (Nike Inc., 2020, p. 8).

1.3 Existing literature and research gaps

1.3.1 Previous research

Research on decent work in GPNs is conducted from multiple perspectives. GPN research focuses on GPN dynamics and their impact on labour (Knorringa & Nadvi, 2016, p. 58) and discusses vertical (global) and horizontal (local) public and private...
governance mechanisms\textsuperscript{4} to protect textiles and garment workers (e.g. Gereffi & Lee, 2016; Schrage & Gilbert, 2021). Development scholars contribute insights on economic\textsuperscript{5} and social upgrading potentials in GPNs (e.g. Barrientos et al., 2016), whereby social upgrading refers to the improvement of decent work in factories (Barrientos, Mayer, et al., 2011, p. 301). Research on sustainable supply chain management (e.g. Köksal et al., 2017), socially responsible sourcing (e.g. Zorzini et al., 2015), or CSR in the supply chain (e.g. Feng et al., 2017; Yawar & Seuring, 2017) focuses on the role of global buyers, especially MNEs, and how they can ensure compliance with labour standards in their supply chains. International law scholarship adds insights on hard and soft legal instruments\textsuperscript{6} and their de jure and de facto impact on human and labour rights in GPNs (e.g. Bartley, 2011; Caraway, 2010; Norpoth, 2014). Research on labour and employment relations focuses on the agency of workers (e.g. Das, 2016; Pun et al., 2020), how workers are affected by GPN dynamics (e.g. Anner, 2019), and the state of employment relations in garment production countries (e.g. Alamgir & Banerjee, 2019).

My review of existing literature revealed that multiple global and local influences shape (in)decent work outcomes in garment GPNs. The situation can – in simplified form – be pictured as follows. Global competitive pressures put downward pressure on the quality work of supplier firms (Anner, 2019, p. 724). Global private regulation is intended to counter this effect but is only effective if a series of pre-conditions are met (Berliner et al., 2015, pp. 200–201; Toffel et al., 2015, p. 219). Local public institutions in the Global South often fail to protect workers on their own (Meardi & Marginson, 2014, p. 655) but can contribute to achieving decent work in their interaction with global regulatory efforts (Toffel et al., 2015, p. 219). Workers often lack the necessary bargaining power and functional institutional representation to effectively protect their labour rights (Anner, 2011, pp. 318–319; Zajak, 2017, p. 537) but can drive substantial decent work

\textsuperscript{4} Gereffi and Lee (2016, p. 30) distinguish vertical governance that coordinates along the value chain, horizontal governance that coordinates within a specific location, private governance that is driven by private actors (especially MNEs) and public governance that is driven by public actors (governments at various levels, supranational organisations).

\textsuperscript{5} Economic upgrading includes the improvement of production processes, produced products, business functions and sales markets or GPNs (Barrientos, Gereffi, and Rossi 2011, pp. 323-324).

\textsuperscript{6} Hard law "refers to legally binding obligations that are precise [...] and that delegate authority for interpreting and implementing the law (Abbott and Snidal, 2000, p. 421). Soft law “begins once legal arrangements are weakened along one or more of the dimensions of obligation, precision, and delegation” (Abbott and Snidal, 2000, p. 422).
improvements if they are empowered and integrated into networks of labour activism (Zajak et al., 2017, p. 538). To be effective, all decent work measures need to account for local cultural and industry specifics (Perry et al., 2015, p. 741; Soundararajan & Brown, 2016, p. 99). The first article drafted in the course of this dissertation theoretically discusses these findings in further detail and includes a structured overview of global and local (in)decent work drivers (see chapter 2).

1.3.2 Research gaps

The summary of research insights shows that not only multiple factors but also a multiplicity of factor interactions need to be accounted for when studying decent work in global production. It was therefore rather astonishing to find that comparatively little research exists on the actor in GPNs that stands where the factors interact: the local supplier. More supplier-centred research has been called for (Feng et al., 2017, p. 305; Köksal et al., 2017, p. 24; Perry et al., 2015, p. 749; Soundararajan, 2014, p. 351). Thereby suppliers ought to be considered as active agents who are likely to pursue different strategies depending on their evaluation of the situation (Scott, 2013, pp. 94–95; Yeung & Coe, 2015, pp. 32–33). Research on suppliers can further understanding on how different external influence factors are processed by owners-managers and which factor constellations motivate the improvement of work realities on the ground. Thereby, it needs to be noted that since work on this PhD project started, insights on the supplier perspective have grown. I integrated recent publication insights in my latest journal articles (see chapters 4 and 5) and the conclusion. Compared with research on other GPN actors, research on suppliers nevertheless continues to be underdeveloped (Bae et al., 2021, p. 654; Fontana & Egels-Zandén, 2019, p. 1047; Villena, 2019, p. 1149).

With a focus on the supplier perspective, the following more specific research gaps could be identified that will be addressed with this dissertation.

Most research projects in garment GPNs focus on working conditions in garment factories that directly export to global buyers or their agents (tier-1 suppliers) (Gold et al., 2020, pp. 1274–1275; Mares, 2010, p. 194). However, the effectiveness of global labour standards is argued to decrease as one moves farther away from the lead firm, the global buyer (Grimm et al., 2016, p. 1972; Villena, 2019, p. 1149). For example, Soundararajan and Brown (2016) confirm this effect empirically for horizontal subcontracting (tier-1 garment suppliers subcontract a share of their production volume to tier-2 garment suppliers). In addition, lower-tier suppliers showed lower levels of labour standard
compliance in Bangladesh (Alamgir & Banerjee, 2019, p. 292) and India (Anner, 2019, pp. 711–712). However, the diffusion of labour standards has rarely been analysed in the vertical garment supply chain (tier-1 garment suppliers buy textiles and other garment components from lower stages of the supply chain). Previous research findings suggest that working conditions are not necessarily worse in lower stages of the supply chain, particularly textiles production (Cooke & He, 2010, p. 355; Grace Annapoorani, 2017, p. 57). This shows that the factors affecting decent work differences across different horizontal and vertical nodes of the garment GPN are incompletely understood. To better understand the interplay of glo-cal drivers on (in)decent working conditions in the garment GPN, it is therefore necessary to not only analyse tier-1 garment suppliers but also those at lower tiers, as well as textiles and raw material suppliers.

The decent work concept and the different sets of public and private labour standards are often defined at a global level (see section 1.2). Yet increasing evidence suggests that GPN actors from the Global South have – at least partially – a different understanding of what makes a workplace decent (e.g. Bae et al., 2021; Fontana & Egels-Zandén, 2019; Hoogesteger & Massink, 2021). These findings are problematic for the decent work debate as they question the universal legitimacy of global labour standards (de Neve, 2014, p. 204; F. R. Khan & Lund-Thomsen, 2011, p. 86). They furthermore influence actor decision-making and provide an argument for suppliers to circumvent existing global regulations (Bae et al., 2021, p. 654). Previous research mainly focused on showing that local understandings can contradict global understandings. For the concept of decent work in particular, how owners-managers of supplier firms construct their own decent work understanding has not been evaluated. These insights are necessary to better understand decent work decisions in supplier firms and to improve global decent work concepts and standards so that they better integrate the perspective of developing country suppliers.

Decent work in garment GPNs has been especially researched in South, East, and Southeast Asia, particularly in China (e.g. Jiang et al., 2012; Smyth et al., 2013), India (e.g. Anner, 2019; Jamali et al., 2017), Bangladesh (e.g. Alamgir & Banerjee, 2019; Fontana & Egels-Zandén, 2019), Sri Lanka (e.g. MacCarthy & Jayarathe, 2012; Perry et al., 2015), and Vietnam (e.g. Anner, 2018; Tran & Jeppesen, 2016). Furthermore, some researchers have focused on Latin and South America (e.g. Dewey, 2018; Posthuma & Bignami, 2014). Middle Eastern and North African contexts have drawn considerably
less research attention.\textsuperscript{7} Looking at the research contexts of this dissertation, my literature review revealed less than a dozen scientific publications on decent work issues in the garment GPNs in Egypt\textsuperscript{8} and Jordan\textsuperscript{9} in the last ten years. This is line with the observation of Al Ariss and Sidani (2016a, p. 356) and Budhwar et al. (2019, p. 920) who call for more research work and Human Resource Management (HRM) in the Middle East and North Africa.

1.4 Theoretical background: GPN, crossvergence, and framing approaches

1.4.1 The GPN perspective

The preceding literature review showed that employment practices of suppliers are not only influenced by their local business environment but also subject to global dynamics in GPNs. To account for these dynamics, the \textit{GPN approach} guided my analysis. The network view is especially relevant in complex GPNs, such as the garment GPN (Pickles et al., 2015, p. 383), that involve multiple actors and span across a wide range of locations (Coe & Yeung, 2015, pp. 1–2). The \textit{GPN perspective} overlaps theoretically with the \textit{GVC approach} (Coe & Yeung, 2019, p. 776; Gereffi et al., 2001, p. 2). While the \textit{GVC approach} focuses on the actors and processes involved in the creation of a good or service (Gereffi et al., 2001, p. 3; Nadvi & Raj-Reichert, 2015, p. 244), the \textit{GPN approach} explicitly extends the analysis to include non-economic actors that influence power dynamics within GPNs (Coe & Yeung, 2015, p. 2, 2019, p. 783). This dissertation therefore follows the proposition of Coe et al. (2008, p. 3) and views the \textit{GPN approach} as an extension of linear chain approaches such as the \textit{GVC approach}. Consequently, it considers theoretical insights that are published under both headings.

\textsuperscript{7} For notable exceptions see, for example, Cairoli (2011); Plank et al. (2014); Arianna Rossi (2011, 2013); plus the publications on Egypt and Jordan listed below.

\textsuperscript{8} Abdel-Hamid Morssi (2016); Azmeh (2014); Azmeh and Nadvi (2014); Kamal (2014).

\textsuperscript{9} Aissi et al. (2018); Azmeh (2014); Azmeh and Nadvi (2014); Domat et al. (2012); Kolben (2013, 2015, 2019); Lenner and Turner (2019); Robertson (2019).
The GPN perspective informed the terminology in this dissertation. Terms such as GPN, private regulation, public regulation, global buyer, or tier-1/ tier-2 supplier originate from the GPN debate. Furthermore, the GPN perspective provided an overview of the actors shaping GPN dynamics, including economic actors that add value in garment production (suppliers, buyers, agents, distributors, etc.) (Appelbaum & Gereffi, 1994, p. 46; Frederick, 2019, p. 36) and non-economic actors (nation states, labour groups, industry organisations, civil society actors, international organisations, development actors, etc.) (Coe & Yeung, 2019, p. 783; Frederick, 2019, p. 31; Yeung & Coe, 2015, p. 32). GPN scholarship formed my understanding of power dynamics within GPNs, particularly existing governance structures, inter-actor linkages and upgrading strategies (Coe & Yeung, 2019; Gereffi et al., 2005).

The GPN approach was not the only theoretical frame used in this dissertation. To account for the multiplicity of network relationships and complex power dynamics, the GPN perspective needs to retain a high level of abstraction (Wright & Kaine, 2015, p. 486). Ponte and Sturgeon (2014, p. 196) propose a “modular-theory-building approach” to connect micro-level theories on single actor linkages to the overall picture of multi-actor GPNs. For tier-1 and tier-2 suppliers, these micro-level theories are, however, yet to be further developed (Bae et al., 2021, p. 654; Fontana & Egels-Zandén, 2019, p. 1047; Villena, 2019, p. 1149). This paper therefore borrowed from other disciplines to theoretically construct the perspective of developing country suppliers in GPNs. In particular, the crossvergence perspective and cognitive framing theories were used, as will be outlined in the following sections.

Please note that while the theoretical GPN perspective permeates this dissertation, the term GPN is used alternately with the term “global supply chain” (see e.g. chapters 2 and 3) depending on the terminology dominating a particular publication outlet.

1.4.2 The crossvergence perspective

The crossvergence perspective originates from international business research. Ralston (2008, p. 29) describes it as advocating “that the combination of [local] sociocultural influences and [globalising] business ideology influences is the driving force that precipitates the development of new and unique value systems among individuals in a society owing to the dynamic interaction of these influences”. In international business research, and particularly in international human resource management (IHRM), the discipline that addresses work-related issues in international business, the crossvergence
perspective is used to solve the dilemma of simultaneously existing convergence and divergence trends (Al Ariss & Sidani, 2016a, p. 353; Ralston, 2008, pp. 28–29). Convergence trends are found when business environments become similar worldwide due to globalisation and ‘best’ practices travel around the globe (Kerr et al., 1960; Levitt, 1983; Prentice, 1990). Especially in MNEs, headquarter policies and practices are transferred to local subsidiaries. Divergence trends, on the other hand, describe prevailing differences of business practices across countries. They are linked to institutional and cultural differences across countries (Al Ariss & Sidani, 2016a, p. 352).

Prior to this dissertation, the crossvergence perspective was not used to explain GPN dynamics. However, it fits well with the insights generated on decent work in GPNs. GPN and crossvergence scholarship alike find the interaction of global and local influences on local (supplier) firms to shape employment practices in international business environments (Al Ariss & Sidani, 2016a, p. 353; Barrientos, Mayer, et al., 2011, p. 313; Brewster et al., 2015, pp. 463–464; Gereffi & Lee, 2016, p. 30). The crossvergence perspective thereby goes beyond the focus on governance and power dynamics inherent in the GPN approach (e.g. Gereffi et al., 2005); for instance, it also considers the local cultural environment and its impact on work relations and practices (Al Ariss & Sidani, 2016a, p. 352; Reiche et al., 2012). This inspired me to develop a crossvergence framework for research on suppliers in GPNs (see chapter 2). This framework combines the crossvergence perspective with research insights on decent work in GPNs, and it guided the empirical work conducted in this dissertation.

The crossvergence and the GPN perspective point to the importance of conceptualising local (supplier) firms as active agents that design their individual business practices in response to global and local dynamics (Winchester & Bailey, 2012, pp. 13–15; Yeung & Coe, 2015, p. 34). For further guidance on how to conceptualise decision-making in supplier firms, I turned to the cognitive perspective in management, as outlined in the next section.

1.4.3 The cognitive framing perspective

The cognitive perspective in organisation and management studies focuses on mental processes and their impact on decision-making and behaviour (J. P. Walsh, 1995, p. 281). It is especially used to further understanding of how decisions are made in ethically ambiguous situations and highly complex situations (Hahn et al., 2014, p. 463), which both describe the situation of suppliers regarding decent work in global production.
The cognitive perspective suggests that decision-makers construct ‘cognitive frames’ of different concepts which aid them in ‘making sense’ of ambiguous situations related to these concepts and ultimately provide behavioural guidance (Fassin et al., 2011, p. 427; J. P. Walsh, 1995, p. 281). Combining cognitive frames with the crossvergence theory (Ralston, 2008) and ethical decision-making models (Hunt & Vitell, 2006; Zeni et al., 2016) yields the following picture of the relationship. Cognitive frames inform the evaluation of glo-cal influences on suppliers and therewith a decision-makers’ ethical judgement and behaviour. Cognitive frames therefore influence how owners-managers of supplier firms respond to glo-cal dynamics.

This dissertation follows a dynamic or interactive position on cognitive frames which is closely connected with a social constructivist view of the world (Gutierrez-Huerter O et al., 2021, p. 4; Zimmermann et al., 2021, p. 3). Social constructionists highlight that our understanding of reality is socially constructed (Berger & Luckmann, 1991). Independent of whether an objective reality exists or not, (groups of) individuals construct a subjective understanding of reality based on their previous experiences and social interactions. This dissertation therefore used the empirical research to trace how local stakeholders socially construct shared moral interpretations, in order to better understand ethical decision-making (Reinecke & Ansari, 2015, p. 868). The cognitive perspective thus permeates this dissertation, and it especially informed the theoretical approach in my article on decent work frames (see chapter 5).

1.5 Guiding research questions

Three research questions guided the work in this PhD project. The published articles address aspects related to these questions.

(1) How do glo-cal influences crossverge at the point of the supplier and motivate (in)decent work outcomes in the garment GPN?

(2) How do crossvergence dynamics diffuse across different horizontal nodes and vertical stages of the garment GPN?

(3) How do owners-managers of garment supplier firms frame their decent work perspectives?

The conclusion of this dissertation picks up the initial ambition to contribute starting points for overcoming the impasse of indecent working conditions in the garment GPN and discusses implications for research and practice.
1.6 Research context: Textiles and garment industries in Egypt and Jordan

1.6.1 Garment global production network

The highly globalised garment GPN is of core importance for economic development in many countries across the Global South (Pickles et al., 2015, p. 383). With its low entry barriers, the garment stage of production (low skilled jobs, low technical requirements, low fixed costs) has been a gateway for developing countries to diversify their exports activities (Pickles et al., 2015, p. 383; Staritz et al., 2016, p. 1). The value of worldwide annual exports totalled $US 305 bn. for textiles and $US 494 bn. for garments in 2019 (WTO, 2022). United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (2018, first paragraph) estimates that the fashion industry offers more than 75 million job opportunities worldwide, many of them in the Global South (Perry et al., 2015, p. 738). The GPN is furthermore known for its employment opportunities for women. On average, 45% of workers in the textiles sector and 68% of workers in the garment sector are female, shares that are much higher than the overall share of female employees in industry in general (ILO, 2014, p. 12).

Contemporary garment GPNs are highly complex (see figure 1), and the vertical supply chain consists of multiple stages. Specifically, raw materials are transformed into textiles and other garment components, which are subsequently assembled into garments and then exported and marketed and sold to the end consumer (Appelbaum & Gereffi, 1994, p. 46). Exporters are thereby either in direct contact with garment brands and retailers or sell their products via agents. On a horizontal level, exporters (tier-1 suppliers) can subcontract parts of their sales volume to subcontractors (tier-2/ lower-tier suppliers) (Gold et al., 2020, p. 1274; Soundararajan & Brown, 2016, pp. 91–92). Additionally, non-economic actors influence trade in the GPN; these actors can include local governments, business associations and labour organisations/ unions, international organisations, global

10 The empirical research for this dissertation was conducted before the Covid-19 pandemic. Therefore, data from before the pandemic are presented to describe the garment GPN.
This dissertation focuses on tier-1 and tier-2 textiles and garment production (highlighted in dark grey in figure 1). The textiles stage of production encompasses the production, imprinting and dying of yarns and fabrics (Appelbaum & Gereffi, 1994, p. 46; Fukunishi et al., 2013, p. 24). The garment stage of production focuses on the assembly of garment components; textiles and other inputs are cut, made and trimmed into garment that is exported and later sold by retailers (Appelbaum & Gereffi, 1994, p. 46; Fukunishi et al., 2013, p. 24).

Figure 1. Exemplary model of a garment GPN
Source: Own creation based on FWF (2010), Frederick (2019, p. 36) and Appelbaum and Gereffi (1994, p. 46)

Power structures in the garment GPN are characterised as follows. Most garment GPNs are controlled by powerful buyers (Fernandez-Stark et al., 2011, p. 7; Staritz et al.,
2016, p. 3). The lead firm, often a MNE based in Europe or Northern America, takes charge of design, marketing and sales and outsources the bulk of the manufacturing process to suppliers in the Global South (Gereffi & Memedovic, 2003, p. 3; Perry et al., 2015, p. 738). Thereby, the lead firm exerts significant control over its network of suppliers and often determines the product and production requirements, timelines, how much to produce and what the prices should be (Jamali et al., 2017, p. 460). Furthermore, it has been observed in recent years that large Asian tier-1 suppliers are increasingly taking control of coordinating the lower stages of the supply chain (Merk, 2014, p. 278).

1.6.2 Textiles and garment industry in Egypt

The dissertation encompasses empirical research in the textiles industry and the garment industry in Egypt (see figure 1). Both stages of the garment GPN are of core importance for the Egyptian trade and labour market. In 2015, the garment GPN contributed 3% to the Egyptian GDP, accounted for 16% of industrial growth and represented 15% of non-oil and gas exports (Egyptian Ministry of Trade and Industry, 2015, p. 2). The export value of the garment industry ($US 1.7 bn.) is larger than that of textiles exports ($US 1.3 bn.) (UN, 2022; data: 2019). Most importantly, the industries employed more than half a million workers in a country otherwise marked by high unemployment rates (Raza et al., 2020, p. 19). Most of textiles and garment manufacturing takes place in Egypt’s industrial zones in Lower Egypt. This dissertation includes research in the main textiles and garment production centres in Greater Cairo (10th of Ramadan, Shoubra El Kheima, El Obour), Port Said, Alexandria (Borg El Arab, Alexandria city), and Central Delta (El Mahalla) (see figure 2).

The distinguishing feature of the Egyptian garment GPN is its long-standing historical tradition and close ties to national government, especially in the textiles industry. Industrial forms of cotton farming, spinning, and weaving started in 1818, and the production of cotton textiles and garments remained a key feature of the Egyptian industry and under close protection of the government until the 1970s (Abdallah et al., 2012, p. 17; El-Haddad, 2012, p. 2). Today, most cotton ginners and a series of textiles companies remain publicly owned (Abdallah et al., 2012, pp. 15–16). Privatisation took place especially in the garment industry. The ready-made garment sector, which is closely embedded in global trade flows, developed around the 1990s (Grumiller et al., 2020, p. 19). Nevertheless, close local and traditional ties remain. Medium-sized, family-owned enterprises are the typical players in the private upstream textiles and garment production (Abdallah et al., 2012, pp. 15–16).
Another characteristic of the Egyptian garment GPN is its coverage of the whole production process from cotton cultivation to the manufacture of yarns, fabrics, and ready-made garments (El-Haddad, 2012, p. 2; Raza et al., 2020, p. 6). Many factories have integrated textiles production and garment assembly (characterised as “integrated firms” in figure 1). However, most raw materials, especially synthetic fibres, and some textiles still have to be imported from abroad (Raza et al., 2020, pp. 28–29). Egyptian exports focus on the markets of the United States and Europe, plus Turkey. The main export partners of textiles products are Turkey (21% of textiles exports), Italy (12%), and the United States (12%). The main export partners of garment products are the United States (56% of garment exports), followed by Spain, Germany, the United Kingdom, Turkey, and Italy (each between 3% and 10%) (own calculations based on: UN, 2022; data: 2019).

The labour base of the Egyptian garment GPN consists primarily of young workers with a secondary or technical school degree (Raza et al., 2020, p. 49, expert interviews). The share of female workers is high in comparison with other industries in Egypt but low compared with textiles and garment production in other countries (Abdallah et al., 2012, p. 22; Raza et al., 2020, p. 48). Suppliers employ local workers especially, with foreign workers sometimes being considered an alternative labour source owing to severe recruitment, retention, and productivity challenges in the industry (Azmeh, 2014, p. 501; Marello et al., 2009, p. 2). Labour costs are highly competitive (United Nations Economic Commission for Africa [UNECA], 2013, p. 1). A benchmark published by Arafa Holding (2017, p. 5), one of the largest textiles and garment enterprises in Egypt, presents hourly wages as slightly higher than in India but significantly lower than in China, Morocco, or Turkey. As the Egyptian Pound was devaluated shortly before the empirical research of this dissertation (Raza et al., 2020, p. 19), the relative value of wages decreased even further in 2017.

Analyses of labour-related challenges in the industry indicate that textiles and garment manufacturers suffer from high turnover rates, high absence rates, low labour productivity, and difficulties in attracting skilled and reliable workers (Abouel-Farag et al., 2012, p. 282; Aboughattas, 2016, pp. 8–11). This finding is frequently connected with the conclusion that sweatshop conditions are non-existent in the garment GPN in Egypt since workers just leave their employer if they are not satisfied (Azmeh, 2014, pp. 502–503; Marello et al., 2009, pp. 5–8). However, the increasing number of strikes (El-Haddad, 2012, p. 18), reports on missing social dialogue structures and child labour
(FLA, 2016; Ghoneim & Grote, 2006), and Disney’s temporary blacklisting of Egyptian suppliers (Egypt Ministry of Trade and Industry, 2017) portray a different picture. Workers are demanding higher salaries, better working conditions, and more dialogue (El-Haddad, 2012, p. 18; El-Mahrousa Center for Socioeconomic Development, 2014, p. 9).

1.6.3 Garment industry in Jordan

This dissertation encompasses empirical research in the garment industry in The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. The textiles industry is not analysed because it is of negligible relevance for the Jordanian economy and global trade.

The garment industry is a key player in Jordanian trade. Its export value is $US 1.9 bn., which represents 23% of total exports, and it grew by 50% in the past five years (own calculations based on: UN, 2022; data: 2019). The value of the industry to Jordanian domestic welfare is highly disputed owing to the industry’s weak ties to the local economy though, which is further outlined below. A study commissioned by Better Work Jordan (BWJ) and compiled by D. Brown and Deardorff (2011) softened this debate by concluding that the industry adds 36.9% of industry output to domestic value, which is in line with garment industries in other countries. Reports on the number of employees working in the industry vary significantly. Better Work Jordan (2020, p. 19) reports that 73,208 workers are employed in the factories they cover.

The Jordanian garment industry is distinguished by its strong international linkages and weak ties to the domestic economy. An export-oriented garment industry developed in Jordan after the Qualifying Industrial Zones (QIZs) Agreement came into effect in Jordan in 1997 (Kolben, 2019, p. 11). The agreement grants exemptions from tariffs and quotas to Jordanian manufacturers producing in these zones if a certain percentage of value added is of Israeli origin. This attracted foreign direct investment. Asian manufacturers, mainly from Taiwan, India and Hong Kong, especially invested in setting up garment factories in Jordan (Azmeh, 2014, p. 499). Raw materials and workers were simultaneously imported. Currently, enterprises operating in QIZs are predominantly foreign owned and the majority of employees are migrant workers from Bangladesh, India, Sri Lanka, Nepal, and Myanmar (BWJ, 2020, p. 20; data: 2019). Even though Jordanian law mandates a 25% share of local workers, BWJ (2020, p. 19) found that 79% of workers were non-Jordanian in 2019. Azmeh and Nadvi (2014, pp. 713–715) portray
the industry as a prime example of how Asian garment MNEs manage and control production sites across the globe and incorporate them into GPNs.

Jordanian exports focus almost exclusively on North America. Eighty-eight percent of exports are destined for the United States and 4% for Canada (own calculations based on: UN, 2022; data: 2019). While some products are still exported under QIZs regulations, most enterprises currently make use of the Jordan-US Free Trade Agreement signed between the two countries in 2001. This agreement allows Jordanian manufacturers to import raw materials from any country in the world and to export duty free to the United States. Production activities in Jordan are commonly limited to the assembly of ready-made garments, mainly cutting, making, and trimming.

Geographically, Jordan’s garment enterprises are located predominantly in the north of Jordan. The research presented in this dissertation focuses on the Al-Hassan industrial zone (Irbid), Al-Tajamouat industrial zone (Sahab), Al-Dulayl industrial zone (Dulayl), and satellites in residential areas (e.g. Ajloun) (see figure 3). Satellite units that only employ Jordanians are situated in locations with high unemployment rates across the country (Oxford Business Group, 2017, p. 2).

The labour base of the Jordanian garment industry is predominantly young, female, and – as outlined above – foreign (BWJ, 2020, pp. 19–20). Recruitment of Jordanian workers is depicted as highly difficult, and the industry is not considered an attractive workplace locally. A study by BWJ (2012) traced this perception back to low wages, the industry’s poor reputation in regard to workers’ rights, and moral concerns about women working in the industry. In addition to attempts to make the industry more attractive for domestic workers, recent domestic and international efforts also focus on opening employment opportunities to Syrian refugees living in Jordan (Oxford Business Group, 2017, p. 3).

Decent work is a core concern in the Jordanian garment industry. In 2006, the National Labor Committee (NLC), an American NGO, presented a report revealing systematic abuse of migrant employees and human trafficking practices in the QIZs. The Government of Jordan implemented several measures (often with international support) which significantly improved decent work in the industry (BWJ, 2019b; Business and Human Rights Resource Center, 2018, p. 1; Kolben, 2019, p. 54). Today, compliance with global labour standards is described as outstanding relative to other garment production countries (Enclude BV & CMC, 2019, p. 4). How decent work could be improved in Jordan is discussed in detail in chapter 3 of this dissertation.
Figure 2. Map of Egypt, including industrial zones
Source: Own creation using Google Maps

Figure 3. Map of Jordan, including industrial zones
Source: Own creation using Google Maps
1.7 Methodology: An iterative qualitative multiple-case analysis

1.7.1 Research design

The PhD project included a qualitative multiple-case study conducted in Egypt and Jordan. Four cases were analysed: (a) textiles producers in Egypt, (b) garment producers in Egypt, (c) tier-1 garment producers in Jordan, and (d) tier-2 garment producers in Jordan.

Qualitative research is well suited to analysing an ethics-related topic through the lens of one selected actor (owners-managers of supplier firms) that is embedded in a specific cultural context (the garment GPNs in Egypt and Jordan) (Reinecke et al., 2016, p. xiv). It offers the opportunity for theory elaboration and generation (Flick, 2009, p. 15), and it therefore enabled me to elaborate a crossvergence framework for decent work decision-making in supplier firms. The comparative design allowed studying the extent of similarities and differences across cases (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 550) and thus supported the identification of glo-cal influences on suppliers across countries and GPN nodes. Furthermore, when evidence for an assumption was detected across two different contexts, the design increased the robustness and reliability of this finding (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 550). The research contexts in Egypt and Jordan fulfilled methodological requirements for case comparisons. A sufficient amount of case characteristics ought to be similar in order to allow the researcher to focus on the selected aspects intended for comparison (Flick, 2009, p. 135). Jordan and Egypt have similar cultural backgrounds, but they differ in their economic internationalisation, especially in their garment GPNs (Azmeh, 2014). The two countries were therefore especially suitable to analyse the impact of global versus local influences on decent work frames and crossvergence processes.

1.7.2 Two-phase research process

The research presented in this dissertation follows the qualitative research process proposed by Flick (2009, p. 92). Guiding research questions were defined and preliminary assumptions were developed. Subsequently, pre-interviews were conducted in the research contexts that informed the data collection process. Then, data were collected and analysed. The analysis provided rich information on owners-managers’ decent work understandings and the crossvergence of decent work practices. The results, however, exceeded a publishable scope. Therefore, selected results were identified for publication,
including those that (1) addressed an aspect of the pre-defined guiding research questions, (2) contributed novel insights to the scientific debate, (3) contained sound implications for practice, and (4) were of high research quality. Each selected finding was further analysed for publication, following again the research process proposed by Flick (2009, p. 92) as illustrated in figure 4. As these second loops of analysis are described in detail in the publications (see chapters 3-5), they will not be repeated here. Instead, the entirety of the collected data and the first phase of analysis are described in the following sections.
Figure 4. Overview of the iterative research process

Source: Own creation based on Flick (2009, p. 92).
1.7.3 Phase 1: Data collection

The main data source for this dissertation was interviews with owners-managers of supplier firms (owners, general managers, compliance managers, HR managers). Respondents were chosen with the help of purposive sampling, a method that aims to select data sources that are likely to reveal the most information relevant to the research purpose (Patton, 2002, p. 230). Specifically, I aimed for maximum variation sampling, meaning that the interviewees should represent the broadest extent of variation within the delimitation of the four research cases. Common themes that are discovered based on the input of such interviewees reflect the core and shared experiences and perceptions of the overall research case (Patton, 2002, p. 235). During the dissertation design, I created a maximum variation sampling frame, and local industry and labour experts helped me to select respondents based on the criteria included in the frame. They additionally suggested conducting selected interviews with non-exporting firms to see what work realities look like without a global influence.

In total, 54 owners-managers from 38 factories were interviewed. Tables 1 and 2 present the sampling frame and Annex 1 provides an anonymised overview of respondents. The sample includes small, medium, and large textiles and garment factories from different industrial zones in Egypt and Jordan, and respondents differed in gender, nationality, job title, and age. During the interviews, the owners-managers elaborated their decent work understanding, reported on selected (decent) work practices (working times arrangements, compensation and benefits, employer-employee communication), and described what their dream work environment would look like and what they would need to implement it (see owner-manager interview outline in Annex 6 and sample owner-manager interview transcripts in Annex 10 (Egypt) and Annex 11 (Jordan)). Interview probes focussed on identifying respondents’ rationales for decent work understandings and decisions. The interview process was stopped when saturation was achieved, meaning that more interviews did not provide substantially more information (Bauer & Aarts, 2000, p. 34). As decent work perceptions and practices were substantially more homogeneous in Jordan than in Egypt, saturation was achieved for tier-1 garment suppliers in Jordan rather quickly. Tier-2 garment suppliers were difficult to identify, however, and expert and document data (see Table 3) had to supplement tier-2 interviews to achieve saturation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factory location</th>
<th>Factory size (workers)</th>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Jordan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garment</td>
<td>Textiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Zone</td>
<td>0-499</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500-1499</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1500-5500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Area</td>
<td>0-499</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500-1499</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1500-5500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: In addition to the factories presented in the sampling frame, five interviews were conducted in factories that produce for the local market (one textiles and one integrated factory in Egypt, three garment factories in Jordan).

Note 2: Integrated factories produce textiles and garments in Egypt.

**Table 1. Overview of participating suppliers**

Source: Own creation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management role</th>
<th>Local/ migrant</th>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Jordan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garment</td>
<td>Textiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>2 female, 7 male</td>
<td>1 male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>migrant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>7 male</td>
<td>2 male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>migrant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR and/ or Compliance</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>1 female, 4 male</td>
<td>1 female, 3 male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>migrant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (e.g., exports, production)</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>1 female, 1 male</td>
<td>3 male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>migrant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4 female, 19 male</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 female, 9 male</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The sampling frame excludes 6 respondents whose factories produce for local markets.

**Table 2. Overview of owners-managers interviewed**

Source: Own creation

Owners-managers of supplier firms linked decent work to different glo-cal dynamics during the interviews but did not explain them in detail. Further data were needed to better
understand the institutional, socio-cultural, political, and economic industry environment to fully comprehend glo-cal influences on suppliers. A document analysis and interviews with industry and labour experts provided me with the necessary information. First, I collected documents on global labour standards, local labour laws and collective bargaining agreements, reports, and studies on labour issues in the research contexts, corporate and industrial decent work policies and manuals, and newspaper articles discussing decent work in the local industries (see Table 3; a list of analysed documents is included in Annex 4). Second, industry and labour experts from local industry and labour organisations and international (development) organisations were interviewed at various stages of my field research (see Table 3 for an overview, Annex 2 for an anonymised overview of interviewed experts, and Annex 7 for a sample expert interview outline). The interviewed experts provided information on glo-cal decent work influence factors, local decent work understandings and practices, local decent work challenges and opportunities, and other issues that emerged during the supplier interviews and needed further clarification. Experts also helped me to identify relevant documents and facilitated contacts to owners-managers of supplier firms.

Data triangulation was anticipated as a need, owing to the research topic being highly sensitive. I examined the extent to which other stakeholders confirmed the local decent work practices reported by owners-managers of supplier firms in order to validate the credibility of the supplier interviews (Flick, 2020, p. 8; Lincoln & Guba, 1985, pp. 295–296). Documents and expert interviews served this purpose in combination with selected worker interviews and field observations. Workers in Egypt (individual interviews) and Jordan (group interview) were asked what makes a workplace decent for them, what they like about their current workplace, and what they do not like about it (see Table 3 for an overview, Annex 3 for an anonymised overview of respondents, and Annex 8 for a worker interview outline). Observations were conducted in factories and during industry and
worker events (see Table 3 for an overview, Annex 5 for a list of field observations, and Annex 9 for a sample factory visit documentation). Factory visits were feasible in Egypt, but owners-managers in Jordan were unable to spare the time to give me a tour. Instead, I visited industry and worker events to get a feeling of local discourses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expert interviews</th>
<th>No. of experts</th>
<th>Worker (group) interviews</th>
<th>No. of workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry expert</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour expert</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document analysis</th>
<th>No. of documents</th>
<th>Field observations</th>
<th>No. of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal information</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>Factory visits</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report/study</td>
<td>&gt;20</td>
<td>Industry events</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate/industry strategies/ manuals</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>Worker events</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News article</td>
<td>&gt;150</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Overview of collected supplementary data
Source: Own creation

Data were collected in October and November 2017 in Egypt and April and May 2018 in Jordan. All collected interview data were transcribed or documented and then translated if necessary. The details of the data collection and documentation process are described in the published research papers (see chapters 3–5). Annexes 12–14 show the interview briefing documents and the participant consent and data protection form. The document analysis was extended in phase 2 of the research process, when specific further information was needed for the selected publications.

1.7.4 Phase 1: Data analysis
Data analysis was conducted using the research software MAXQDA. In phase 1, all interview data and selected documents were analysed with a content analysis guided by Schreier (2014). The analysis identified and structured interview claims that contributed
to answering the guiding research questions. An overview of findings was created to summarise the detected research findings. For each case, the overview contained a within-case analysis of decent work understandings and crossvergence processes (focus on working times arrangements, compensation and benefits practices, and employer-employee communication) and a cross-case analysis. Data on employer-employee communication proved insufficient as the topic had to be skipped in many interviews owing to time constraints. All other findings were discussed with the supervisors of this dissertation and peer researchers with a similar research focus. They were furthermore presented in research seminars. Based on these discussions and the criteria outlined in section 1.7.2, selected research findings were chosen for publication (see section 1.8 for an overview) and analysed in further detail (phase 2). The analysis method was tailored to the research question in focus of each publication and is therefore described within each publication (see chapters 3–5).

1.7.5 Reflections on research ethics

To comply with ethical research practices as postulated by the principles of research ethics in social and business sciences (Germany)\(^\text{11}\) and the code of ethics for research in the social and behavioural sciences (the Netherlands)\(^\text{12}\), the following steps were taken.

First, general standards of good research practice were adhered to. All research participants were provided with written and verbal information on the research purpose, the topics of the qualitative interviews, and the interview format (see Annexes 12 and 13). They voluntarily signed their consent to participate and were explicitly informed that they could stop the interview whenever they wanted. Participants were thereby informed about data protection as suggested by the data protection office of the Ruhr-University Bochum\(^\text{13}\) (see Annex 14). Interviews were anonymised to the greatest extent possible before the analysis, and the identity of the supplier firms that participated in the study is confidential. The full interview transcripts include information that is necessary to retain

\(^{11}\) See https://www.konsortswd.de/aktuelles/publikation/forschungsethische-grundsaezte-und-pruefverfahren-in-den-sozial-und-wirtschaftswissenschaften/


\(^{13}\) See https://dsb.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/datenschutz/interviewdaten/
for the analysis but rather specific to individual companies. Industry insiders would be able to identify research respondents from these transcripts. Therefore, this dissertation only includes sample interview transcripts. Preliminary research findings were presented to and discussed with representatives of local and international industry and labour organisations.

Second, in the dissertation design phase, the risks of conducting research on decent work in Egypt and Jordan were evaluated. The identified risks informed all phases of the empirical process from the study design to the publication of results. In Egypt, labour issues in the garment GPN represent a highly sensitive topic, especially regarding labour agency. Labour unrest and union actions sparked the Arab Spring protests, and political elites perceive such actions to be threats to economic, social, and political stability (Hussein, 2014). In consequence, labour activism is suppressed and leaders of the labour movement fear imprisonment (Ramadan & Adly, 2015, pp. 15–16). Even though the trade union law was renewed in 2017, it is still intensely criticised for restricting union activities and freedom of association by global and local union federations (Magdy, 2017). The risk of doing research in Egypt, especially regarding union activities, became public when a PhD student was killed during his field research in Egypt (D. Walsh, 2017). Precautions therefore had to be taken to minimise risks for my local contacts supporting the research and me. Compared with Egypt, Jordan is a safe research environment and international observers can analyse decent work issues in the industry without risk. Decent work is nevertheless a highly sensitive topic in the local industry. Since the report of the NLC (2006) came out, Jordan has been under close scrutiny regarding labour issues. Industrial actors worked hard to lose their sweatshop image, and new labour scandals are feared as a threat to the economic survival of the industry. Exposing standard violations of individual actors therefore puts high social pressure on these actors and economic pressure on the entire industry.

To minimise risks for my local contacts and me, decent work was framed as a business/HR issue throughout the empirical research and the focus was put on the perspective of owners-managers of supplier firms. In Egypt, all interviews were facilitated by local business contacts who vouched for my integrity. Union representatives were not interviewed, and the role of unions was not discussed during the interviews in Egypt. In both contexts, I focused on discussing the reasons why work practices are designed in a certain manner, without evaluating during the interviews whether the discussed work practices comply with global or local standards. I followed the research
objective to better understand the position of textiles and garment supplier firms without judging it or trying to change it. I furthermore chose only results for publication that help to answer my research questions and enrich the scientific debate and are unlikely to harm research participants economically, socially, or politically.

1.7.6 Reflections on the research quality and my position in the research

Lincoln and Guba's (1985, p. 219) trustworthiness criteria guide this reflection on the explanatory power of the conducted research. Their four criteria for evaluating qualitative research include credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.

Credibility refers to the question of whether the interpretation of research results can be made based on the collected data (Döring et al., 2016, p. 109; Lincoln & Guba, 1985, pp. 295–296). This study made repeated use of data triangulation to increase credibility as suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1985, p. 305). Responses of owners-managers of supplier firms were validated with expert interviews, worker interviews, field observations, and document research. The maximum variation of respondents furthermore helped in assembling a wide variety of opinions and work practices (Patton, 2002, p. 230) that allowed the evaluation of contradictory claims (‘negative case analysis’, Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 309). Native speakers involved in the transcription and translation of data aided the understanding of locally specific expressions and references and helped to detect cultural misunderstandings. Credibility was furthermore checked during discussions of results with peers. When they offered different interpretations for research results, I checked them against the data as suggested by Nowell et al. (2017, p. 3) and if necessary, collected more data to evaluate them.

The criterion of transferability evaluates the applicability of research results to other contexts (Döring et al., 2016, p. 109; Lincoln & Guba, 1985, pp. 296–297). For this research, a question that arises is how far research results are transferable to other garment production contexts. While global dynamics play out similarly across textiles and garment production contexts worldwide, local dynamics are context specific. It is nevertheless argued in this dissertation that presented research findings can serve to develop research assumptions for other contexts as other publications indicate similar local dynamics occurring across production contexts in the Global South (see chapters 3–5). Based on the advice of Lincoln and Guba (1985, p. 219), the analysed research cases and research contexts are described in depth so that other researchers can judge whether they find them likely to be transferable to their research contexts.
Dependability refers to the question of how far the research process is made transparent and follows a consistent research logic (Döring et al., 2016, p. 109; Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 298). As recommended by Schou et al. (2012, p. 2091), the data collection and analysis process was documented in detail and the findings were described with several quotations (see section 1.7 and chapters 2-5). The methodology sections in this dissertation furthermore include explanations for my methodological choices. I hope the research logic is thereby made transparent.

The criterion of confirmability centres on how far personal interests, perceptions, and prejudices of the researcher inform research results (Döring et al., 2016, p. 110; Lincoln & Guba, 1985, pp. 299–300). Reflexivity is called for (Schou et al., 2012, p. 2091). I constructed research findings based on my previous knowledge and the knowledge gathered during the empirical analysis. The following factors might have influenced results. First, I work as a consultant with public sector actors on promoting decent and inclusive work in business. Even though I have not yet worked in the garment GPN, the work taught me to identify opportunities for reconciling societal and economic interests and to see private companies as partners rather than enemies in the quest for decent work. While this dissertation in consequence promotes supporting suppliers who want to improve decent work, it is acknowledged that business goodwill is limited, and my supplier-centred approach can only work in combination with strengthening legal regulations and labour activism. Second, my ethical precautions described in section 1.7.5 motivated the supplier-centred approach in this research (in addition to the scientific reasons outlined in section 1.3.). Even though this should not have influenced the confirmability and credibility of the presented results, it influenced the research questions asked and the choice of which results to publish. The research publications and the conclusion of this dissertation therefore link research results to other publications to counter this imbalance. Third, I represent my research institute in the German Partnership for Sustainable Textiles. My participation in this rather buyer-centred initiative might have contributed to a gradual shift I noticed in my research process. While I started with a purely supplier-centred research focus, I increasingly linked the supplier perspective to global (often buyer-centred) discourses in recent publications (see especially chapters 4 and 5). Even though this shift counters my intention of putting the suppliers in the centre of the debate, it better connects my research findings to scientific and practical discourses. Fourth, it was difficult for me to remain neutral during data collection. On the one hand, I did not want to inspire socially desirable interview responses, but on the other hand, I did not want to endorse respondents’ reports of indecent work practices. Regarding the
former, data triangulation revealed only a small social desirability effect (see especially chapter 3). Regarding the latter, I hope that ending the interviews with dreams about a better work environment stimulated positive thinking about decent work. I furthermore hope that sharing the knowledge gathered during this PhD project with local participants contributes to promoting decent work in the research contexts. Fifth, I am a Western socialised researcher and conducted research in the Global South. Socio-cultural traditions, work, and living realities were therefore foreign to me, and that is likely to have shaped my research interpretations. Intensive discussions with my native translators as well as Egyptian and Jordanian friends and colleagues helped me to gain a better understanding of local specifics during my research. Studying publications on Egyptian, Jordanian, and Islamic institutions, work ethics, and management practices proved furthermore helpful. Nevertheless, more research by native speakers is likely to produce further insights on decent work in Egypt and Jordan.

1.8 Publications of theoretical and empirical findings

1.8.1 Overview of publications and presentations

Research findings were published (or are under review) in scientific peer-reviewed journals (see Table 4) and were presented in scientific seminars and conferences (see Table 5). Each publication or presentation addresses selected parts of the guiding research questions. The following chapters of this dissertation present the journal articles in their current stage of publication. The articles’ abstracts are presented below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Article title</th>
<th>Journal/Book</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Crossvergence of socially (ir)responsible employment practices in supplier firms</td>
<td>Critical perspectives on international business (journal)</td>
<td>Published on 18/09/2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Decent work frames of garment factory owners-managers and the legitimacy of global labour standards: a qualitative investigation in Egypt and Jordan</td>
<td>Journal of Business Ethics</td>
<td>Submitted on 25/03/2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Overview of publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation title</th>
<th>Seminar/ Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decent work and price competition in global production – the dilemma of mid-sized supplier firms (in Egypt)</td>
<td>Research seminar of the Institute of Development Research and Development Policy, Bochum, 16/09/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossvergence of socially (ir)responsible employment practices in global production</td>
<td>PhD workshop, 23rd International Congress of DAVO (Centre for research on the Arab world), Tübingen, 08/10/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossvergence of working times arrangements in textiles and garment supplier firms in Egypt and Jordan</td>
<td>PhD conference of the Institute of Development Research and Development Policy, Bochum, 08/11/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossvergence of compensation and benefits practices in textiles and garment supplier firms in Egypt and Jordan</td>
<td>PhD seminar of the Institute of Work Science (Bochum) and the Management Institute (Paderborn), Paderborn, 21/03/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours in the garment supply chain in Egypt and Jordan: Convergence to global standards?</td>
<td>Research seminar of the Institute of Development Research and Development Policy, Bochum, 10/09/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting decent work in global production – lessons learnt from the Jordanian garment industry</td>
<td>7th International Conference on CSR, Sustainability, Ethics and Governance, Lisbon (online), 25/06/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What makes a workplace decent? Global standards meet local perspectives in Egypt and Jordan</td>
<td>Research seminar of the Institute of Development Research and Development Policy, Bochum (online), 03/05/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decent work in the garment supply chain - A qualitative analysis of the suppliers' perspective and decision-space in Egypt and Jordan</td>
<td>Research seminar of the Competence Centre for Qualitative Research, FOM university (online), 05/10/2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Overview of presentations
1.8.2 Abstract: Crossvergence of socially (ir)responsible employment practices in supplier firms

Purpose: The purpose of this paper is to introduce the notion of crossvergence from IHRM as a conceptual lens for understanding and analysing the formation of socially (ir)responsible employment practices in supplier firms in GPNs. The crossvergence perspective can particularly contribute to understanding how the agency of suppliers is influenced by the interaction of global-local dynamics.

Design/Methodology/Approach: The paper illustrates how the formation of socially (ir)responsible employment practices can be understood as a process of crossvergence. Subsequently, it reviews and structures insights from GPN and IHRM literature to detail the process.

Findings: The paper underscores the complicated role of suppliers in ensuring decent work in GPNs. Suppliers face a multitude of global and local interacting, and partially conflicting, demands. They process these demands as active agents and need to develop suitable employment practices in response.

Originality/value: The paper supports the nascent discourse on supplier agency in forming socially responsible employment practices. It connects different streams of literature to illuminate the perspective of suppliers, introduces IHRM insights to the debate, and offers conceptual guidance for analysing interacting global and local pressures on suppliers.

1.8.3 Abstract: Promoting decent work in global production – lessons learnt from the Jordanian garment industry

The study explores the progress towards decent work (SDG 8) in the garment industry in Jordan. The global garment industry is notorious for recurring labour scandals, and the garment industry in Jordan has historically been no exception. In 2006, a report by an American NGO revealed severe incidents of forced labour, sexual assault and harassment, excessive overtime, and discriminatory wages. The report sparked an international outcry and triggered global and local actions to improve working conditions in the industry. In 2016, international observers reported significant improvements and comparably favourable working conditions. To explore this progress, a case analysis of the Jordanian garment industry was conducted with a focus on the perspective of suppliers. Pertinent questions centred on the factors that enabled their decent work improvements and those that hindered further progress. Twenty interviews with corporate, institutional, and labour
stakeholders; observations of industry events; and review of relevant documents and publications informed a qualitative explanatory case study analysis. A crossvergence perspective served as the theoretical basis for the analysis. This theory predicts that global and local influences interact at the factory level to shape the work practices of suppliers. Accordingly, the results illuminate the multiple-level developments needed to promote decent work in Jordan. Public, business, and labour stakeholders on global, local-industry, and factory levels shaped decent work realities in Jordan. The results confirm the importance of previously well-researched influences such as global and local labour regulation and labour agency. They highlight the necessity of resources and financial viability at the factory level to translate global and local demands into decent work progress. Over and above, they illustrate the significance of a third-party mediator and advisor, BWJ, for aligning the multiple stakeholder influences on suppliers.

1.8.4 Abstract: Vertical and horizontal diffusion of labour standards in global supply chains: Working hours practices of tier-1 and tier-2 textiles and garment suppliers

This paper explores the diffusion of working hours standards in the global garment supply chain. It compares tier-1 and tier-2 garment suppliers in Jordan and garment and textiles suppliers in Egypt. Building on the idea of crossvergence, the paper views standard adoption as being influenced by multiple global, local, and firm-level factors. The analysis draws on a qualitative multiple-case study encompassing 30 owner-manager interviews, eight (group) interviews with workers, 13 expert interviews, and multiple documents and field observations. After the collected data underwent a qualitative content analysis, the within-case and cross-case analysis followed a flexible pattern matching logic. Convergence to global standards was found to be higher in tier-1 compared with tier-2 firms and differed between the garment and the textiles industry. The study strengthens existing evidence that global labour standards dissolve along the supply chain. Buyers contribute to this dissolution as their procurement demands counteract their labour standard demands. Furthermore, intellectual, financial, and physical resource limitations could be linked to the excessive working hours of lower-tier suppliers. Human resource characteristics were found to significantly affect working hours independent of the supply chain node or chain. The findings underscore the need for new procurement strategies in the garment supply chain, and further investments in local-level initiatives that support suppliers and workers in strengthening resources for labour standard compliance.
1.8.5 Abstract: Decent work frames of garment factory owners-managers and the legitimacy of global labour standards: a qualitative investigation in Egypt and Jordan

Global labour standards serve to ensure decent work in GPNs. At the same time, normative disagreements between global and local approaches to decent work can thereby raise questions about the legitimacy of global standards and impair their effectiveness. This paper explores cognitive decent work frames of garment factory owners-managers, compares them with global decent work frames, and deducts implications for the setting and implementation of global labour standards. A thematic analysis of semi-structured interviews with 30 owners-managers in the garment industry in Egypt and Jordan served to identify owner-manager frames. Owners-managers were found to dominantly frame decent work as a (paternalistic) family responsibility and as a business responsibility. Further notions that recurred across interviews were the framing of decent work as a human responsibility, religious (Islamic) responsibility, social responsibility, and regulatory responsibility. Only selected aspects of the detected frames accorded with global conceptualisations of decent work. The results imply the need to differentiate between universalistic and particularistic aspects of decent work. While respondents supported the need to protect universal human rights, their perception of other labour responsibilities differed from global conceptualisations. The benefits of informal, locally specific decent work practices thereby remain unseen in the global standards debate. This paper therefore proposes to include universalistic (rights-oriented) and particularistic (responsibility-oriented) regulations in global labour standards.
2 Crossvergence of socially (ir)responsible employment practices in supplier firms


2.1 Introduction

The SDGs (UN, 2015) include “decent work for all” being achieved worldwide by 2030, and the ongoing incidence of labour scandals underscores the importance of this objective. Reports particularly highlight working conditions of suppliers in developing countries that operate in buyer-driven GPNs. Five years after the Rana Plaza factory building collapse in 2013 that killed 1,134 garment workers, unsafe factories continue to be reported in Bangladesh (Barrett et al., 2018, p. 2). In addition, forced labour remains a problem in the Thai fishing industry (Human Rights Watch, 2018), and in the cell phone production chain, child labour in cobalt mining is only one of the labour-related concerns (Hermes EOS, 2017).

What drives the formation of socially irresponsible employment practices in developing country supplier firms? What could motivate responsible practices? The social dimension of work in GPNs is attracting increasing attention in critical debates on international business (e.g., Khattak et al., 2017; J. Lee & Gereffi, 2015). Especially GPN scholars address decent work shortcomings and analyse how GPN dynamics affect labour outcomes in supplier firms. First, the impact of globalisation and its (negative) influence on employment practices is debated. In particular, global competition is argued to incentivize suppliers to reduce labour standards (Standing, 1999, p. 584). Second, the design and effectiveness of public and private labour market regulation are analysed. The existing literature presents a rather bleak outlook and characterizes current regulatory means as insufficient to prevent irresponsible employment practices (Barrientos, Mayer, et al., 2011, p. 313; Berliner et al., 2015, pp. 200–201). Third, the role of the local environment is discussed. Local institutions are commonly characterized as failing to protect workers in developing countries, but they have attracted renewed interest because they can have a positive or negative effect as they interact with global regulatory efforts.
(Mayer & Gereffi, 2010, pp. 4–5; Toffel et al., 2015, p. 219). Fourth, a debate on the role of suppliers is just beginning. GPN scholars discuss opportunities for economic upgrading of suppliers and how these opportunities affect social upgrading (Knorringa & Pegler, 2006), as well as the role of large first-tier suppliers and their influence on labour standards in GPNs (Merk, 2014). Additionally, selected qualitative studies illuminate the perspective of suppliers and their motivation (or rejection) for complying with global labour standards (e.g., Fontana & Egels-Zandén, 2019; Perry et al., 2015; Soundararajan & Brown, 2016).

This paper is rooted in this last stream of literature and responds to the observation that there is limited research on CSR from the supplier perspective, particularly on suppliers’ social responsibility for labour (Fontana & Egels-Zandén, 2019, p. 1047; Huq et al., 2014, p. 611; Perry et al., 2015, pp. 740–741). The paper intends to encourage the creation of a holistic framework to explain the formation of socially (ir)responsible employment practices from the supplier perspective. The few existing frameworks capture only some aspects of the literature outlined above. Yu (2015), for instance, focused on the effectiveness of private codes of conduct. However, private labour market regulation is only one of the factors that affect suppliers and influence their employment practices.

This paper introduces the concept of crossvergence (Ralston, 2008) as a conceptual lens to guide the framework-building process. Crossvergence is used in IHRM14 and describes practice formation in international business as follows: Global and local forces meet at the point of the decision-makers in local firms and drive them to design unique, context-specific employment practices in response. The concept captures three ideas that this paper advocates to consider when building a systematic understanding of the formation of socially (ir)responsible employment practices. First, suppliers must consider a complex web of both global and local influences when making employment decisions. Tools capturing this complexity are needed as different influences constantly interact and only in combination can motivate responsible employment decisions (Lund-Thomsen &

---

14 This paper’s understanding of IHRM follows the broad definition of Björkman and Stahl (2006, p. 1) which “covers all issues related to the management of people in an international context [including] human resource issues facing MNCs in different parts of their organisations [and] comparative analyses of HRM in different countries.”
Lindgreen, 2014, p. 14). Second, suppliers design their employment practices. They are active agents who process external influences and respond in their (business) interest (Scott, 2013, pp. 94–95). A better understanding of supplier agency can help to explain why global and local regulations can be effective for some suppliers but fail for others. Third, for suppliers, many decisions related to the social responsibility of employment practices are simultaneously human resource (HR) decisions (e.g., working hours or wages). However, HR research has rarely been linked to the debate on decent work in GPNs (for a notable exception, see Jayasinghe, 2016). IHRM insights can contribute to the current debate by elucidating how employment practices develop in international business and which factors influence employment decisions.

The paper will show how the concept of crossvergence can serve as a conceptual lens for analysing and understanding how suppliers as active agents form socially (ir)responsible employment practices in response to interacting global and local influences. After a brief characterisation of GPNs, supplier firms and the social responsibility of employment practices, the crossvergence perspective is introduced in section 3. Section 4 starts detailing the multiplicity of influences on local firms and the agency of suppliers in designing employment responses. Thereby, GPN as well as IHRM findings are considered.

2.2 GPNs, suppliers and their employment practices

This paper focuses on socially (ir)responsible employment practices in developing country supplier firms embedded in buyer-driven GPNs. A brief characterisation of GPNs, supplier firms and the social responsibility of employment practices shall lay the foundation for the subsequent discussion on the crossvergence of employment practices.

2.2.1 GPNs

A GPN refers to “an organisational arrangement, comprising interconnected economic and non-economic actors, coordinated by a global lead firm, and producing goods or services across multiple geographical locations for worldwide markets” (Coe & Yeung, 2015, pp. 1–2). Many GPNs include production sides in developing countries and are therefore not only discussed as an integral part of international business but also linked to development outcomes (J. Lee & Gereffi, 2015, p. 320). For the purpose of this paper, the term GPN was chosen over alternative terms such as “global commodity chain”, “global value chain” or “global supply chain” as the GPN approach highlights the network
character of production relationships and the agency of the individual actors within the network (Coe et al., 2008, p. 272).

The GPN approach portrays the involvement of economic and non-economic actors in global production as a network of interconnected relationships. Thereby, it acknowledges that the network does not only encompass vertical and inter-national but also horizontal and intra-national linkages (Coe et al., 2008, p. 271). The local context of GPN actors frames their behaviour and thereby influences GPN dynamics. GPN research is therefore oftentimes called to bridge literatures to foster understanding of the local impact on GPN phenomena as well as the GPN impact on local phenomena. Coe et al. (2004), for instance, bridge works on local institutional structures with works on GPNs to gain a more comprehensive understanding of regional development. Conversely, this paper proposes to bridge works on GPNs with HRM literature to advance understanding of decent work in GPNs.

The GPN approach highlights the importance of analysing the agency of different actors involved in globally dispersed production networks. It encourages actor-centered research and provides conceptual foundations to build upon, e.g., Yeung and Coe's (2015) dynamic theory of GPNs. Works answering to these calls thereby tend to focus on analysing the agency of buyers, workers, and institutions. Supplier agency, and especially the agency of small and medium-sized suppliers, is less frequently discussed and awaits further attention (Soundararajan et al., 2018, p. 1303).

2.2.2 Different types of suppliers

Referring to “the suppliers” in GPNs can be misleading because it depicts very different types of companies as belonging to one group. Even within one single industry in one GPN, different types of suppliers can be encountered. Therefore, the heterogeneity of suppliers is addressed in the following and further specified in Table 6.

In GPN research, suppliers are especially differentiated according to their role in the GPN (Nadvi & Raj-Reichert, 2015, p. 244; Yeung & Coe, 2015, p. 45) and according to their level of economic upgrading (Barrientos, Gereffi, & Rossi, 2011, pp. 323–324; Lund-Thomsen et al., 2012, pp. 1218–1221). It is discussed in how far the tier-level and product, process or functional sophistication are linked to the design of employment practices. Table 6 provides an overview of commonly used supplier typologies.

Besides GPN-related characteristics, general characteristics of a company and its internal stakeholders can be used for characterizing different types of suppliers. The list
of characteristics that influence a firm’s HR strategy is thereby long (see e.g., S. E. Jackson et al., 2014, p. 3). In order not to overload this paper, Table 6 focuses on selected characteristics that have been salient in the decent work debate.

In line with the thematic focus of this paper, the subsequent discussion will especially relate to suppliers struggling to implement socially responsible employment practices, e.g., suppliers in buyer-driven GPNs that offer labour intensive and low skilled production work. The level of analysis can be the individual supplier, or a horizontal network of suppliers showing collective employment practices (see Fontana & Egels-Zandén, 2019 for a discussion of supplier collective behaviour). It will be noted that different types of suppliers (or supplier networks) are likely to react differently to global and local influences and chose different employment responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification criteria</th>
<th>Different types of suppliers</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role in GPN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier</td>
<td>Tier 1 // tier 2 // tier 3 etc.</td>
<td>Nadvi and Raj-Reichert (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of specialisation</td>
<td>Specialized supplier (industry-specific) // Specialized supplier (multi-industry) // Generic supplier</td>
<td>Yeung and Coe (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of economic upgrading within a value chain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product sophistication</td>
<td>• High // low brand value of buyer • High // low product quality • High // low product complexity</td>
<td>Humphrey and Schmitz (2002) Barrientos, Gereffi, and Rossi (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process sophistication:</td>
<td>• Labour intensive // machine intensive • Old // standard // progressive technology</td>
<td>Lund-Thomsen et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional sophistication</td>
<td>• Low skill content (e.g., assembly) // high skill content (e.g., design, marketing)</td>
<td>Humphrey and Schmitz (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal stakeholder characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>• Foreign // local</td>
<td>Akorsu (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management base</td>
<td>• Foreign // local • Western // Southern</td>
<td>Lawler et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business strategy</td>
<td>e.g., Diversification // growth // innovation // cost control</td>
<td>S. E. Jackson et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation size</td>
<td>e.g., Number of employees</td>
<td>Oka (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation culture</td>
<td>e.g., Clan // adhocracy // hierarchy // market</td>
<td>Cameron and Quinn (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life cycle stage</td>
<td>e.g., Start-up // growing // mature // declining</td>
<td>S. E. Jackson and Schuler (1995)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6. Typologies of suppliers**
Source: Own creation based on the works referenced within the table
2.2.3 Socially (ir)responsible employment practices

Contributing to the decent work debate, this paper focuses on the social responsibility of suppliers’ employment practices. Employment practices refer to the organisational rules and activities by which people are employed and managed. The specification socially (ir)responsible highlights that employment practices are discussed under ethical considerations. Drawing on definitions of ethical HRM, socially responsible practices are understood in this paper as practices that cater to the well-being of employees (Armstrong & Taylor, 2014, p. 1).

Even though the understanding of what is “responsible” is considered highly context specific (Burchell et al., 2014, p. 468), there is an increasing consensus in the international debate that certain employment practices are irresponsible and should be prohibited. The responsibility of employment practices is therefore frequently defined in reference to global labour standards intending to prohibit inhuman or irresponsible practices. Empirical studies on the social responsibility of employment practices following this operationalisation distinguish between compliant and noncompliant practices. The reality of suppliers is, however, more complex. Soundararajan and Brown (2016, pp. 96–97) find that firms often interpret standards based on their own assumptions and expectations and point to the existence of various shades of grey between compliance and noncompliance. Furthermore, suppliers can implement practices that go beyond compliance. Most definitions of CSR even stress the voluntary nature of socially responsible behaviour (e.g., van Marrewijk, 2003, p. 102). The social responsibility of employment practices is therefore depicted as a multi-point scale in figure 5 (vertical axis).

It is beyond the scope of this paper to concretely discuss different forms of employment practices and their responsibility (e.g., design of salary systems, organisation of working times). However, the multi-dimensionality of the construct shall be highlighted. Suppliers can choose different levels of responsibility depending on the employment dimension concerned. Barrientos and Smith (2007) show, for example, that suppliers react differently to so-called outcome standards (e.g., health and safety, wages, working hours) in comparison with process standards such as the freedom of association and collective bargaining.

Figure 5 illustrates this paper’s understanding of socially (ir)responsible employment practices. It was designed in consideration of the author’s field experience and depicts examples of three suppliers. The vertical axis proposes to tread the social responsibility of employment practices as a multi-point, or even continuous, variable. The horizontal
axis depicts the multi-dimensionality of the concept. Various patterns of socially (ir)responsible employment practices can therefore result from the process of crossvergence that will be outlined in the remainder of this paper.

Figure 5. Exemplary patterns of socially (ir)responsible employment practices
Source: Own analysis

2.3 The formation of socially (ir)responsible employment practices as a result of crossvergence

Imagine four suppliers producing garments for the fictional brand STAR. The four suppliers are of a similar size, produce similar products, and operate in countries with similar labour laws. They are all subject to STAR’s code of conduct. Supplier A is a first-tier supplier operating in a country with strong institutions. Supplier B, another first-tier supplier, operates in a country with weak institutions. Supplier C, a second-tier supplier, operates in the same country. Supplier D, also a second-tier supplier, operates in the country with strong institutions. STAR’s code of conduct as well as national laws cap working hours at maximal 60 hours per week, including overtime.

What do working hours look like in the four firms? Looking at the suppliers’ roles in the GPN as well as the strength of local institutions, the shortest hours would be expected
at supplier A, and the longest hours at supplier C. Would this assumption change by looking through the *crossvergence* lens? Maybe, because no assumption could be made without asking further questions, e.g.: What working times arrangements do workers demand? How strong is their negotiating power? How high are fixed costs for labour? What are the consequences of non-compliance with global or local regulatory demands? How risk affine is the supplier? The results of the example show the relevance of these questions: Supplier B and C operate 48 hours per week because their local female labour base refuses to work more hours due to family obligations. Supplier D operates 72 hours per week. Fixed labour costs are high, sales prices of second-tier suppliers are low, and the supplier considers excessive hours inevitable to remain profitable. Supplier A in comparison complies with the maximal 60 hours per week. First-tier suppliers are regularly audited by STAR and the supplier fears to lose them as a customer if non-compliance is detected.

The example illustrates the complexity of understanding the social responsibility of employment practices in GPNs. Global, local, and business considerations come together and lead to different types of employment responses. The notion of *crossvergence* is introduced in the following as a conceptual lens to capture this complexity and to understand how the agency of suppliers is influenced by their global and local environment.

The idea of crossvergence arose in the convergence-divergence debate in international business. Convergence advocates (e.g., Kerr et al., 1960; Levitt, 1983; Prentice, 1990) argued that due to globalisation, business environments become similar worldwide and ‘best’ practice HR experiences travel around the globe. Divergence advocates however highlight that differences in HRM will prevail across countries, and explain these differences with the help of institutional theories (Wood et al., 2012; Wood & Horwitz, 2015) and cultural theories (T. Jackson, 2015; Reiche et al., 2012). Ralston (2008, p. 29)

\[\text{The assumption is based on following research findings: The pressure to comply with labour standards is higher for first-tier than for second-tier suppliers (Mares, 2010; Posthuma, 2010). Strong institutions, e.g., in the form of press freedom (Toffel et al., 2015), independent workers' institutions (Frenkel, 2001), or state regulatory capacity (Locke et al., 2013) incentivize suppliers to improve their employment practices.}\]
points out that converging and diverging pressures meet at the point of the individual local firm. Firms are simultaneously impacted by global and local dynamics, and their agency determines how these dynamics translate into employment practices (Winchester & Bailey, 2012, pp. 13–15).

Applying the idea of *crossvergence* to the case of suppliers in GPNs, the process can be pictured as follows: As exporters, suppliers are subject to global competition and global regulatory demands. Global competition often translates into price, time, and quality pressure. Global (public and private) regulatory demands set responsibility benchmarks for HR decisions. As local firms, suppliers are influenced by their local institutional, socio-cultural and industry environment. Local institutions, especially labour laws, delimit the scope for HR decision-making. Local culture shapes values and beliefs about business, work, and ethics. And the way business is done in the industry serves as reference for HR decisions. These influences come together at the point of the supplier and are (consciously or unconsciously) processed at this point. Suppliers for instance weigh costs and benefits of different employment responses, decide depending on risk considerations, or orient themselves at the local industry benchmark. The salience of different drivers for suppliers’ decision-making thereby depends on the supplier characteristics discussed in the second section of this paper. Large multinational suppliers might be in a position to negotiate decent lead times and prices, second-tier suppliers might not be audited for labour standard compliance, and firms working with a migrant labour base might consider local culture as irrelevant for their employment decisions. Depending on the suppliers’ active processing of global-local dynamics, different forms of employment patterns evolve.

The notion of *crossvergence* puts suppliers in the focus of the analysis when trying to understand decent work shortcomings, or how to better promote responsible employment practices in GPNs. It can serve as a conceptual lens to understand how supplier agency is influenced by interacting global and local influences. Figure 6 outlines the overall process of crossvergence as described above. The different elements of the process will be further specified in the next section of this paper.
Figure 6. Crossvergence of socially (ir)responsible employment practices
Source: Own creation

2.4 Detailing the process of crossvergence

Existing empirical research as well as the reviews of Vogel (2008), Mayer and Gereffi (2010), Barrientos, Mayer, et al. (2011), Berliner et al. (2015), and Lund-Thomsen et al. (2016a) provide significant insights into global and local influences on employment practices in GPNs. Yu (2015) furthermore summarised factors influencing the effectiveness of private codes of conduct. The following analysis uses the notion of crossvergence to systemise and extend existing research insights from GPN and IHRM literature. For this purpose, the literature on GPN and IHRM was reviewed, and external global and local influences were identified and clustered, using the qualitative research software MAXQDA. IHRM literature especially extended insights from GPN literature on local influences. The processing of interacting global and local influences at the point of the supplier is discussed in the last part of the section.

2.4.1 Global influences

Three global influences on suppliers are discussed in the literature: global competition, global public labour market regulation, and global private labour market regulation.

Standing (1999, pp. 584–585) postulates that global competition has led to converging employment practices that are characterized by income insecurity, employment
insecurity, low pay, longer working hours, increased female participation, and job specialisation. Davies and Vadlamannati’s (2013) longitudinal study of labour practices in 135 developing and developed countries empirically supports this and concludes that competition for foreign investments leads to reduced enforcement of labour laws and convergence to low levels of responsibility.

To counter the trend of declining responsibility, global standards set by the ILO, by international finance institutions, and in trade agreements harmonize national labour laws and policies and lead to a converging framework of labour market regulation across borders. However, convergence oftentimes stops at the regulatory framework, with most empirical studies showing that suppliers’ actual compliance with global labour standards lags far behind official national regulations (Caraway, 2010, p. 226; Stallings, 2010).

The limits of public regulatory efforts in GPNs sparked the debate on labour market regulation through private initiatives of large MNEs, especially from the Global North. A comparison of the different sets of private labour standards reveals directional convergence for general principles such as prohibitions against child labour, forced labour, discrimination, and excessive working hours as well as the right to organize and the rights for security and occupational health and safety. Nevertheless, private regulation fails to achieve full convergence (Barrientos, Mayer, et al., 2011, p. 307; Berliner et al., 2015, pp. 200–201; Locke et al., 2013, pp. 543–544) because not all suppliers are subject to private labour standards and comprehensive enforcement fails due to information asymmetries and conflicts of interests.

Table 7 starts detailing the concepts of global competition, global public regulation, and global private regulation in order to illustrate which characteristics of these global trends have especially been discussed to influence the social responsibility of employment practices in supplier firms.
### Influences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global competition</th>
<th>References (selected)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Lead time pressure</strong> – Pressure of lead firms on supplier to deliver the order in short lead times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Flexibility pressure</strong> – Pressure of lead firm on supplier to flexibly respond to production demands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Quality pressure</strong> – Pressure of lead firms on suppliers to adhere to product quality specifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global public labour market regulation and initiatives</th>
<th>References (selected)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- set by ILO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- set by international finance institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- integrated in trade agreements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Technical assistance</strong> – Projects of international organisations offering support to suppliers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Activist pressure</strong> – Labour-related campaigns of global unions, NGOs, and the media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global private labour market regulation and initiatives</th>
<th>References (selected)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Buyer codes of conduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Industry standards and labels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Multi-stakeholder standards and labels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- International framework agreements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Audit regimes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Buyer audits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Third-party audits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buyer-Supplier Cooperation</strong> – Activities of buyers offering support to suppliers (e.g., capacity building)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7. Global influences

Source: Own creation based on the works referenced within the table
2.4.2 Local influences

IHRM scholars distinguish between local institutional and socio-cultural influences on suppliers and also highlight the importance of the industry environment of local firms (Fan et al., 2016, p. 304). Local influences are also discussed in the GPN debate, especially the need to view global regulatory efforts in local settings or putting “codes in context,” as Toffel et al. (2015, p. 205) phrase it.

From an institutionalist perspective, political and legal institutions shape the behaviour of organisations. The effectiveness of employment practices depends on their fit with local institutional contexts (Sparrow et al., 1994, p. 272). Looking at the institutional side in the context of GPNs, scholars show that among other factors, stringent national labour legislation (Frenkel, 2001, p. 558), press freedom (Toffel et al., 2015, p. 218), independent workers’ institutions (Frenkel, 2001, p. 558), and state regulatory capacity (Locke et al., 2013, p. 543) can incentivise suppliers to improve their employment practices. Local institutions, however, do not always have a positive impact. First, domestic institutions in the Global South are often considered too weak to ensure socially responsible employment practices in GPNs (Mayer & Gereffi, 2010, pp. 3–5). Second, domestic institutions can conflict with private labour market regulation and therefore impede their effectiveness (Locke et al., 2013, p. 543).

Discussing the impact of the socio-cultural environment on employment practices, IHRM researchers find that values, assumptions, and beliefs of decision-makers shape local HR policies and practices (Briscoe & Schuler, 2004, pp. 114–115). Especially gender discrimination in employment is frequently attributed to socio-cultural assumptions about gender roles. The World Bank (2013, pp. 63–65) for instance links the practice to pay male workers more than female workers in the Middle East to the local assumption that men have to financially provide for their families. Even though the socio-cultural context of suppliers receives less attention in the GPN debate, works discussing labour agency in GPNs (e.g., Coe & Hess, 2013), as well as qualitative studies on suppliers acknowledge its importance. Soundararajan and Brown (2016, pp. 95–97) and Perry et al. (2015, p. 741) emphasise, for instance, that cultural values can conflict with or motivate responsible employment practices.

HRM scholars highlight the need to consider industry characteristics as an antecedent of employment practices (S. E. Jackson & Schuler, 1995). Thereby, especially local industry characteristics are of importance as industry characteristics can differ significantly across contexts. Lund-Thomsen et al. (2012, pp. 1214–1215), for instance,
show that machine stitching of footballs in factories is common in China, while footballs are stitched in home-based settings in Pakistan. Evaluating the impact of the industry environment on employment practices, GPN scholars especially discuss the locally dominant production regime (Lund-Thomsen et al., 2012) and the available labour base. Azmeh (2014) shows in his study on the Egyptian and Jordanian garment industry that the social embeddedness of workers significantly affected labour regimes in that industry.

Table 8 starts detailing local institutional, socio-cultural and industry influences on suppliers but cannot be considered comprehensive. Especially insights from IHRM literature await validation in the context of GPNs.
## Influences

### National and subnational institutional environment

- **Legal institutions**, including
  - Labour laws regulating employment practices, employment relations and health and safety standards
  - Labour inspections ensuring law enforcement
  - Labour courts ruling on labour-related disputes

- **Worker institutions** – Policies and support offers of worker associations and unions

- **Business institutions** – Policies and support offers of trade, industry, and employer associations

- **Civil society institutions** – Campaigns and support offers of NGOs, community organisations, and media

- **Education and training institutions** – Foundation for skills development of workers and managers

- **Financial institutions** – Availability of financial resources for labour-related investments

**References (selected)**


### National and subnational socio-cultural environment

- **Local culture** – Distinctive values, assumptions and beliefs shared by the local community, e.g., regarding following dimensions proposed by Hofstede (2011):
  - Power distance
  - Individualism versus collectivism
  - Masculinity versus femininity
  - Uncertainty avoidance
  - Long-term versus short-term orientation
  - Indulgence versus restraint

- **Value of CSR** – The value a society attributes to socially responsible behaviour of local companies

- **Definition of labour-related CSR** – Local definition of socially responsible employment practices

- **Gender norms** – Local definition of how women and men should behave and be treated

**References (selected)**


### National and subnational industry environment

- **Labour markets** – Characteristics of the available labour force (e.g., size, skill level, and nationality)

- **Competitors** – Characteristics of local competition (e.g., intensity, degree of cooperation, CSR standards)

- **Industry reputation** – The labour-related CSR reputation of the local industry

- **Technology** – The standard type of technology and degree of automatisation used in the local industry

- **Production process** – The standard production process used in the local industry

**References (selected)**


### Table 8. Local influences

Source: Own creation based on the works referenced within the table
2.4.3 Processing of interacting global and local influences

A distinctive feature of crossvergence is that it highlights the impact and simultaneous dynamic interaction of converging as well as diverging forces. This characteristic of crossvergence fits well to recent developments in the debate on decent work in GPNs. Lund-Thomsen et al. (2016a, p. 11) claim an “emerging consensus that the combination of different drivers, rather than any single factor alone, produces socially and environmentally responsible behaviour.” Not only global-local interactions have thereby to be considered but also global-global interactions because global stakeholders in GPNs do not speak with one voice.

Different insights on the impact of global-local interactions can be found in the debate on decent work in GPNs. While Nadvi and Wältring among others feared in 2002 (p. 5) that global labour market regulation would weaken national efforts, more recent works indicate that global and local demands need to be aligned in order to enhance the effectiveness of global regulation (e.g., Mayer & Gereffi, 2010, p. 19). The impact of local institutions is thereby the focus of the debate. Toffel et al. (2015) prove in a quantitative study across different countries and industries that domestic legal institutions significantly influence suppliers’ compliance with private standards. Protective laws governing collective labour rights and press freedom reduce labour violations in social audits. A few qualitative studies additionally indicate an interaction of the local socio-cultural environment with the implementation of global standards. In their research on a knitwear-exporting cluster in India, Soundararajan and Brown (2016, pp. 96–97) report complaints by local managers that lead firms’ understanding of labour standards does not necessarily match their own understanding and experience. This disconnect compromised the managers’ willingness to comply with private regulatory demands. Characteristics of the local industry and their interaction with global standards are addressed in quantitative studies on the effectiveness of private labour standards. Bartley and Egels-Zandén (2015) and He and Perloff (2013) include industry characteristics as control variables in their research designs.

Global-global interactions cause significant strain for local suppliers because global advocates of a competitive market and global advocates of social standards frequently have conflicting demands. On a public regulatory level, Stallings (2010) and Caraway (2010) show that global pressure for labour standards exists in parallel with global pressure for the flexibility of labour markets, and these pressures partially contradict each other. On a private regulatory level, scientists and practitioners warn that compliance with
international labour standards is hampered by lead firms’ demands for decreases in price and lead time (Lund-Thomsen et al., 2012, p. 1234; Oka, 2010, p. 73). A supervisor in China vividly summarizes the resulting conflict for suppliers: “The foreigners put us in a trap. On the one hand, they talk about human rights, but on the other hand, they also want good products cheaply. For that, they have to trade of human rights. It is quite obvious” (Ngai, 2005, p. 108).

The notion of crossvergence points to the opportunity to use theories about actor decision-making to advance understanding of interaction effects. The concept highlights that drivers of convergence and divergence join at the point of the individual (Ralston, 2008, p. 29). Decision-makers (consciously or unconsciously) process the different drivers and make their socially (ir)responsible employment decisions. Different theories exist on how decisions are made in organisations. In the context of GPNs, transaction-cost theory and legitimacy theory have been used to explain decision-making in lead firms (Anner, 2012; Huq et al., 2014) but have yet to be applied to the context of suppliers. In particular, legitimacy theory seems likely to be able to provide theoretical guidance since it is frequently used to explain CSR-related firm agency (Bhattacharyya, 2014, p. 718). The theory postulates that firm decision-makers use legitimacy considerations as (one) basic principle when making strategic, especially CSR-related, decisions. Legitimacy is thereby achieved when firm actions are congruent with the norms, values, beliefs, and definitions of the larger society (Suchman, 1995, p. 574).

Other starting points for identifying basic principles guiding decision-making in supplier firms can be found in Yeung and Coe’s (2015) dynamic theory of GPNs. The theory includes a debate on causal conditions that guide decisions in GPNs and that can influence different actors, including suppliers. The authors discuss “competitive considerations” and “risk considerations” as basic principles for actor decision-making in GPNs (Yeung & Coe, 2015, p. 34). Yeung and Coe’s theory was not designed for understanding suppliers’ employment decisions but for generally explaining actor-specific strategies in GPNs. Looking at empirical studies on employment practices of suppliers, however, the ideas included in the framework, especially regarding competitive considerations, correspond to existing research findings. Khara and Lund-Thomsen (2012, p. 276) conclude that suppliers’ decisions on labour standard implementation depend on what they perceive to be economically efficient for their business operations. Stigzelius and Mark-Herbert (2009, pp. 53–54) explicitly refer to expected business
benefits, market access considerations, and financial risks and restraints as facilitators of supplier behaviour.

Future research could show how suppliers’ responses to interacting global and local influences are guided by legitimacy, competitive or risk considerations. Thereby, the differentiation of supplier types and employment dimensions discussed in the second section of this paper ought to be considered. Taking risk considerations as an example, first-tier suppliers commonly face a significant higher risk of being audited by lead firms than second-tier suppliers (Posthuma, 2010, p. 5) and the risk of losing workers due to Health and Safety breaches is often significantly lower than losing them due to unattractive working hours.

2.5 Conclusion

This paper introduced crossvergence as a conceptual lens to capture the complexity of interacting global and local influences on suppliers, and to analyse the agency of suppliers in navigating this complexity. It furthermore started structuring existing research findings to detail the crossvergence of socially (ir)responsible employment practices. With this effort, the paper intends to aid the creation of a framework that explains the formation of socially (ir)responsible employment practices in GPNs from the supplier perspective. The remainder of this conclusion reflects on this paper’s contribution to the debate on global-local interactions in GPNs, its contribution to the nascent discourse on supplier agency, and the benefit of understanding employment decisions of suppliers for advancing the UN’s goal of decent work for all

The GPN approach highlights the importance of not only considering vertical but also horizontal linkages in the analysis of network dynamics and outcomes in global production. The crossvergence process presented in this paper confirms this claim for the analysis of employment outcomes. Considering the local institutional, socio-cultural and industry environment of suppliers is crucial for understanding the social responsibility of their employment practices. The quest to specify the crossvergence process thereby indicated the need to bridge literatures to advance understanding of horizontal linkages in GPNs. This paper particularly benefitted from using IHRM insights to supplement the discussion on local influences on suppliers’ employment practices and their interaction with global dynamics. Reviewing the literature, thereby, revealed further potential of IHRM to contribute to the debate on decent work in GPNs which went beyond the scope
of this paper. Insights on HRM in MNEs may contribute to the analysis of global-local interactions since subsidiaries like suppliers need to apply globally defined standards in a local context. Results from comparative analyses of HRM furthermore elucidate how domestic firms make employment decisions in different parts of the world, including the Global South. Thereby, it remains to be tested whether HR practices of suppliers in GPNs have more in common with the employment practices of local MNE subsidiaries or those of domestic firms. Bridging literatures proved for the topic of employment practices promising to advance understanding of the local embedding of global networks.

The GPN approach encourages actor-centered research to advance understanding of GPN dynamics and outcomes, especially supplier agency awaits further attention. This paper discussed the agency of suppliers in processing global and local influences, and in designing employment responses. The crossvergence perspective particularly points to the opportunity to use theories about actor decision-making to further unpack suppliers’ processing of global and local influences. Legitimacy, competitive or risk considerations can guide their employment responses. When discussing supplier agency, it needs to be noted that suppliers are not only on the receiving end of global and local demands. As active agents, they respond to external influences and shape them in return. First, the agency of (first-tier) suppliers determines in how far global labour standards are implemented in the suppliers’ own supply chain (Wilhelm, Blome, Bhakoo, & Paulraj, 2016). Second, the agency of (clusters/networks of) suppliers can impact the contours of global governance structures in GPNs (Knorringa & Nadvi, 2016). Crossvergence cannot be considered a unidirectional or a one-time process. Instead, a dynamic bidirectional relationship between external influences and supplier responses exists. The dynamic nature of crossvergence is recommended to be addressed in future research because the responsibility of employment practices in the long run depends on how suppliers react to external influences.

The development of a framework that explains the formation of employment practices from the suppliers’ perspective is advocated in this paper as a starting point to identify new ways to promote socially responsible employment practices despite unfavourable circumstances. More research on supplier agency can for instance help to develop incentives for suppliers to act responsibly. An exemplary thought experiment will illustrate this idea. If future research shows that cost-capability considerations primarily guide supplier agency, suppliers’ cost-capability ratios for socially responsible employment practices need to be optimized to achieve the UN’s goal of decent work for
all. Theoretically, responsible practices do not need to be an economic burden for suppliers. Reviews of the business benefits of CSR (Carroll & Shabana, 2010; Homburg et al., 2013) as well as research on the link between strategic HRM and business performance (Sels et al., 2006; Sheehan, 2014) suggest that suppliers might be incentivized to promote socially responsible employment practices for their own economic profit. Jayasinghe (2016) finds first empirical evidence for this suggestion in Sri Lanka. If future research can identify socially responsible and economically beneficial employment practices as well as suitable capacity-development tools supporting suppliers in the implementation of these practices, supplier agency might become another force next to buyer, labour, and government agency promoting socially responsible employment practices in GPNs.

To qualify this rather optimistic outlook on the role of suppliers, it needs to be noted that the implementation of socially responsible employment practices is not likely to benefit all suppliers in GPNs — as is the case for lead firms’ CSR practices. The focus on supplier agency is therefore advocated as a supplement to the existing focus on lead firm agency, labour agency, and government agency, not as a substitute. The paper thereby supports Ponte and Sturgeon's (2014, p. 196) notion of a “modular theory-building approach” and introduces the concept of crossvergence as a conceptual lens to advance the module on supplier agency.
3 Promoting decent work in global production – lessons learnt from the Jordanian garment industry

This chapter has been accepted to be published in the Springer book “Social Responsibility in a Dynamic Global Environment: Sustainable Management in Challenging Times”.

3.1 Introduction

In 2019, the ILO found that despite CSR improvements, the current rate of progress is insufficient to achieve “decent work for all” (SDG 8) by 2030 (ILO, 2019c, p. 3). In particular, the garment GPN has been highlighted as a prime case of corporate social irresponsibility (Luque & Herrero-García, 2019, p. 1285). Many garment workers encounter excessive and forced overtime, pay below living wages, health and safety concerns, repression of collective bargaining rights, discrimination, and sexual harassment. One strategy to support the enhancement of CSR efforts is based on the analysis of cases in which significant decent work progress has been made. Case studies foster understanding of how complex factors interact in a real-life environment (Yin, 2009, p. 4). In this paper, the case of the garment export industry in Jordan is examined, where significant decent work improvements have been realized, although the end goal has not yet been achieved (BWJ, 2019b; Business and Human Rights Resource Center, 2018, p. 1; Kolben, 2019, p. 54).

The current paper builds on previous research regarding Jordan. Early articles highlighted the precarious working conditions in the garment export industry and linked them to the trade regime (Kolben, 2013), the dominance of migrant labour (Francoise De Bel-Air & Dergarabedian, 2006), and the questionable economic viability of the industry (Domat et al., 2012). Jordan had no natural competitive advantage in garment production, little experience in garment exports, and few qualified garment workers when the country entered a preferential trade agreement with the United States. Foreign companies subsequently set up factories in Jordan to benefit from the agreement, but they remained disconnected from the local economy and employed mostly vulnerable migrant labour. This situation nourished the ground for labour abuse (Azmeh, 2014, pp. 505–506; Kolben, 2013, p. 218). More recently, studies have addressed efforts for improving working conditions and identified success factors. Kolben (2015) discusses the
interaction of private and public labour regulation to enforce labour standard compliance in Jordan. Aissi et al. (2018) find that the heightened monitoring and intergovernmental dialogue driven by the Jordan-United States free trade agreement benefitted labour rights. Kolben (2019) traces how BWJ, a joint program of the ILO and the International Finance Corporation, supports the development of the garment industry and decent work. Robertson (2019) examines one BWJ project in particular and links the BWJ transparency portal to improved labour standard compliance.

Although the early observations of unacceptable working conditions in Jordan are not unusual for global garment production (Anner, 2019, p. 705), the identified success factors are not necessarily universally applicable. Free trade agreements were not found to benefit labour rights in South Korea (van Roozendaal, 2017) and Bair (2017) finds the effectiveness of the Better Work (BW) program to be contingent on the local context. Such findings underline the need to account for contextual specifics when discussing enablers and inhibitors of decent work progress. The current scientific debate features an increasing consensus that no single factor alone can explain decent work outcomes. The interaction of different global, local, public, and private factors shape working conditions in global production (Lund-Thomsen et al., 2016a, p. 11; Niforou, 2015, p. 301). Therefore, current research on individual drivers of decent work needs to be accompanied by case studies that illustrate the interplay of drivers and highlight contingencies. Holzberg (2019) theoretically systematized factors that interact and influence labour-related CSR decisions in supplier firms. She argues that the interaction of global competitive forces (e.g., price pressure, lead time pressure) and global public and private regulatory efforts (e.g., labour standards, audit regimes), combined with local institutional factors (e.g., legal institutions, worker institutions), socio-cultural factors (e.g., work ethics, gender norms), and industry factors (e.g., labour markets, production sophistication), must be considered when trying to understand decent work outcomes. Global and local factors crossverify at the point of the supplier and through their interaction shape decent work realities on the factory floor (Holzberg, 2019, p. 311). As the framework mirrors the complexity of the real-life environment of production networks, it serves as the theoretical starting point for the design of this case study.

The case study analyses the interaction of global, local, public, and private factors that shape working conditions in the Jordanian garment export industry to answer two research questions:
(1) Which factors and factor interactions enabled decent work progress in the garment export industry in Jordan between 2008 and 2018?

(2) Which factors and factor interactions inhibit further decent work progress in the garment export industry in Jordan in 2018?

The background of the Jordanian case and the methodological research design are outlined in the next section of the paper. Case study findings are presented and discussed subsequently. The concluding section sums up the study’s main research contributions and their implications for the Jordanian and the global garment production networks.

3.2 Jordanian garment industry: Background and decent work developments

By producing 25% of the country’s total exports and employing 68,300 workers, the garment export industry is central to the Jordanian trade and labour market (BWJ, 2019a, p. 10, data: 2018). Approximately 95 factories operate in Jordan, producing mainly for the United States (BWJ, 2019a, p. 10, data: 2018). A distinguishing feature of the industry is its strong international linkages. The garment export industry developed after a preferential trade agreement with the United States came into effect in 1997. Asian manufacturers in particular invested in setting up garment factories in Jordan (Azmeh, 2014, p. 505). Currently, almost all factories are foreign-owned and 75% of the workforce, along with most owners and managers are migrants, especially from Bangladesh, India, Sri Lanka, and Nepal (BWJ, 2019a, p. 10, data: 2018). Jordanian Labour Law requires a 25% share of Jordanian workers, which is supported by the creation of satellite factories in rural areas.

Poor working conditions in the industry first drew attention in 2006 owing to a report by the NLC (2006). The report included testimony by migrant workers about working hours exceeding 20 hours per shift on 6-7 days per week, beatings and torture by supervisors, sexual abuse, and wages being withheld or severely underpaid. The accounts portrayed inhumane living conditions, with insufficient living space, food, and water. The information sparked an international outcry. Buyers retreated from Jordan and several of the factories mentioned in the NLC report closed (Kolben, 2013, p. 213). Jordan was placed on the United States Department of Labor’s (USDOL) forced labour list in 2009, and the United States government started providing funding and technical expertise to aid labour standard improvement. Agreement was reached to institutionalize the BW
program in Jordan. The program aims to promote labour standards and productivity in the
global garment industry.

In 2019, international observers reported significant improvements and comparably
favourable working conditions (Aissi et al., 2018, pp. 691–692; Kolben, 2019, p. 54;
Robertson, 2019, p. 24). Jordan was removed from the USDOL’s forced labour list in
2016, and a 2019 report issued in the name of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs noted
“the excellent compliance with environmental and social standards” as a core benefit of
the industry (Enclude BV & CMC, 2019, p. 4). In particular, at 220 JOD (approximately
310 USD in 2018), the monthly minimum wage was more than three times higher than in
Bangladesh and could cover living expenses in most rural areas of Jordan. Workers
worked on average 53.5 hours per week and excessive hours, forced labour, physical
violence by supervisors, and unauthorized wage deductions were found to be exceptions
rather than the norm (BWJ, 2019a, data: 2018). Nevertheless, decent work for all has not
yet been achieved (Business and Human Rights Resource Center, 2018, p. 1). Especially
at subcontractors, working conditions remain sub-standard, for example, with working
hours of up to 97 hours per week (BWJ, 2019a, p. 34, data: 2018). Furthermore, Jordan
has a single trade union structure and therewith remains noncompliant with the ILO’s
Freedom of Association convention. In addition, BWJ criticises occupational safety and
health breaches, especially in dormitories, and acknowledges shortcomings in tracking
and preventing incidents of rape and sexual harassment.

3.3 Methodology of evaluation and data

The decent work developments in the Jordanian garment export industry were analysed
with an explanatory case study design. The analysis aimed to explain which developments
enabled decent work improvements, which factors hindered further progress, and how
interactions between different drivers shaped the current decent work situation.

Evidence was collected from multiple sources (see Table 9 for an overview and
Annexes 15-17 for further details): Between April and May 2018, seven industry and
labour experts and 13 factory owners-managers were interviewed. A maximum variation
logic guided the sampling of respondents as common themes that are discovered across a
diverse range of respondents are likely to reflect core and shared experiences of the
overall research case (Patton, 2002, p. 235). Furthermore, 20 workers participated in
group interviews, and the author observed three industry and workers’ events. During the
interviews, respondents reported on current working conditions and reflected on changes over time, reasons for improvements, and remaining obstacles. Interviews lasted 60-90 minutes, and most were audio-recorded and transcribed. If respondents did not consent to recording, the interviews were documented in detail. The interviews and observations were primarily conducted in English or German. Selected interviews and observations were aided by translators (Arabic, Bengali, Hindi, Nepali, and Sinhala). All interviews were labelled with a code that specified the type of interview (Firm, Expert, or Worker). The eighteenth interview in Jordan, which was the twelfth firm interview, was labelled J18F12. Complementing the field research, over 60 international and local publications were analysed to obtain insights on the case of Jordan between 2006 and 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplier firm interviews</th>
<th>Factory owners-managers</th>
<th>Expert interviews</th>
<th>Experts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>Non-Jordanian</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-499</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-1499</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-5500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of expertise</td>
<td>Industry expert</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labour expert</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worker group interview</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Document analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>Non-Jordanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Overview of collected data (chapter 3)

Source: Own creation

The data were analysed with the help of Yin's (2009, pp. 141–144) explanation building technique. Holzberg's (2019) crossvergence framework provided the initial theoretical propositions. It proposes that global competitive pressures (price, lead time, flexibility, quality pressure), global public labour market regulation (labour standards set and promoted by international institutions), global private labour market regulation (labour standards set and promoted by buyers and private MSIs), local institutions (labour laws, business, labour and civil society institutions), local socio-culture (local values,
norms and decent work beliefs) and the local industry environment (technological, business and labour characteristics of local industrial clusters) shape work outcomes in global garment production. The propositions were revised until a coherent explanation for the developments in Jordan was found. Interviews and documents were coded following the steps of a qualitative content analysis as outlined by Schreier (2014). The final category system is presented in Annex 18, and Annex 19 shows an excerpt from the coding frame. The interviews with owners-managers served to identify which factors influenced the design of working conditions and (de-)motivated decent work improvements. Insights from experts helped to elucidate the factors that were addressed and to evaluate the extent to which the interview insights were common for the industry. The documents primarily served to trace developments over time, and along with the worker interviews, they were used to triangulate the data following Yin's (2009, p. 114) suggestion to use multiple sources of evidence to ensure validity. Using the iterative process of the explanation building technique was intended to ensure the internal validity of the case study. The analysis was done twice and documented in MAXQDA to foster reliability.

3.4 Case study results

The analysis confirmed that an interplay of multiple factors enabled decent work progress in Jordan. As proposed by previous authors (Holzberg, 2019, p. 311; Lund-Thomsen et al., 2016a, p. 11; Soundararajan & Brown, 2016, p. 84), global and local industry factors interacted at the factory level and needed to be considered simultaneously to understand decent work developments. Thereby, categorisation according to level was insufficient for structuring the multiple factors detected. As suggested by the explanation building technique, different theoretical logics were considered before eventually finding that an actor-oriented sub-categorisation suited the data. Enabling factors on each level could be attributed to the influence of business, labour, or public stakeholders, whereby labour-oriented societal actors such as NGOs or local clans were included among labour stakeholders. Figure 7 depicts the different influences that shaped decent work realities in Jordan. Theoretically, it mirrors Gereffi and Lee's (2016, p. 30) proposal that private (business), social (labour), and public governance on global and local levels affect social upgrading in global supply chains, and extends it by adding the factory level. Thereby, in the case of Jordan, stakeholders on each level not only governed decent work efforts but actively supported their implementation to various degrees. Moreover, the analysis
revealed that the coordinated interaction of different actors was crucial for decent work progress. The work of BWJ played a particularly important role in this regard and was placed in its own category as a cross-level influence in the analysis. The following sections outline the enablers of decent work progress in Jordan by level and highlight their interactions and the role of BWJ in facilitating them. The section on inhibitors identifies remaining issues in Jordan in 2018 that contributed to inhibiting or even deteriorating progress.

Figure 7. Stakeholder influence on decent work in the garment industry in Jordan
Source: Own creation

3.4.1 Enablers of decent work progress

3.4.1.1 Global-level developments

On a global level, public, business, and labour stakeholders have put pressure on the Jordanian garment export industry to improve working conditions.

With regard to public governance and support, North American governments in particular, and since 2016 also the EU, had an interest in the industry. United States
governmental actors used trade agreements to demand decent work and put Jordan on the USDOL’s forced labour list from 2009 to 2016. The EU-Jordan agreement financially motivated suppliers to employ Syrian refugees [BWJ-report-2016], and the industry received technical and financial support to fulfil these demands. United States governmental actors have repeatedly acted as mediators in local decent work debates, and the United States, Canada, and the EU have substantially helped finance BWJ to monitor and support decent work progress in Jordan.

In terms of business governance and support, international buyers put pressure on suppliers by specifying codes of conduct or by requiring international certificates that (partially) go beyond the Jordanian law and ILO core labour standards. The characterisation of buyer-supplier relationships thereby differed between respondents. While some characterized their relationship as a “partnership” [J18F12], others highlighted discrepancies between buyers’ codes of conducts and the high pressure on prices, as will be further discussed in the inhibitors section. All respondents agreed that the work with BWJ substantially helped to improve understanding between buyers and suppliers. “Better Work teach us 90% from what [buyer] auditors need” [J08F05].

Finally, with regard to labour governance and support, the international union Industri-All supported the Jordanian garment union; for instance, by providing trainings to union representatives. Furthermore, international NGOs continued to monitor the industry. The Institute for Global Labour and Human Rights, for instance, has regularly published reports on the situation in Jordan [IGLHR-2011a, IGLHR-2012, IGLHR-2013].

3.4.1.2 Local industry-level developments

On the local industry level, Jordan experienced substantial changes driven by public, business, and labour stakeholders. Thereby, stakeholder collaboration was key to promoting decent work.

Several decent work improvements were linked to changes on the public level, especially legislative changes. The minimum wage was frequently raised for Jordanians (see figure 8). Furthermore, progress towards the support of migrant labour was made in 2010 when the workers received the legal right to join trade unions. Even though compliance with labour laws was still mainly assessed by BWJ in 2018, resources and capabilities of the local labour inspectorate were incrementally developed to eventually take over factory assessments. Generally, a pattern was discerned indicating that
governmental efforts oftentimes (initially) focused on Jordanian workers but subsequently also benefitted migrant workers as the garment export industry is mandated to not discriminate between nationalities, with the mandate being strictly controlled by BWJ and other stakeholders.

For business and labour organisations, documents and interviews showed a marked increase in decent work sensitivity and capabilities. All interviewees from these organisations underlined the necessity to focus on decent work for the survival of the industry. Employer representatives placed this need in the context of the need to remain competitive, whereby the focus on decent work was frequently considered as the strategic edge of Jordan. While the treatment of migrant labour in particular was a black box for union representatives in the past, interviews and observations showed that investments in infrastructure and capabilities enabled the union to represent both local and migrant members in 2018.

Along with decent work sensitivity and capabilities, collaboration between employers and employees improved. The introduction of a collective bargaining process, which resulted in the first collective bargaining agreement (CBA) in 2013, was highlighted by industry and labour experts as a milestone. The process was intensely supported by BWJ and was described as functioning by experts in 2018: “We work every two years, we have a new collective bargaining agreement, we sit, we bargain, we communicate. The dialogue becomes very intense at one point or another, but we always reached the conclusion that both parties can agree upon. That is reasonable, acceptable, and workable” [J15E05]. Among others, CBAs reduced wage discrimination (see figure 8), set organisational safety and health standards for dormitories, and unified the contracts for migrant workers.
3.4.1.3 Factory-level developments

Interests and power structures on the factory level changed substantially between 2008 and 2018 and were essential for understanding decent work progress in Jordan. Employers’ and workers’ decent work resources developed, and dialogue between these two groups was established in many factories.

Many interviewed owners-managers and all experts described compliance with labour standards as an economically beneficial necessity. Based on this awareness, decent work capabilities were continuously developed. Direct exporters especially possessed the necessary structures, policies, and management skills to promote decent work. As most direct exporters operating in Jordan belong to large Asian textile and garment firms, they additionally had the financial resources to invest in decent work. However, not all interviewed owners-managers possessed awareness, capabilities, and resources. Limitations, especially concerning subcontractors, are elaborated in the inhibitors section.

J18F12: [decent] work is growing the industry […]. We are focusing on much better issues today because the bar is rising in the industry because of the willingness, of the owners also, management also. That's the whole equation.
Workers initially started with a very weak bargaining position in Jordan. Being young, foreign, poor, and poorly educated, they were subject to the (good)will of their employers in 2008. These characteristics still hold true for migrant labour in 2018 (see Section 3.4.2.4), but their support structures and decent work capabilities have improved. The union supported workers and trained them in their rights and responsibilities and their negotiation skills. BWJ and other stakeholders gave workers a voice in their assessments:

J19F13: During this audit, they will make interview with the worker. [...] Then you will get a feeling if they are happy or not. If they are not happy, they will ask why and what is the issue [...]. Better Work, they will do this, and Ministry of Labour, they will do this, plus the buyers, before issue of any order. He will be continual visit, every time visit.

Furthermore, the value of migrant labour for employers improved as the law currently requires employers to hire 25% Jordanian workers, who were said to be less productive and reliable. The integration of Jordanian workers additionally contributed to enhancing working conditions as their bargaining position is relatively strong. (Skilled) Jordanian labour was reported to be difficult to recruit, and particular care was reported to be taken to retain women, who commonly do not work in rural Jordan: “[...] this industry becoming not anymore attractive to the worker, especially the local workers. It's not easy to keep the workers in the company” [J09F06]. Individual workers also benefited from social and family support. Respondents reported cases in which all workers from a community left the factory if one of them felt mistreated.

When asked about dialogue, respondents highlighted the Performance Improvement Consultative Committees (PICCs) in which representatives of all groups of workers interact and consult with their employers. Factories that had been working with BWJ since the beginning especially praised the benefits of having PICCs. Supervisor and management trainings initiated by BWJ furthermore focused on improving day-to-day communication on the factory floor. J15E05 emphasized that for decent work progress “it's always important to listen to them [workers], hear their stories and see what they need, what is missing”.

3.4.1.4 Interactions

Developments on factory, local industry, and global levels are not independent of each other. Interview responses and documents did not indicate single factors that enabled change, but rather described an interwoven process driven by various stakeholders on different levels. The following example illustrates this interaction.
The Jordanian government increased the minimum wage for local labour in 2012 but failed to protect migrant labour (see figure 8). Local stakeholders, in this case the local union supported by BWJ, admonished this shortcoming. They highlighted that different wages for local and migrant labour constituted an act of discrimination, which is prohibited by international labour standards and most buyers’ codes of conducts. Local stakeholders struggled to solve this dilemma. In a mediation led by the United States, the Government of Jordan and local business and labour organisations finally agreed that a sectoral agreement should remedy the breach. This agreement started a collective bargaining process on the local level that was again supported by global stakeholders, specifically the ILO in cooperation with BWJ. In the end, employer and employee representatives agreed that in-kind benefits provided to migrants could offset the difference between the in-cash minimum wages of local and migrant labour [CBA-2013]. Overtime pay of migrant workers, however, was still calculated based on their in-cash wages; a significant shortcoming in an industry environment where overtime is indispensable to make a living. A memorandum of understanding remedied this shortcoming in 2014 [MoU-2014]. The memorandum of understanding obligated suppliers to calculate an increasing amount of in-kind benefits into their overtime pay. By August 2017, overtime pay had to be calculated on the same basis for Jordanian and migrant workers. Despite these provisions, equal and minimum wages were not yet provided to all workers in 2017. BWJ detected inaccurate calculations of overtime wages in 27% of analysed cases [BWJ-Report-2017]. Only after BWJ trained factory managers and the global and local union trained worker representatives on the correct calculation of overtime pay was this percentage reduced to 15% in 2018 [BWJ-Report-2018]. Hence, the contribution and interaction of multiple actors on global, local industry, and factory levels was necessary to improve wages for all workers.

3.4.1.5 Better Work Jordan

As already indicated, BWJ played a crucial role in promoting developments on global, local industry, and factory levels, particularly by coordinating interactions between the different stakeholder groups. Interview respondents highlighted that BWJ consulted, monitored, and facilitated across stakeholders.

BWJ worked with all industry stakeholders and provided advisory services, trainings, secondments, information resources, and/or project support. Services were portrayed as highly successful by respondents. Almost all changes on global, local industry, and factory levels were made with the support of BWJ.
BWJ factory assessments were especially characterized as instrumental for decent work progress. “Better Work is watching you. That is good, Better Work, it is good that we have them. [...] One needs someone, an external buddy, who says, this is right, this is wrong” [J02E01]. Suppliers and experts agreed that BWJ assessments were increasingly accepted by buyers as substitutes for their own audits and thorough advisory services through the program enabled suppliers to develop compliance with global and local labour regulations. Assessments additionally helped BWJ to understand which underlying factors caused decent work deficits in Jordan. As described above, the detection of multiple cases of wage discrimination in factory assessments in 2012 helped to initiate the collective bargaining process to harmonise wages.

In addition to the advisory and assessment services, BWJ’s facilitatory role was emphasized in interviews and documents. Different information portals, reports, and publications made the status quo of decent work in Jordanian factories transparent to buyers and the public. Building on increased transparency, BWJ stimulated dialogue between stakeholders. On the factory level, owners-managers underlined that BWJ greatly helped employer-worker dialogue by promoting PICCs and worker-management committees. “[PICCs existed] since long time with the labour union. They’ve got more organized with BWJ, when BWJ started. BWJ started in 2009. That’s when it got official, more documented” [J07F04]. On the industry level, BWJ supported the negotiation of CBAs. Local stakeholders are connected in BWJ’s Project Advisory Committee, and global buyers are connected with local stakeholders during the annual buyer forums. Furthermore, respondents highlighted that BWJ promotes understanding and solves problems across stakeholders in each training and advisory meeting.

As the BW program exists in many countries but is not equally successful in all (Bair, 2017, p. 169), the analysis also examined which factors enabled BWJ to successfully serve as an advisor, assessor, and facilitator in Jordan. The obligation to participate and program acceptance across stakeholder groups were thereby shown to be of core importance. In 2010, the Government of Jordan mandated that suppliers exporting to the United States and Israel and their subcontractors had to participate in the program. Most BW programs in other countries are voluntary (Bair, 2017, p. 174). Furthermore, documents and reports showed that global buyers, governments, and NGOs put pressure on local stakeholders to work with BWJ. Consequently, BWJ covered almost all exporting garment suppliers in Jordan in 2018. In addition, BWJ managed to win
acceptance and respect across stakeholder groups. Interviewees repeatedly highlighted that BWJ balanced the interests of all stakeholders.

J15E05: When Better Work Jordan came to Jordan […] we were worried. […] Actually, it came up to be a very healthy relationship. They taught factories and they taught the sector how to improve working conditions, to have decent jobs, decent work, good working environment. They pinpoint on the relations, where we can improve, and we can work together to accomplish better results at the end.

3.4.2 Inhibitors of decent work progress

Despite progress, the garment export industry had not achieved decent work for all in 2018. Thus, the analysis also sought to identify which issues inhibited or even deteriorated progress.

3.4.2.1 Competitiveness of the Jordanian export industry

The quest to improve working conditions was frequently set against the need to remain competitive. Even though several interviewees highlighted that decent work helps suppliers improve competitiveness, this criterion co-existed with buyers’ price, lead time, and quality demands. Decent work improvements affecting running costs (e.g., increasing wages or reducing working hours) were frequently described as a threat to competitiveness. When asked about the possibility of negotiating with buyers, one respondent explained: “The American clients, no. The Americans, they are coming, ‘I have this jacket with this cost, take it or leave it’ […]” [J09F06].

Subcontractors especially criticized the immense price competition. The interviewed subcontractors were medium-sized firms with limited financial resources. They stressed their lack of bargaining power vis-à-vis direct exporters and expressed they could only be profitable with excessive overtime and a focus on migrant labour. Interviewed subcontractors had not been trained in decent work and their management systems were much less developed than those of direct exporters. They had only recently started working with BWJ because they were legally obligated to and/or they considered decent work progress as a prerequisite to economically upgrade. At the time of the analysis, it remained unclear whether they would manage to economically and socially upgrade.

The competitive situation of most direct exporters looked more favourable. Their highly sophisticated production system and qualified (migrant) workers ensured outstanding productivity, and as direct exporters, they earned higher income from sales
than subcontractors. Nevertheless, they also underlined that the future of the export industry in Jordan was questionable, and some showed reluctance to make substantial further investments. “If I cannot project my cost for the next three to five years, if I cannot project the laws that I’m working under for the next three to five years, it’s a very sceptical concept” [J07F04]. The lack of a promising perspective for the garment exports industry in Jordan was linked by owners-managers and experts to (1) the minimum wage, which was more than three times higher in Jordan than in Bangladesh, (2) the dependence on the United States, where the political climate in 2018 questioned the benefits of free trade, and (3) the repeated ad hoc changes in local labour regulations (minimum wages, tax exemptions, labour policies concerning local labour). As one way out of this dilemma, respondents contemplated winning European buyers. At the time of the interviews, the need to hire 15% of refugee labour to qualify for the EU-Jordan agreement and the lack of connections to European buyers prevented most firms from starting trade with Europe.

3.4.2.2 Institutional environment in Jordan

When asked about what factory owners-managers wished to change to further develop socially and economically, a common theme involved government regulations and government cooperation with the export industry. This argument again referred to the link between decent work and competitiveness. Respondents outlined examples of intense bureaucracy and frequent changes in regulatory demands which impaired competitiveness. “They [Ministry of Labour] are supporting and they are making problems for us. Yearly they are changing the law. Yearly they are changing, so it’s not workable actually” [J08F05]. Migrant managers especially felt that foreign investors were not welcome in Jordan.

Experts remarked that frequent changes in government officials impaired dialogue and that they hoped for more support of the export industry from government side.

J07F04: “this is a sector that recruits 70,000 people. There’s big potential for the sector to grow. […] Doubling the 70,000 to become 140,000 is a great opportunity in front of us. […] We just need to see the future. […] If the government would believe in the sector and would take the sector to the next level […]”.

Even though different steps towards more stakeholder dialogue were taken, documents and interview responses showed that there was no joint perspective for the garment industry in 2018. While the mainly foreign-owned garment exports industry was rooted in the Cut-Make-Trim-business and relied heavily on migrant labour, the
government was interested in moving the industry into higher value-added segments. It furthermore continued to enact regulations reducing the share of migrant labour to counter rising unemployment rates in Jordan. Notably, the government strategy was considered to be an inhibitor in the mainly foreign-owned exports industry. For the local industry, it was viewed as enabling social and economic upgrading.

3.4.2.3 Limits of social auditing

Factories in Jordan are subject to the Jordanian labour law, ILO core labour standards, and buyers’ codes of conduct. The factories are inspected by BWJ, local labour inspectors, and international auditors, whereby BWJ succeeded in substantially aligning these assessments. While most respondents considered BWJ assessments as just and helpful, respondents perceived local inspections to be a burden. Buyer inspections were considered acceptable at the time of the interviews, whereby improvements in buyer inspections were frequently attributed to BWJ. The responses showed that in 2018 a functioning inspection system depended on BWJ.

However, BWJ inspections were not perfect as BWJ interviews and reports showed. First, BWJ uses local legislation and ILO core labour standards for reference in their assessments and is thereby limited. Regarding Freedom of Association, the Jordanian law only allowed for one trade union in the industry, and factories therefore could not comply with this standard. Second, local and BWJ assessments held scope for deceit. Some workers reported cases in which they were asked to work overtime without it being recorded. Third, BWJ repeatedly noted difficulty in assessing some standards, particularly the prevention of sexual harassment which is a highly sensitive topic in Jordan. Fourth, BWJ assesses decent work issues which local stakeholders have limited power to change. The support of migrant-sending countries and foreign recruitment agencies is for instance needed to permanently eradicate child labour, forced labour, and the payment of recruitment fees.

3.4.2.4 Worker vulnerability

Workers often belonged to vulnerable groups (young, poor, mainly female, poorly educated), and migrant workers had an especially weak bargaining position. They were isolated in industrial zones and commonly only stayed in Jordan for two years. They depended on local and international organisations to fight for their rights, and it is especially notable that migrant workers were not legally eligible to stand for union office
in 2016 and their right to vote in union elections was not enforced in 2015 [BWJ-report-2015]. The single union structure prevented them from selecting another union. Although migrant workers were much better protected in 2018 than in 2008, they remained dependent on global actors for protection.

Additionally, many direct exporters struggled with the management of Jordanian labour. Interviews and documents revealed a socio-cultural disconnect, especially between foreign managers and local workers. Interviews with Jordanian managers who successfully run satellite or locally owned firms showed that the needs of local and migrant workers differed. Improving formal labour standards had not necessarily made a workplace attractive for Jordanians. And even though Jordanians had more bargaining power than migrants vis-à-vis their employers, they still belonged to a vulnerable labour group and were sometimes induced to act against their will:

J18F12: “Jordanians like to work only eight hours, predominantly. But […] they want to make extra money by doing overtime, because the cost of living is going up. They might not like it but now the change is coming.”

3.5 Conclusions and perspectives

The garment export industry in Jordan went from being a prime case of social irresponsibility to a good practice case of social compliance in the garment supply chain. The analysis revealed that multiple actors on global, local industry, and factory levels contributed to this success. The identification of most of the decent work enablers and inhibitors confirmed previous research insights: Complementary private, social, and public governance (Gereffi & Lee, 2016), strengthened labour agency (Siegmann et al., 2016), more developed supplier resources (Soundararajan & Brown, 2016, p. 99), and MSIs (MacDonald et al., 2019) can help decent work progress. Competitive pressures, worker vulnerability, and limits of social auditing often inhibit it in the garment supply chain (Anner, 2019). The bird’s eye perspective of the case study prevents an in-depth discussion of each identified enabler or inhibitor. This conclusion therefore focuses on two particular observations and their implications that were especially relevant for Jordan, plus the overall implications of the detected multiple-level, multiple-stakeholder interactions.

The case showed that global pressure and local institutional changes were a necessary but not yet sufficient condition for decent work progress. Capacity development, CSR sensitivity, and financial viability at the factory level were needed to support suppliers in
their efforts to incrementally enhance labour standards. Factories with sophisticated management systems and high productivity rates managed to run profitable and responsible businesses. At the time of the analysis, subcontractors especially showed a substantial need for further development. Previous research has highlighted the need for technical capabilities and financial resources to promote decent work across garment production contexts (Nadvi & Raj-Reichert, 2015, pp. 244–245). This case study builds on this insight and extends it by showing how technical resources that enable decent work progress can be successfully developed: BWJ started work with suppliers in Jordan over 10 years ago, incrementally included a growing number of factories into their services, and adapted their services to the needs of the industry. This long-term investment tailored to the specific needs of local factories made the difference. However, such investments are difficult to finance. Many garment producers, especially medium-sized ones in the Global South, are not able to pay for such services. A model that obligates buyers, along with suppliers or international organisations, to pay for advisory services is therefore recommended.

While substantial decent work progress had been realized in Jordan, future progress remains uncertain. Several respondents were unsure how long it will remain financially viable to produce in Jordan. If the export industry moves elsewhere, decent work progress has been in vain; a fear shared with many other garment production contexts (S. I. Khan et al., 2019, p. 46; Ruwanpura & Wrigley, 2011, pp. 1040–1042). Some experts contemplated strategically focusing on CSR-sensitive buyers and high-quality products to ensure competitiveness and to aid efforts to win European buyers. The current trend in Europe towards nearshoring and sustainability-sensitive consumerism (McKinsey & Company, 2018, pp. 6–7) could help suppliers in these efforts. To win the support of the Jordanian government, suppliers need to further invest in satellite units and local labour. By providing large-scale work opportunities to local and refugee workers, the garment export industry incentivises local public actors to invest in its development. As this envisaged market is a niche market however, this strategy is not universally applicable.

The case study especially illustrated that no single factor alone can explain decent work progress. Multiple stakeholders interacted and jointly shaped decent work realities. While the complexity of GPNs and the multiple-stakeholder influence on decent work realities has been previously pointed out in literature (Lund-Thomsen et al., 2016a, p. 11; Niforou, 2015, p. 301), this case study contributes to existing research by practically showing how this interaction plays out in practice. A crossvergence perspective
(Holzberg, 2019), which assumes an interplay of global and local factors at the factory level, thereby proved useful to grasp decent work progress. It breaks with the common research practice to primarily focus on the influence of buyers on suppliers and shows global and local demands to equally shape decent work outcomes in supplier firms. Although case studies can illustrate the web of influences on suppliers, they cannot discuss individual enablers or inhibitors in depth. Therefore, future research is recommended to continue studying individual influences on suppliers while placing research findings more strongly in their external context. For this purpose, this study provides a map (see figure 7) systematising decent work enablers and inhibitors by level (global, local industry, factory) and stakeholder group (public, business, labour) to the debate.

In practice, the interplay of public, business, and labour stakeholders on global, local industry, and factory levels emphasises the need for cross-level stakeholder dialogue and aligned actions to drive sustainable change. However, joint efforts are often compromised because stakeholder interests differ or because stakeholders lack a unified understanding as they oftentimes exist in very different economic, social, and cultural realities. This finding is in line with previous research highlighting the need for multi-stakeholder interaction and engagement to foster decent work progress (Baumann-Pauly et al., 2017; MacDonald et al., 2019). Contributing to this stream of literature, the case shows how multi-stakeholder engagement can be successfully coordinated. In Jordan, BWJ contributed substantially to facilitating dialogue and aligned actions across stakeholders. Thereby, the case showed that the decent work journey is not necessarily a linear process. Changes in one node of the network (e.g., if interests or personnel of stakeholders’ change) and changes in network linkages (e.g., through power shifts in global competition) can reverse progress and require renewed efforts to facilitate dialogue and to support a joint agenda to promote decent work. Furthermore, limits of BWJ’s influence were revealed; for example, BWJ has limited means to ease global competition or to relieve worker vulnerability. In conclusion, the work of BWJ should not be a one-time commitment; it needs to be institutionalized as a permanent institution in Jordan and further strengthen cooperation with actors that have access to BWJ’s “blind spots”. While Jordan’s journey towards decent work cannot be copied point for point to other contexts, the idea of a multiple-level, multiple-stakeholder mediator that facilitates dialogue and helps to align actions across public, business, and labour actors can.
J18F12: Everybody is partnering with BWJ, Ministry of Labour, factories, owners, the buyers. It's basically a teamwork. Everybody is contributing and everybody is benefiting at the end of the day.
4 Vertical and horizontal diffusion of labour standards in global supply chains: Working hours practices of tier-1 and tier-2 textiles and garment suppliers

This chapter has been submitted to the “The International Journal of Human Resource Management” and is currently under review.

4.1 Introduction

Labour institutions and researchers find that working conditions in the global garment supply chain regularly breach international standards of decent work (Anner, 2019, p. 706; White et al., 2017, p. 382). The problem affects not only producers, workers, and their families but also their communities’ chances for economic and social development (Barrientos et al., 2016, p. 1280). This article focuses on the design of working hours. Forced overtime and excessive hours are common in garment and textiles production (ILO, 2014, pp. 22–23). They not only negatively affect workers’ performance but also compromise their health and well-being (Bannai & Tamakoshi, 2014, p. 16) and in some cases have even led to suicide (Smyth et al., 2013, p. 383). Most global labour standards prohibit forced overtime and excessive hours, but they have limited effect. Standards dissolve in supply chains as multiple factors moderate whether they are adopted into suppliers’ employment practices and enforced in daily business (for overviews see Holzberg, 2019; Lund-Thomsen et al., 2016a).

Research on labour standard compliance in garment production has especially focused on suppliers that directly export to global buyers (Gold et al., 2020, p. 1275). Buyers are, however, increasingly being held accountable for their entire supply chain, and in some countries this accountability is legally mandated (Amengual & Distelhorst, 2019, p. 2; Villena, 2019, p. 1149; Wilhelm, Blome, Wieck, & Xiao, 2016, p. 196). Such requirements are challenging as garment supply chains are complex networks of contracting and subcontracting relationships (Alamgir & Banerjee, 2019, p. 275; Coe & Yeung, 2015; Grimm et al., 2016, pp. 1972–1973). These relationships can be differentiated based on whether they occur between vertical stages of the supply chain or between horizontal nodes within one stage (Lazzarini et al., 2001, p. 7). Appelbaum and Gereffi (1994, p. 46) differentiate between five vertical stages in the garment supply
chain: (1) Raw materials are manufactured into (2) apparel components, especially textiles. These are (3) assembled into garments, (4) exported and (5) marketed and sold to the end consumer. This paper focuses on the second and third stage, the manufacturing of textiles and the assembly of garments, which commonly take place in the Global South (Reinecke et al., 2019, p. 13). Within each stage, subcontracting among producers creates different horizontal nodes. Especially in the stage of garment assembly, tier-1 suppliers who directly export to global buyers frequently subcontract a share of their production to lower-tier suppliers (Caro et al., 2020, p. 1). The degree to which companies comply with global standards varies across the vertical stages and horizontal nodes (Gold et al., 2020, p. 1282). Horizontal, especially hidden, subcontracting commonly has a negative impact on working conditions, but the factors driving this phenomenon are incompletely known (Caro et al., 2020, p. 2; Gold et al., 2020, p. 1275). Additionally, little scientific insight exists on the vertical diffusion of standards in the garment supply chain.

The present study is theoretically embedded in IHRM scholarship, particularly the convergence-divergence debate. It is a core strength of IHRM research to compare HR practices across contexts and to explain variations in international standard diffusion. Different frameworks have been developed to structure the antecedents of international HRM, some of them explicitly referring to the context of the Global South (e.g. Budhwar et al., 2016; Holzberg, 2019). Analyses of the convergence and divergence of HRM have shown that global as well as local influences shape HR decisions in international business. The concept of crossvergence covers this consolidation of converging and diverging influences (Al Ariss & Sidani, 2016a, p. 353). It explains why global standards are rarely adopted to their full extent, especially in the Global South (Holzberg, 2019, p. 306).

This study compares labour standard adoption across vertical stages and horizontal nodes of the garment supply chain. Specifically, it uses a multiple-case study approach to investigate the design of working hours in four research cases: direct garment exporters and subcontracting garment producers in Jordan (horizontal differentiation) and garment exporters and textiles producers in Egypt (vertical differentiation). While Egypt and Jordan have similar cultural backgrounds, they differ in their economic internationalisation, especially in the garment supply chain (Azmeh, 2014). Studying both countries helped to disentangle global and local influences on suppliers and to explain (the limits of) global standard diffusion. The focus on the Middle East and Northern Africa answers calls for more HRM research in the region (Al Ariss & Sidani, 2016a, p. 353; Budhwar et al., 2019, p. 906).
The study answers following research question and two sub-questions:

How do global working hours standards diffuse in the garment supply chain?

- How does global labour standard adoption compare across different horizontal nodes of the supply chain in Jordan (tier-1 vs. tier-2 garment production)?
- How does global labour standard adoption compare across different vertical stages of the supply chain in Egypt (textiles vs. garment production)?

4.2 Theoretical background

This section (1) operationalises the concept of global labour standards, (2) embeds the research in the convergence-divergence debate, and (3) reviews existing insights on the diffusion of labour standards in global supply chains.

4.2.1 Global labour standards

Global labour standards establish minimum requirements for decent employment worldwide but are not distinct. Various private and public standards exist in parallel and, for some labour issues, additionally refer to national legislation. Public labour standards are promoted by international organisations and inform national legislation and international labour initiatives (Holzberg, 2019, p. 312). Global buyers, often in negotiation with civil society organisations and/or global unions, additionally define private standards and request suppliers to comply with them (Nadvi & Wältring, 2002, p. 22).

For the current study, global standards were operationalised based on the regulations relevant for the research contexts. Desk research and interviews indicated that especially five private standards were requested from suppliers: Business Social Compliance Initiative (amfori BSCI, 2018), Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI, 2014), Fair Labor Association (FLA, 2011), Social Accountability 8000 (SAI, 2014), and/or Sedex (Sedex, 2017). Furthermore, some suppliers were subject to buyer-specific codes of conduct. Private standards directly affect business operations as buyers can blacklist non-compliant suppliers. Regarding global public standards, several ILO conventions (ILO, 1919, 1921, 1935, 1962) must be considered because they inform the work of international organisations operating in the research context. The ILO regulates regular and overtime hours but refers to national legislation for the prohibition of excessive hours and break times.
Working hours regulations in these standards are highly convergent (see Annex 20): a maximum of 48 regular working hours are allowed per week. Overtime must be voluntary, temporary, and paid with a premium. Most private standards prohibit excessive hours, defined as hours exceeding 60 h/w, while only Egypt prohibits excessive hours by law. Breaks are mandatory, and Egypt requires at least 60 min/d. The study therefore works with one operationalisation of global working hours standards (see figure 9) and only distinguishes between the different sets of standards when the included working hours regulations diverge.

4.2.2 Convergence, divergence and crossvergence in international human resource management

IHRM scholars have debated for decades whether HR practices converge to international HR standards or whether context-specific divergence prevails. Convergence advocates highlight the harmonising effect of globalisation and the worldwide diffusion of ‘best practices’ (e.g. Kerr et al., 1960; Levitt, 1983; Prentice, 1990). Budhwar et al. (2019, p. 926) find directional convergence across countries in the Middle East as similar factors influence the nature of HRM in the region. Their literature review shows that Middle Eastern HR systems have integrated global elements but nevertheless remained distinctively different from Western ones. Divergence advocates link cross-country differences in HR practices to national institutions and local culture (T. Jackson, 2015; Reiche et al., 2012; Wood et al., 2012; Wood & Horwitz, 2015). An increasing consensus suggests that convergence and divergence trends exist in parallel (e.g. Al Ariss & Sidani, 2016b, p. 283; Paik et al., 2011, p. 657). Al Ariss and Sidani (2016a, p. 353) link this finding to Ralston's (2008) concept of crossvergence: Managers are influenced by global dynamics as well as their local environment and develop distinctive HR systems in response. Jamali and Neville (2011, p. 599) illustrate crossvergence in practice. They show how converging and diverging forces concurrently shape CSR orientations of managers in Lebanon. Contemporary international business strategies are thus often ‘glocal’, containing global, local and distinct/ hybrid elements (Svensson, 2001, p. 15).

Researchers studying the diffusion of labour standards in global supply chains have come to a similar conclusion. In their literature review, Lund-Thomsen et al. (2016a, p. 11) found that multiple global and local influences on suppliers interact, resulting in different levels of compliance. Toffel et al. (2015, p. 219) highlight the necessity to consider the local context when analysing the impact of global labour standards. Holzberg (2019, pp. 311–312) thus described the formation of HR practices in global supply chains.
as a process of crossvergence. She differentiates between global influences (competition, public and private labour standards) and local influences (institutions, culture, industry) on suppliers and assumes their impact to be moderated by the micro-environment of the firm. Following this idea, suppliers’ working hours practices are assumed to deviate from global standards to varying degrees.

4.2.3 Diffusion of global labour standards in different nodes and stages of the supply chain

This study compares labour standard adoption across horizontal nodes and vertical stages of the supply chain. For horizontal subcontracting, previous research has shown that compliance levels decrease in lower horizontal nodes of the supply chain: Nadvi and Raj-Reichert (2015) demonstrated that lower tiers show lower levels of labour standard compliance in the computer supply chain. Alamgir and Banerjee (2019, p. 292) confirmed this finding for the garment industry in Bangladesh, Anner (2019, pp. 711–712) for the garment industry in India. The Clean Clothes Campaign (2005, p. 25) even find it to be a strategy of tier-1 suppliers to horizontally subcontract to keep labour standards low. Huq et al. (2014, p. 629) complement existing evidence by showing that buyers’ labour standard demands fail to reach tier-2 garment suppliers. Regarding vertical subcontracting, the empirical evidence is inconsistent. While Villena and Gioia (2018) find that environmental and labour risks increase with vertical subcontracting in the automotive, electronics and pharmaceutical supply chains, research in the garment supply chain could not confirm this proposition. Grace Annapoorani (2017, p. 57) found differences regarding labour issues between the textiles and garment industries in India but could not characterize one industry as being more or less compliant. The same holds true for Cooke and He (2010, p. 355) who analysed CSR and HR practices in the textiles and garment industries in China. Horizontal subcontractors are therefore proposed to show lower levels of compliance than direct exporters in Jordan, while the direction of compliance differences between garment and textiles firms in Egypt remains to be evaluated (see figure 9).

Knowledge on the reasons why labour standard compliance differs across horizontal and vertical linkages in supply chains is incomplete (Caro et al., 2020, p. 2; Grimm et al., 2016, p. 1972). According to the crossvergence paradigm, global influences, local influences, and differences in the micro-context of suppliers can explain variation in labour standard adoption (Holzberg, 2019, p. 317). Taking local influences out of the
equation because the local context can be kept constant, global influences and firm-level differences across tier-1 and tier-2 textiles and garment suppliers remain to be evaluated.

Previous research especially linked differences in labour standard adoption to global influences, particularly the influence of global buyers. Among others, Gold et al. (2020, p. 1282) argued that private labour regulation mainly reaches tier-1 suppliers as buyers have more power over them than over lower-tier suppliers. Posthuma (2010, p. 5) find that lower-tier suppliers are rarely audited and Grimm et al. (2016, p. 1972) add from a buyer-perspective that it is highly challenging for global buyers to manage sustainability issues beyond their tier-1 suppliers. This line of argumentation is shared by Villena (2019) and Anner (2019) who however add that the improvement of labour standards of lower-tier suppliers needs not only the support of global labour regulation but requires a fundamental change of procurement practices in global supply chains. This finding addresses the interaction of global labour standard demands with competitive pressures; a topic that is currently vividly debated: Reinecke and Donaghey (2021, p. 457) find that the pressure that global buyers exert on their suppliers is characterised by a ‘structured antagonism’ of interests. Typical business models of global garment brands feature price competitiveness and procurement flexibility and therewith put downward pressure on working conditions in the supply chain (Jamali et al., 2017, p. 460; Reinecke et al., 2019, p. 8). At the same time, social responsibility efforts of these brands invest in ensuring compliance with global labour standards in the supply chain (Amengual & Distelhorst, 2019, p. 2). Supplier-centred research has shown that this inherent contradiction motivates incompliance with global labour standards (Jamali et al., 2017, pp. 476–477; F. R. Khan & Lund-Thomsen, 2011, p. 86). Buyer-centred research acknowledges this problem and finds that private regulatory efforts are most successful if buyers’ sourcing practices are aligned with their compliance demands (Amengual et al., 2020, p. 838; Amengual & Distelhorst, 2019, p. 30). While Villena (2019) has introduced this debate into research on lower-tier suppliers, knowledge on how buyer procurement demands influence working conditions in lower horizontal nodes and vertical stages of the supply chain remains incomplete. This study therefore traces the impact of buyer procurement demands across the supply chain.

The inconsistent empirical evidence on the vertical diffusion of labour standards that was presented above indicates that global influences cannot fully explain differences in labour standard adoption across the supply chain. Structural differences between the textiles and the garment industries seem to interact with differences in supply chain power
relationships and lead to inconsistent employment outcomes (Grace Annapoorani, 2017, p. 57). The need to consider firm- and industry-specifics when analysing employment practices in global supply chains is thereby a well-established fact (Barrientos, Gereffi, & Rossi, 2011, pp. 335–336; Holzberg, 2019, pp. 314–315). Labour abuse is especially associated with low-skill jobs in labour intensive industries (Josserand & Kaine, 2016, p. 747; Reinecke et al., 2019, p. 49). Which structural differences between tier-1 and tier-2, textiles and garment producers cause different levels of labour standard adoption is however unknown and remains to be evaluated within the study.
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Research propositions:

1. The level of convergence to global labour standards is higher in the case of direct exporters compared with the case of subcontractors in the garment industry in Jordan. Factors driving this difference remain to be evaluated within the study.

2. The level of convergence to global labour standards differs in the case of garment suppliers from the case of textiles suppliers in Egypt. Factors driving this difference remain to be evaluated within the study.

Figure 9. Overview of research propositions (chapter 4)

Source: Own creation

### 4.3 Methods

#### 4.3.1 Research context: The garment supply chain in Jordan and Egypt

The garment supply chain is a highly globalised production network (Fernandez-Stark et al., 2011, p. 7). The lead firm, commonly a MNE from Northern America or Europe, is responsible for design, marketing and sales and has outsourced most of the manufacturing process (Gereffi & Memedovic, 2003, p. 3). The collection of raw materials, the
production of textiles and other apparel components, and the assembly of garments is commonly done in the Global South (Gereffi & Memedovic, 2003, p. 3; Reinecke et al., 2019, p. 13). On lower stages of the supply chain, especially in the stage of garment assembly, horizontal subcontracting remains common and is often hidden from buyers (Caro et al., 2020, p. 1).

The exporting garment industry in Jordan encompasses solely the stage of garment assembly. About 50 direct exporters, 15 satellite factories (sub-units of direct exporters near residential areas), and 15 subcontractors operate in Jordan (BWJ, 2019a, p. 11; data: 2018) and export mainly to the United States. The context therefore allows to study the impact of horizontal subcontracting on global supply chain dynamics. A distinguishing feature of the industry in Jordan is its strong international linkages. Most companies are South or Southeast Asian-owned, and Asian migrants, especially from Bangladesh, India, Sri Lanka, and Nepal, compose 75% of the workforce (BWJ, 2019a, p. 10; data: 2018). Jordanian Labour Law requires a 25% share of Jordanian workers, which is supported by the creation of satellite factories. Following a number of labour scandals that began in 2006, working conditions have been closely monitored by international observers (Kolben, 2013, pp. 210–217). BWJ, a program initiated by the ILO and the International Finance Corporation, started working with suppliers to improve labour standard compliance in 2009. Today, international observers report significant improvements and comparably favourable working conditions (Aissi et al., 2018, pp. 691–692; Robertson, 2019, p. 24).

The garment supply chain in Egypt is vertically integrated and covers the entire production process from cotton cultivation to the manufacture of yarns, textiles, and garments (Said & Abdel-Hamid, 2018, pp. 11–13). It is therefore highly suitable for studying the vertical diffusion of global labour standards. The focus of this paper is on the production of textiles and garments, which are mainly exported to the United States and Europe, plus Turkey. Textiles manufacturing is highly capital intensive and depends on technological investments in machinery, while clothing manufacturing is predominantly labour intensive with rather inexpensive technical equipment (Fukunishi et al., 2013, pp. 19–20). A distinguishing feature of the industry is a long-standing historical tradition. Family-owned enterprises operate in Egypt and their employees are mainly young Egyptians with little education. In garment production, the share of female workers is high by local standards. In textiles factories, they are a minority. Although working conditions in factories are formally documented as comparably favourable
(Azmeh, 2014, pp. 502–503; Marello et al., 2009, pp. 5–8), reports by local media and nongovernmental organisations about breaches of labour standards increasingly paint a more complicated picture (FLA, 2016).

4.3.2 Research design

The paper draws on a qualitative multiple-case study conducted in the textiles and garment industries in Jordan and Egypt. The study design was chosen as it enables an in-depth analysis of actor decision-making in their complex real-life environment (Reinecke et al., 2016, pp. xii–xiv; Yin, 2009, p. 2). The within-case and cross-case analysis followed a pattern-matching logic (Trochim, 1989). The technique helped to guide the use of theory in the analysis and to structure it. Data were collected to derive case-specific patterns of working hours designs. Empirically observed patterns were compared with theoretically indicated patterns (derived from the literature) to assess the degree of standard adoption and to structure the presented rationales for working hours designs. Subsequently, the patterns were compared across the research cases to assess differences across the supply chain.

4.3.3 Data collection

The main data used for the analysis consisted of semi-structured interviews with owners, HR, Compliance and/or General Managers of supplier firms (“owners-managers”). A maximum variation logic guided respondent sampling. The method is designed to discover common themes across a wide variety of respondents that reflect the core and shared experiences of the research population (Patton, 2002, p. 235). Industry experts and contacts helped facilitate access to interviewees.

In total, 30 owner-manager interviews (see Annex 21), conducted between September to October 2017 (Egypt) and April to May 2018 (Jordan), were analysed. Fewer interviews were needed in the garment industry in Jordan as the industry was highly consolidated and interview responses were very homogeneous. Respondents varied in age, gender, and nationality and represented suppliers of different sizes and from different locations (see Table 10). During the interviews, respondents described their working hours and reflected on changes over time and the reasons for implementing certain practices. If respondents mentioned only selected aspects, they were prompted to provide more information. If firms had both textiles and garment operations (“integrated firms”), the operations were discussed separately. The interviews were conducted in English or
German, in Egypt with Arabic translation. Interviews lasted 60 - 90 minutes, with working hours being only one part of the interview. Most interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. If respondents did not give permission for recording, their interviews were documented in detail. To validate the credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, pp. 295–296) of the translation, the transcription was done by native speakers who not only transcribed the English or German contents but also translated the Arabic questions and answers. All transcripts were subsequently double-checked by the author. The translators deviated during the interviews from the wording of the interviewer but accurately conveyed their meaning. To protect respondents’ anonymity, each interview was assigned an interview code, specifying the context (Egypt or Jordan) and type of interview (Firm, Expert, or Worker). For example, the fifth interview in Jordan, which was the second owner-manager interview, was labelled J05F02. Saturation was achieved for all research cases except the tier-2 garment suppliers in Jordan. Three tier-2 suppliers participated in the study. Other tier-2 suppliers could not be identified or repeatedly postponed interviews before cancelling them. Expert and document data served to fill (most of) the data gap (see section 3.5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factory location</th>
<th>Factory size</th>
<th>JORDAN Tier-1 garment suppliers (JO tier-1)</th>
<th>JORDAN Tier-2 garment suppliers (JO tier-2)</th>
<th>EGYPT Garment suppliers (EG RMG)</th>
<th>EGYPT Textiles suppliers (EG TEX)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Zone</td>
<td>0-499</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500-1499</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1500-5500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Area</td>
<td>0-499</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500-1499</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1500-5500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The sampling frame shows 34 instead of 30 interviews as it includes four interviews in integrated firms (Egypt) in which textiles and garment operations were discussed.

Table 10. Overview of participating suppliers (chapter 4)
Source: Own creation
4.3.4 Data analysis

The data analysis followed a pattern-matching logic (Trochim, 1989) and was supported by the qualitative research software MAXQDA.

First, theoretically indicated and empirically observed patterns were deduced, with global labour standards serving as theoretical reference for working hours designs. Respondents’ rationales for working hours were expected to follow a crossvergence logic (Holzberg, 2019), including references to external global and local influences and the internal firm environment. A content analysis, guided by Schreier (2014), helped identify empirically observed patterns. The main categories were structured according to the logic of the theoretical patterns, and sub-categories were added using a subsumption strategy (Schreier, 2014, p. 176). This process ensured comparability with the theoretical patterns and accounted for all information within the data. All data were double-coded at minimum to ensure coding consistency. In the Egyptian cases, more coding rounds were frequently necessary as interview responses showed higher ambiguity, particularly due to language challenges, fuzzy working time policies, and a social desirability effect.

The content analysis showed that two cases were not homogeneous within themselves. In the Jordanian tier-1 garment industry, respondents clearly distinguished between migrant and Jordanian workers. In the Egyptian textiles industry, the interviewed firms worked either with a 2-shift or a 3-shift system and working hours differed accordingly. Both cases were divided into two sub-groups.

In the second step, theoretical and empirical patterns were matched for each research case, using a version of pattern matching that Sinkovics (2017, p. 473) labelled “flexible pattern matching”. The initial theoretical patterns were compared with the empirically observed patterns and gradually refined until they explained the empirical findings. Flexible pattern matching accommodates the circular nature of qualitative research and allows combining and exploring different theoretical approaches. In the third step of the analysis, the results were compared across the research cases by matching patterns of tier-1 and tier-2 garment exporters in Jordan (horizontal comparison) and patterns of garment and textiles exporters in Egypt (vertical comparison).

The pattern-matching procedure confirmed the structuring of working hours designs according to global labour standards. To assess the level of convergence to global standards, it was analysed whether observed working hours fully matched, breached, or even exceeded global standards. Furthermore, reported changes over time were considered and translated into a trend of increasing, decreasing, fluctuating or unchanging
hours. Initial theoretical patterns of *working hours rationales* were significantly refined during the analysis. Although arguments referring to external global and local influences could be structured following the logic of Holzberg (2019), Osterwalder and Pigneur's (2010, p. 35) differentiation of human, intellectual, physical, and financial resources better covered arguments pertinent to the micro-context of suppliers. Furthermore, an additional category was used to include references to cross-level initiatives promoting labour standards in Egypt and Jordan. Annex 24 presents the final pattern-matching frame.

### 4.3.5 Data triangulation

Due to the high sensitivity of the research topic, the research frame anticipated the need for *data triangulation*. Other perspectives on the research issue were examined (Flick, 2020, p. 5) in order to validate the *credibility* of interview responses (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, pp. 295–296). Thirteen interviews with industry and labour experts (see Annex 22), eight (group) interviews with workers (see Annex 23), field notes documenting observations during factory visits, and the analysis of multiple documents helped triangulate the data. This data predominantly confirmed the information provided by owners-managers of supplier firms. In Jordan, interviewed experts reported the same working hours designs as owners-managers. The Annual Report of BWJ (2019; data: 2018) furthermore confirmed the trends that were discovered in the comparison of tier-1 and tier-2 suppliers. Workers however reported exceptional incidents of tweaked overtime records and cases in which they had to fulfil their production targets although regular overtime was already used. The additional hours were not recorded. In Egypt, there are no statistics that explicitly refer to the export industry. Instead, statistics combine firms producing for local and for export markets. The data nevertheless confirmed the direction of working hours differences between the textiles and the garment industry (CAPMAS, 2018, p. 28; data: 2017). Experts added that the reported working hours designs were common for the export industries.

### 4.4 Results

Interviewed owners-managers described how they organised working hours (see Annex 25 for a complete overview of designs) and why they organised working time in this way. Figure 10 illustrates the pattern-matching results comparing working hours designs to
global labour standards. Table 11 categorizes rationales for the design of working hours in each case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common workweek</th>
<th>JO tier-1 Jordians</th>
<th>JO tier-2 Migrants</th>
<th>EG RMG 3-shifts</th>
<th>EG TEX 2-shifts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48 h/w excl. break</td>
<td>60 h/w excl. break</td>
<td>48-54 h/w incl. break</td>
<td>48 h/w incl. break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>↑ hours increased</td>
<td>↓ hours decreased</td>
<td>~ hours fluctuate</td>
<td>= hours unchanged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Global standards**

**Regular hours**

- max. 6 d/w: ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓
- max. 48 h/w: ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓

**Overtime (OT)/ Excessive hours**

- max. 12 OT h/w: ★ ✓ ✗ ✓ ✓ (✓) ✗
- premium pay for OT: ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓
- only temporary OT: ✓ ✗ ✗ ✓ ✓ ✗
- only voluntary OT: ✓ (✓) ✗ varies (✓) ✗

**Break time**

- can be any length in JO: ✓ ✓ ✓
- min. 60 m/d in EG: ✓ ✓ (✓) (✓)

✓ = hours match global standards  ✗ = hours breach global standards  ★ = hours exceed global standards

Figure 10. Working hours designs

Source: Own creation

**4.4.1 Case 1: Working hours in the garment industry in Jordan (direct exporters)**

Working hours converged to global labour standards in Jordanian tier-1 garment firms. Jordanians commonly worked 48 h/w and overtime only in exceptional cases. Their willingness to work overtime thereby increased, approaching the norm of global standards. Migrants commonly worked the maximum number of hours allowed by global standards (60 h/w). Working hours had declined over time to reach standard compliance, while the permanence and implicitness of migrant overtime still violated the criterion of *temporariness* and made the criterion of *voluntariness* of overtime a mere formality. However, a trend towards convergence was visible.
Respondents’ rationales for working hours designs included references to global influences and firm resources. Buyers demanded keeping working hours below 60 h/w and monitored compliance with the help of BWJ and their own auditors. Buyer demands were characterized as “very strict” [J18F12]. Although excessive overtime was prohibited, respondents underlined that regular overtime was needed to meet buyers’ procurement demands.

No factory in Jordan can go above break-even by working eight hours. It is a very plain equation, we do a lot of mathematics […] the bottom line is, if you have eight hours, you will not make money. [J18F12]

Overtime regulations were portrayed as being welcomed by migrants: “[Migrants] come here to earn a living. They do not have families. For them being in the job helps.” [J19F13]. However, the needs of Jordanian workers conflicted with buyers’ procurement pressures: “Jordanians cannot work […] more than eight hours, especially the ladies. They have a family; they have their kids.” [J09F06]. As Jordanians were essential human resources for tier-1 firms, owners-managers had to honour their demands. Jordanians had to be hired by law, were difficult to attract and retain, and were well-connected to local authorities and communities.

The interviews clearly revealed that suppliers faced great challenges in balancing global procurement, global labour standards, and human resource demands. Intellectual resources seemed to make the difference. Interviewed firms had developed highly professional HR and planning capabilities and operated with efficient production lines. BWJ, a local initiative with global roots, supported this progress.

We have good, experienced people, experts [in Jordan], […] and we are ready to learn. We [have learned for many years how to improve our business and HR and the] experts continue with us; we will learn more from them. [J19F13]

4.4.2 Case 2: Working hours in the garment industry in Jordan (subcontractors)

Tier-2 garment firms commonly operated with 66 - 72 h/w and thus breached global labour standards. Although hours had declined over time, it remained doubtful whether working hours would eventually converge to global standards. Respondents characterised tier-2 garment business as being not profitable when working hours complied with standards.

Respondents portrayed working hours designs mainly as a response to global influences, specifically the intense procurement pressure in the industry.
In subcontracting, it is longer hours. […] Because there are deadlines with penalties […] if you get delayed. [And there is] a price issue. We can negotiate when they have a very high season, and they need you very much. […] I remember for one style we took in the high season $1.6 for sewing. When the high season finished, they offered us $0.35. […] You cannot do anything with [this little amount of money]. [J06F03]

Respondents acknowledged that private labour standards prohibited excessive hours, but tier-2 suppliers did not face significant repercussions for breaching this rule. J12F08 said that his goal of becoming a tier-1 supplier was his only incentive to comply with global standards.

While procurement pressure was the dominating theme across interviews, J06F03’s design of working hours was additionally driven by human resource considerations.

[Workers] should not have very long hours, but they should have overtime so that they would benefit because they came from their countries to here to benefit. […] They have to relax, they have to have days off, because if you do continuous overtime [in the sense of excessive overtime], […] productivity would go down. They would start to get sick […]. [J06F03]

The other tier-2 suppliers described workers as wanting excessive hours. For example, J13F09 recounted that 15 workers from a direct exporter switched to his company because they wanted to work excessive hours to maximise their income.

Across tier-2 firms, intellectual, physical, and financial resources appeared less developed than in tier-1 firms. Only one respondent mentioned (self-)training in HR and production planning, the factories looked less organised than tier-1 factories, and respondents complained about scarce financial resources. BWJ had only recently started working with tier-2 firms and their consultants were not (yet) well-accepted by owners-managers.

### 4.4.3 Case 3: Working hours in the garment industry in Egypt

The Egyptian garment industry had more within-case variation than the other cases. Egyptians commonly worked 48 - 54 h/w, in compliance with global standards. Observed regular hours (7 - 8 h/d) were often even shorter than standard regular hours. However, it seemed questionable whether overtime was always voluntary because respondents linked it to production needs rather than worker will. Despite the high compliance levels, the
case cannot be labelled a good example of convergence. Working hours either fluctuated or did not change over time and were driven by local rather than global influences.

Rationales for working hours designs mainly included local and resource arguments. Respondents especially referred to local laws as the determining factor for working hours. Some respondents added that, when offered, overtime opportunities corresponded to workers’ desire to increase their income [E01F01, E12F09, E27F22, E28F23]. Permanent or excessive overtime did not seem possible though as firms predominantly employed local Egyptians with family and social obligations. E19F14 highlighted: “A lot of the workforce are ladies, and they cannot work in night shifts, so we have just one 8 hours with 1 hour rest.” Owners-managers felt they needed to meet workers’ demands because recruiting and retaining skilled labour were difficult. E27F22 explained that a good work environment had to be provided to compensate for meagre salaries.

Even though legal and human resource considerations dominated the interviews, half of the respondents also referred to buyer power and its impact on working hours. They mostly linked global procurement demands, which were said to be non-negotiable, with the need for longer hours: “I do not like for the workers at all to stay after 5, I would love to [give them more free time], [but] what shall I do? It [lead time] is not enough” [E21F16]. In this context, intellectual, physical, and financial resources were described as not being well developed. E11F08 highlighted that only a few firms operated with professional HR departments and sophisticated planning and work processes that might help to reduce overtime. Other firms struggled with lack of space and unreliable delivery of raw materials. E19F14 added that after the Egyptian revolution and the devaluation of the Egyptian Pound, financial resources were tight and investing in better HR and working conditions was impossible. Global and local initiatives supporting resource development were scarce and worked only with selected suppliers in Egypt.

Global (private) labour standards were commonly characterized as impractical. Respondents complained that the standards conflicted with buyers’ procurement demands, production realities in Egypt, or suppliers’ own quality of work understanding.

The exactness, the adherence to specifications […] is not the same in the Egyptian context [it conflicts with Egyptian culture], on the one hand you are dealing with a supply chain that is not […] up to standard, and on the other hand you are dealing with customers [global buyers] that would not tolerate any deviations in whatever form, so it is a big challenge. [E19F14]
4.4.4 Case 4: Working hours in the textiles industry in Egypt

Textiles firms operating with a 3-shift system (8-hour shifts, including breaks) commonly exceeded global standards. Observed regular hours, excluding break time, were shorter than standard hours. Only a few (exceptional) incidents were reported, in which workers worked two consecutive shifts, in breach of global standards. Working hours in firms operating with 2-shift systems (12-hour shifts, including breaks) continuously breached global standards and convergence was not apparent. Most respondents reported no changes in working hours over time. Some indicated that they alternated between 2- and 3-shift systems depending on the order situation and worker availability.

When asked about rationales for working hours designs, respondents explained that their main physical resources, the textiles machines, required 24 h/d operations. Owners-managers operating with 3-shift systems added that the local law required 8-hour workdays. 2-shift systems were linked to the scarcity of qualified and reliable human resources and workers’ wishes to maximise their income. Notably, the textiles workforce was almost exclusively male and regular wages were below living wages.

“I wanted to have three shifts. Immediately, we had resistance […] from the workers, why? [Workers] preferred to work the 12 hours shift, get the 4 hours [overtime pay] every day” [E23F18]

Selected respondents acknowledged that the long hours were detrimental to workers’ health. When asked how they would prefer to organise working time, E3125 said: “I would put the workers to work for 8 hours a day, […] That is natural. I want to look out for my labourers.”

The interviews conveyed the impression that owners-managers genuinely wanted to take good care of their workers but many lacked the intellectual, physical, and financial resources to implement global labour standards. The lack of resources was mentioned the most frequently when respondents were asked how labour standard compliance could be enhanced:

“I think if the people are willing, the [problem is their] ability, [their] education […]. [My colleague] for example he was well educated [by the] ILO. We need 120 people like him, so I think it is education.” [E13F10]

“HR in Egypt is really weak; most factories’ HR departments are not executed productively.” [E06F03]
“Improving the work environment depends very much on the prosperity of the company, the more the company is prosperous the more you can give a better work environment.” [E19F14]

Furthermore, respondents repeatedly described workers’ poor economic, social, and educational background as an obstacle to improving productivity and labour standards:

“The employees especially here are [unreliable and breach the rules] – I know that they are under stress and have financial problems and grievances, but work is work.” [E23F18]

Buyer power was not highlighted as relevant for working hours design. Only one respondent mentioned procurement demands in the export industry to be highly demanding. Buyers’ labour standards were rarely addressed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JO tier-1</th>
<th>JO tier-2</th>
<th>EG RMG</th>
<th>EG TEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ High buyer price and procurement pressure</td>
<td>▪ High buyer price and procurement pressure</td>
<td>▪ High buyer price and procurement pressure</td>
<td>▪ Limited influence of buyer price and procurement pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ High buyer pressure to comply with labour standards</td>
<td>▪ Low buyer pressure to comply with labour standards</td>
<td>▪ Limited influence of private labour regulations (varies across suppliers)</td>
<td>▪ Low/no influence of private labour regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Law: No prohibition of excessive hours</td>
<td>▪ Law: Min. 25% Jordanian workers</td>
<td>▪ Law: Prohibition of excessive hours</td>
<td>▪ Law: Prohibition of excessive hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Law: Min. 25% Jordanian workers</td>
<td>▪ Law: Developed HR and business education</td>
<td>▪ Underdeveloped HR/business education</td>
<td>▪ Underdeveloped HR/business education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Developed HR and business education</td>
<td>▪ Gender norms and local culture</td>
<td>▪ Gender norms and local culture</td>
<td>▪ Gender norms and local culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Gender norms and local culture</td>
<td>▪ Human Resources (Jordanians): Less productive, have family obligations, difficult to recruit</td>
<td>▪ Precarious economic situation of workers</td>
<td>▪ Precarious economic situation of workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Human Resources (Jordanians): Highly productive, need to increase income</td>
<td>▪ Human Resources (Migrants): Highly productive, need to increase income</td>
<td>▪ Medium-to-under-developed intellectual, physical, and financial resources (varies across suppliers)</td>
<td>▪ Medium- to under-developed intellectual, physical, and financial resources (varies across suppliers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Well-developed intellectual, physical, and financial resources</td>
<td>▪ Under-developed intellectual, physical, and financial resources</td>
<td>▪ Human Resources (often female): Family obligations, difficult to recruit and retain</td>
<td>▪ ILO and other actors consult selected suppliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ BWJ monitors and advises</td>
<td>▪ International trainings easily available but costly</td>
<td>▪ Medium-to-under-developed intellectual, physical, and financial resources (varies across suppliers)</td>
<td>▪ Few (costly) international trainings available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ International trainings easily available but costly</td>
<td>▪ BWJ recently started monitoring and advising</td>
<td>▪ Few (costly) international trainings available</td>
<td>▪ Few (costly) international trainings available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ ILO and other actors consult selected suppliers</td>
<td>▪ International trainings easily available but costly</td>
<td>▪ Few (costly) international trainings available</td>
<td>▪ Few (costly) international trainings available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Few (costly) international trainings available</td>
<td>▪ Few (costly) international trainings available</td>
<td>▪ Few (costly) international trainings available</td>
<td>▪ Few (costly) international trainings available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Working hours rationales

Source: Own creation
4.5 Discussion: Diffusion of labour standards through the supply chain

The study analysed the diffusion of global labour standards through the garment supply chain and showed that standard adoption differs across horizontal nodes and vertical stages of the chain. In Jordan, working hours practices converged to global standards more markedly in tier-1 compared with tier-2 firms (*horizontal differentiation*). Buyer pressure to comply with labour standards was higher in tier-1 firms; they were more closely monitored and supported by BWJ; and their intellectual, physical, and financial resources were more developed. In Egypt, the findings revealed that different dynamics were in play in garment compared with textiles production (*vertical differentiation*). Buyer pressure to comply with labour standards was more apparent in the garment industry but did not significantly affect working hours. Practices were driven by legal considerations, as well as social and family obligations, especially for the female workforce. Textiles firms were equally affected by legal obligations, but only some of the interviewed firms complied with them. Scarcity of skilled labour and the earning needs of male workers incentivised constant overtime and excessive hours. The four cases illustrated the idea of crossvergence. In each case, decision-makers were influenced by different global and local factors and developed distinctive HR systems in response.

Given the factors underlying differences in standard adoption between lower- and higher-tier suppliers, the study confirms and extends previous research insights. As previously reported by Grimm et al. (2016, p. 1972) and Nadvi and Raj-Reichert (2015, p. 249), buyers enforce labour standards primarily at their tier-1 suppliers. Lead firms lose power when direct exporters subcontract, especially when subcontracting is hidden (Gold et al., 2020, p. 1282). Going beyond previous research findings, this study evaluated how the deconstruction of buyer power to enforce labour standards interacts with other influences on labour standard adoption, particularly (1) global procurement pressures and (2) structural firm-level differences across tier-1 and tier-2 textiles and garment firms.

(1) Tracing the impact of global procurement demands showed that procurement demands diffused through the supply chain and, in the case of tier-2 suppliers in Jordan, even amplified along the chain. While labour standards were barely audited in subcontracting firms, quality inspections took place at every node and stage of the chain, and competitive prices and lead times were equally enforced. The conflict between labour standard and procurement pressure highlighted in previous research (Amengual & Distelhorst, 2019, p. 30; Anner, 2019, p. 724; Reinecke & Donaghey, 2021, p. 470)
becomes more severe along the supply chain. A thorough revision of buyer procurement strategies is therefore imperative to improve labour standard compliance in the garment supply chain.

(2) The study highlights the importance of the internal firm environment for understanding variation in labour standard adoption across tier-1 and tier-2 textiles and garment firms. A resource-based approach served to structure firm differences. Limited resources evidently contributed to labour standard non-compliance in Jordanian tier-2 factories and represented a barrier to labour standard implementation in Egypt. Resources have previously been linked to CSR implementation (Bux et al., 2020, p. 1745) and sustainable HRM (Muñoz-Pascual & Galende, 2020, p. 4) but were predominantly neglected in the debate on labour standard diffusion in global supply chains. In this study, specifically, Osterwalder and Pigneur’s (2010, p. 35) differentiation of human, intellectual, physical, and financial resources helped to condense the multiple differences that exist on a firm level into a workable framework. Resources thereby explained why labour standards are not necessarily worse in lower stages of the supply chain. They overshadowed global dynamics in the comparison of textiles and garment factories.

The existing literature contains extensive discussion of the characteristics of human resources and their impact on labour standard compliance. In the context of global supply chains, workers are commonly characterized as powerless and authors stress the need to strengthen their position to improve working conditions (Siegmann et al., 2016, pp. 346–347). This study largely confirms these observations but adds that increasing worker bargaining power is insufficient for improving working conditions. Workers only demanded decent hours if their wages covered their income needs and if having sufficient time off work was imperative (e.g., for family duties or health protection). Otherwise, global standards conflicted with workers’ subjective understanding of a good workplace.

Intellectual, physical, and financial resources have attracted less attention in previous research, despite Nadvi and Raj-Reichert (2015, p. 255) having reported that limited financial and technical capabilities of lower-tier suppliers help to explain why labour standards dissolve in supply chains. The current study reinforces this point within the garment supply chain, showing that a lack of intellectual resources, especially HR and planning capabilities, negatively affected productivity and production stability necessary to reduce overtime. Additionally, little sensitivity existed for the negative consequences of constant or excessive overtime, which can significantly impede labour standard compliance (Testa et al., 2018, pp. 860–861). Furthermore, limited bargaining power of
suppliers generally hindered their ability to negotiate longer lead times or better prices. Physical resources especially played a role in Egypt, where old machines, limited production and storage space, and unreliable delivery of raw materials impaired production processes and frequently caused overtime requests. Financial resources to remedy intellectual and physical shortcomings were not available. Figure 11 summarizes the interplay of global influences and firm resources on suppliers.

The study focused on the impact of global influences on working hours designs in different vertical stages and horizontal nodes of the supply chain. For each comparison, the local context was kept constant. Local influences were nevertheless identified to put global influences in context as recommended by Toffel et al. (2015, p. 219). Analysing two country contexts helped disentangling the complex web of global, local, and firm-level influences. While working hours designs differed between Egypt and Jordan, similar working hours rationales could be found across the two contexts (see Table 11). Many of the detected working hours rationales are thereby not specific to the Egyptian or Jordanian context but apply to multiple countries in the Global South. It is stressed across garment production sites that local legal regulations are failing to protect workers on their own (Mayer & Gereffi, 2010, pp. 3–5), that migrant workers tend to work longer hours (Smyth et al., 2013, p. 401) and that textiles and garment workers face precarious living conditions (Anner, 2019, pp. 707–708). The results of this study are therefore likely to be transferable (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, pp. 296–297) within the Global South and can inform research in other textiles and garment production contexts.
4.6 Implications for Theory and Practice

This study built on IHRM insights on international practice transfer connected with existing research on the diffusion of labour standards in global supply chains, and it made the following theoretical contributions. First, the dissection of global influences helps to explain variation in labour standard adoption across different nodes and stages of the supply chain. Thereby, global pressure to comply with labour standards exists in parallel with buyer procurement pressure. While labour standard pressure decreases along the supply chain, procurement pressure does not, at least in the garment supply chain. Building on the work of Reinecke et al. (2019), future research needs to identify sustainable procurement strategies that allow for decent work progress in all nodes and stages of the supply chain. Second, the degree of international buyer influence cannot on its own explain variation in labour standard adoption, even when local influences remain constant. Differences on the micro-level of the firm need to be accounted for. In the case
of horizontal subcontracting, price, lead-time, and flexibility pressure was passed on to tier-2 suppliers with limited resources. Even if global labour standards would be strictly enforced at these production sites, it is highly unlikely that they could meet them. Research therefore must go beyond top-down/ global solutions to ensure decent work across the garment supply chain and complement them with bottom-up/ local approaches. This study thereby exemplified how the resource-based approach can help finding starting points for labour standard improvement. In particular, the role of intellectual, physical, and financial resources requires further research to show how their enhancement supports decent work in global supply chains. Third, the multiple-case study revealed the multiplicity of influences that affect working hours designs. Wage levels, gender roles, and the specific circumstances of migrant labour determined how many hours of work respondents deemed favourable for workers’ well-being. A unilateral enforcement of working hours standards can harm workers if industry wages are below the local living wage, as it is the case in many garment production contexts (Anner, 2019, p. 705). This finding exemplifies that real-world situations in the Global South need to be considered to understand the feasibility of global labour standards. Fourth, the characteristics of global supply chains offer a new research perspective for IHRM. The convergence-divergence debate has previously focused on comparing HR practices of local firms and MNE subsidiaries across different contexts. Thereby, it would be interesting to learn more about HR strategies of suppliers. While supply chain scholarship commonly depicts employment practices of suppliers as a mere question of labour standard compliance, little is known about the HR strategies that suppliers develop in response to the crossverging global and local influences they encounter.

The study contributes three practical insights for improving working hours in the global garment supply chain. First, the frequently limited resources of lower-tier suppliers in global production impair compliance with global labour standards. The enforcement of global labour standards therefore needs to be supported by bottom-up/ local approaches that support suppliers in improving working conditions. MSIs that directly work with suppliers and other local stakeholders serve this purpose. This study shows that they are especially needed in lower nodes and stages of the supply chain, where they are currently rare. Initiatives are therefore called to focus on lower nodes and stages of the supply chain where their help is needed the most. Bolstering intellectual, physical, and financial resources to improve labour standards as well as workers’ capacity to fight for humane working conditions is crucial in the face of the existing limitations of global, local, public, and private labour regulation. Second, efforts to address resource limitations are likely to
be insufficient on their own vis-à-vis the existing procurement pressure in the garment supply chain. The case of tier-1 suppliers in Jordan shows that full compliance with labour standards puts even direct exporters on or over the edge of competitiveness. For horizontal subcontractors, the procurement squeeze is even more severe. As voluntary initiatives to change purchasing practices of buyers have yielded limited results, this study supports the need for greater legal regulation. Buyers who are sincere in their efforts to promote decent work in their supply chains need to rethink their procurement practices. As suggested by Amengual et al. (2020, pp. 837–838) and Amengual and Distelhorst (2019, p. 30), procurement strategies ought to be adjusted to compliance ratings of suppliers. The adjustment however needs to go beyond increasing order volumes and include better price and lead time conditions and longer-term business relationships. Especially fluctuating order volumes make it difficult for suppliers to keep working hours stable. Third, worker and management education being repeatedly linked with substandard working conditions was unexpected. Many respondents considered education to be the key to resource development. This shows the need to integrate local technical and business schools, a currently underrepresented stakeholder group, into MSIs for sustainable change. Future research can thereby show in how far the development of local technical and business schools can facilitate decent work progress.

Theoretical and practical implications were derived from the analysis of four research cases and existing literature. Future research needs to validate and extend presented findings, especially for the big production countries such as China, Bangladesh, and Vietnam. Within the analysed research cases, validating and extending the presented findings with the help of quantitative research would be worthwhile. Especially in the case of tier-2 suppliers in Jordan, only a few interviews could be conducted, and expert knowledge was limited. In the case of Egypt, HR practices and rationales varied significantly. Creating a typology of different supplier groups within one node or stage of the chain would advance understanding of power and resource dynamics across horizontal nodes and vertical stages of global supply chains.
5 Decent work frames of garment factory owners-managers and the legitimacy of global labour standards: a qualitative investigation in Egypt and Jordan

This chapter has been submitted to the “Journal of Business Ethics” and is currently under review.

5.1 Introduction

According to the SDGs, “decent work for all” shall be a reality for workers worldwide by 2030 (UN, 2015). To achieve this goal, public and private actors are increasingly introducing global labour standards to guide not only business operations in a company’s own organisation but also work realities in their GPNs. The standards are intended to ensure that suppliers, often situated in the Global South, establish decent working conditions in their production facilities. Decent work and global labour standards are heterogeneous concepts. Different understandings co-exist regarding what makes a workplace decent (Berliner et al., 2015, p. 194). In the context of global production, the ITC standards map (ITC, 2021) includes 196 different sets of labour standards. Unsurprisingly, the legitimacy and effectiveness of global standards are subject to strong debate.

Previous research has shown that suppliers as well as workers in the Global South question the legitimacy of global standards. Among others, Bae et al. (2021), Fontana and Egels-Zandén (2019), and Soundararajan et al. (2018) show that garment suppliers do not necessarily agree with the moral righteousness or superiority of global standards. Similarly, Hoogesteger and Massink (2021), Flanigan (2018), and de Neve (2014) highlight mismatches between worker interests and global labour standards. Current global standards can therefore be perceived as post-colonial tools to impose Western ethics on Southern suppliers (Blowfield & Dolan, 2008, p. 19; de Neve, 2009, p. 63, 2014, pp. 203–204; F. R. Khan & Lund-Thomsen, 2011, p. 87). Normative disagreements with global standards thereby not only call into question the universal legitimacy of global labour standards, but also influence their effectiveness. If local owners-managers disagree with global understandings, they are demotivated from implementing global labour standards that codify these understandings (Bae et al., 2021, p. 654).
Nevertheless, global labour standards remain a crucial tool in the fight against indecent working conditions (Colle et al., 2014, p. 178; Hendrickx et al., 2016, p. 339). As long as competitive pressures of global buyers make decent working conditions in supplier firms barely affordable (S. I. Khan et al., 2019, pp. 50–51; Perry et al., 2015, p. 749), other tools such as local legal regulations (Mayer & Gereffi, 2010, pp. 4–5) or voluntary self-commitments (Soundararajan & Brown, 2016, p. 97) are insufficient to protect workers. The question that therefore arises is how “more meaningful ways” of global labour regulation (Hoogesteger & Massink, 2021, p. 13) can be developed to protect workers worldwide without compromising local business ethics. Responding to this question, this paper identifies local decent work understandings and discusses the improvement of contemporary standards and how they are imposed on suppliers. It thereby focuses on cognitive decent work frames of owners-managers in global production – the group of actors that is responsible for implementing standards on the ground (Perry et al., 2015, p. 741), despite being underrepresented in setting them (F. R. Khan & Lund-Thomsen, 2011, p. 87) as well as under-researched (Bae et al., 2021, p. 654).

Using a cognitive framing approach enables discussion on a meta-level about which logics determine whether a certain work practice is decent or indecent and how these logics differ between contexts. Cognitive frames are mental representations of concepts that people encounter in their life (Dewulf et al., 2009, p. 158) that help them to navigate complexity and to make ethical judgements (Dewulf et al., 2009, p. 167; J. P. Walsh, 1995, p. 281). Following a dynamic view on cognitive frames (Zimmermann et al., 2021, p. 3), this paper perceives cognitive frames to be socially constructed in a given context. They can be analysed on individual, group, and field levels (Cornelissen & Werner, 2014, pp. 185–186). The paper identifies decent work frames of owners-managers of supplier firms (group-level frames) and compares them to frames used in the global debate on decent work to justify the definition of global labour standards (field-level frames). Three global field frames are discussed in the theory section, including decent work as a (1) social responsibility, (2) negotiated regulation, or (3) human right. Discrepancies between owner-manager frames and global field frames call into question the universal applicability of global labour standards and therewith their legitimacy and effectiveness.

This paper presents empirical research conducted in the garment export industry in Egypt and Jordan. Garment production is highly globalised and notorious for its labour violations (Anner et al., 2014, p. 40). Increasing the legitimacy and effectiveness of global labour standards is therefore important for the industry. Egypt and Jordan, which have similar cultural backgrounds but very different industry environments, were chosen for
the analysis to determine how far cognitive frames extend across different contexts within one region. As regional and cultural specifics influence business ethics (Beschorner & Hajduk, 2017, p. 637), Arab management culture and Islamic work ethics are briefly introduced in the theory section to put empirically detected owner-manager frames in context.

This paper identifies cognitive decent work frames of owners-managers in the garment export industry in Egypt and Jordan, compares them with global frames that inform the definition of labour standards, and derives discrepancies that need to be addressed in the global debate. The study contributes to the debate on the legitimacy and effectiveness of global labour standards and deduces propositions for the design and implementation of these standards. Few studies (e.g., Bae et al., 2021; F. R. Khan & Lund-Thomsen, 2011; Perry et al., 2015) have analysed business ethics perceptions of developing country suppliers in global supply chains, and none have been conducted in Egypt or Jordan. Extending existing literature, this study not only identifies clashes between global and local understandings but also presents the cognitive frames that inform owners-managers’ normative judgements and work practices.

5.2 Theoretical Background

5.2.1 Cognitive frames and their impact on managerial decision-making

The cognitive perspective in management and organisation studies provides the theoretical framework for this paper. It focuses on mental processes and how they affect decision-making and behaviour (J. P. Walsh, 1995, p. 281). The perspective is especially suited to further understanding of managerial and organisational thinking and behaviour in highly complex situations and ethically ambiguous situations (Hahn et al., 2014, p. 463), such as the situation of suppliers regarding decent work in global production. The cognitive perspective proposes that people construct ‘cognitive frames’ (also referred to as cognitive structures, schemata, mental images or representations) of different concepts which help them to ‘make sense’ of ambiguous situations related to these concepts and to ultimately guide their behaviour (Fassin et al., 2011, p. 427; J. P. Walsh, 1995, p. 281). Cognitive issue frames capture the meaning that a person attaches to a specific concept, event, or problem (Dewulf et al., 2009, p. 165). They are not necessarily conscious but can remain subconscious and thus implicitly influence decision-making and behaviour (Dewulf et al., 2009, p. 173; Zeni et al., 2016, p. 839). The paper employs a dynamic view
on cognitive frames which characterises issue frames as socially constructed and changeable through social experiences and interactions (Zimmermann et al., 2021, p. 3). They not only mediate sensemaking processes but also emerge from them (Fassin et al., 2011, pp. 427–428; Zimmermann et al., 2021, p. 3) and are therefore highly context specific.

Issue frames can be analysed on multiple levels (Cornelissen & Werner, 2014, pp. 185–186). While interviews reveal information about individual frames, the analysis of serial interviews in a specific group provides information about cognitive frames on group level. On a higher level, frames can be analysed in terms of a certain issue in a specific field. Cornelissen and Werner (2014, p. 187) define these so-called field frames as “jointly constructed cultural template[s] within an institutional field”. This paper focuses on owner-manager group frames of decent work (“owner-manager frames”) and compares them with field frames in the global debate on decent work and global labour standards (“global frames”). Field frames used in the local debate on decent work and labour in the Middle East and Northern Africa (“local frames”) will furthermore be considered to enhance understanding of owner-manager frames.

Cognitive frames have been linked to actor decision-making and behaviour in various fields related to decent work in global production, including CSR (Fassin et al., 2011), sustainability (Hahn et al., 2014), and HRM (Budhwar & Sparrow, 2002b). Combining cognitive frames with ethical decision-making models (Hunt & Vitell, 2006; Zeni et al., 2016) yields the following relationship: Cognitive frames influence the deontological evaluation of an ethical problem and therewith a managers’ ethical judgement, intention, and behaviour. Taking a more dynamic view on ethical decision-making, cognitive frames or mental models have also been highlighted as mediating organisational sensemaking processes (Hahn et al., 2014, p. 472; Zeni et al., 2016, pp. 839–841). Accordingly, owners-managers of supplier firms (unconsciously) possess cognitive frames which help them decide what is decent, and these mental representations influence their decent-work-related decision-making and behaviour. To understand why owners-managers agree to and comply with certain global standards and not others, it is therefore helpful to understand owner-manager frames and to compare them with global frames.
5.2.2 Decent work and labour standards in global production

Various global research and practice communities discuss the challenge of indecent working conditions in global production, encompassing business-oriented (Arora et al., 2020), labour-oriented (de Neve, 2014), policy-oriented (Fransen & Burgoon, 2017), and society-oriented (Zajak et al., 2017) researchers and actors. Thereby, multiple concepts and measures exist in characterising the desired outcome (Berliner et al., 2015, p. 194). Terms such as decent work, labour rights, social upgrading, and social sustainability overlap (Barrientos, Mayer, et al., 2011, p. 301; Berliner et al., 2015, p. 194; Soundararajan et al., 2021, p. 4) and are sometimes used interchangeably. This paper uses decent work to capture the desired outcome and thus connects to the SDGs terminology. This choice underlines that this paper solely focuses on labour-related concerns and not on other social issues in supply chains. The decent work concept was coined by the ILO (1999). It summarises a pre-defined set of work-related aspirations such as social protection, fair renumeration, and the right to equal opportunities (ILO, 2022). The listed aspirations are operationalised on a macro-economic level with a comprehensive set of indicators (ILO, 2013). However, this paper uses the term on an organisational level to describe work realities in a given supplier firm without a pre-defined operationalisation. Following the cognitive perspective, different decent work understandings are expected to co-exist. Therefore, decent work is only loosely circumscribed to capture all work-related aspirations that affect workers’ health and well-being.

On a global level, organisational decent work understandings are increasingly codified in global labour standards which are defined in practice and regularly used to empirically measure decent work outcomes (Murmura et al., 2017, p. 1408). Global public standards are defined by international bodies such as the ILO or are included in trade agreements. International buyers and standard-setting (multi-stakeholder) organisations additionally define private standards. Currently, multiple different public and private labour standards co-exist (Fransen et al., 2019, p. 400). They differ in the issues they entail, as well as their monitoring mechanisms and governance structures (Colle et al., 2014, p. 178). Suppliers are affected by both public and private standards. International organisations lobby for inclusion of global public standards in local legislation and suppliers’ employment practices (ILO, 2019b, pp. 25–27). Global buyers furthermore request that their suppliers comply with their preferred private standards (Fransen et al., 2019, pp. 398–399). Hence, global labour standards increasingly regulate market access and impose a certain
understanding of what is decent or fair on developing country suppliers (Dolan, 2010, p. 41; F. R. Khan & Lund-Thomsen, 2011, p. 87).

The question of the legitimacy of global labour standards has received significant scholarly attention. On the one hand, global standards are seen as a crucial tool for improving working conditions in global production, and scholars and practitioners focus on how to improve the standards’ effectiveness (Berliner et al., 2015, p. 202). By defining minimum labour standards for all production facilities worldwide, effective standards serve to prevent competition through labour exploitation (Hendrickx et al., 2016, p. 342). On the other hand, global standards do not necessarily mirror local workers’ understandings of a decent workplace (de Neve, 2014; Flanigan, 2018; Hoogesteger & Massink, 2021), can misrepresent certain labour groups (Alamgir & Alakavuklar, 2020), can clash with suppliers’ value systems (Bae et al., 2021; de Neve, 2009; F. R. Khan & Lund-Thomsen, 2011; Soundararajan et al., 2018; Soundararajan & Brown, 2016), are not suited to all suppliers’ business realities (Fontana & Egels-Zandén, 2019; Knudsen, 2013; Simpson et al., 2012), and may even erode individual responsibility by motivating rule-following behaviour (Colle et al., 2014). Cultural or institutional disagreement with the moral legitimacy of global standards can thereby discourage suppliers from implementing them and impair their effectiveness (Bae et al., 2021, p. 654). This paper therefore closely examines the moral justifications of global regulations (i.e., the global frames that serve as references for the definition of global standards) and compares them to moral justifications for local actions (i.e., owner-manager frames that guide employment decisions).

5.2.3 Global frames: Decent work as a social responsibility, negotiated regulation, or human right

Contributions on decent work in global production are commonly embedded in the broader debates on CSR in the supply chain, public and private governance in GPNs, or international labour and workers’ rights. Schrage and Gilbert (2021, p. 660) differentiate between the regulatory and the CSR debates, and Giuliani (2016, p. 49) sees fundamental differences between rights-based and CSR-based approaches. Even though these debates frequently overlap, their differences imply rather varied understandings of what decent work is. This paper thereby differentiates between three global frames that discuss decent work as a (1) social responsibility, (2) negotiated regulation, or (3) human right.
First, in business-oriented literature, decent work is commonly framed as a corporate social responsibility, or a question of social sustainability (Fontana & Egels-Zandén, 2019; Lund-Thomsen et al., 2016b; Yawar & Seuring, 2017). This framing implies that decent work is a voluntary business decision (van Marrewijk, 2003, p. 102) which is made subject to other business decisions (Rodriguez-Gomez et al., 2020, p. 4). It is thereby considered context-specific which issues a company needs to tackle to benefit its workers (Beschorner & Hajduk, 2017, p. 637). Second, in other publications, particularly those oriented to policy and development, decent work is framed as a negotiated regulation, or governance challenge. Public, business, and civil society stakeholders negotiate global and local, as well as public and private labour standards (Gereffi & Lee, 2016, p. 30), and the extent to which suppliers comply with these standards is subject to intense scholarly debate (Barrientos, Mayer, et al., 2011; Knorringa & Nadvi, 2016). This framing suggests that working conditions can be considered decent when they comply with negotiated labour regulations. Third, in international law and increasingly in the business and political debate, decent work is linked to universally defined labour and human rights (e.g. Lebaron, 2021; Mena et al., 2010; Nolan, 2017). Labour rights (or workers’ rights) are fundamental entitlements of workers, and human rights are fundamental individual entitlements as defined in national and international laws and treaties (Mantouvalou, 2012, p. 172). This framing implies that working conditions are decent when they protect, respect, and remedy workers’ human and labour rights as codified in international human and labour rights treaties.

In recent years, the notion of decent work as a human right is increasingly supported in theory and in practice. Giuliani (2016, p. 41) sees the universal recognition of fundamental human rights (in contrast to a business-specific definition of social responsibilities) as a core advantage of the rights-based approach, and Kaltenborn et al. (2020, p. 2) show the close connection and interlinked terminology between the SDGs and universal human and labour rights. The UN’s Guiding principles on business and human rights (UN, 2011), the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (OECD, 2011) and the SA8000 standard (SAI, 2016) are explicitly linked to globally defined human and labour rights. Thereby, it should be noted that the final regulations remain products of negotiation between different countries and stakeholders. Negotiation processes can thereby water down the human rights orientation of decent work frameworks (Blustein et al., 2016, p. 3). A further criticism is that most global decent work regulations are not yet legally binding (Blustein et al., 2016, pp. 3–4). Therefore, it remains a question of CSR whether an organisation or factory choses to implement them.
Hence, different moral justifications overlap in the global debate which might all inform or clash with owner-manager frames.

5.2.4 Local frames: Decent work as a cultural or religious duty

This study is conducted in the Arab Republic of Egypt and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, two Arab countries whose culture is significantly influenced by Islamic traditions (Sidani & Thornberry, 2010, p. 37). Management perspectives and practices in the Middle East and North Africa have been shown to contain culture-bound elements (Namazie & Covarrubias Venegas, 2016, p. 26). Thereby, not only characteristics of Arab management culture but also Islamic work ethics are considered. Islam regulates all aspects of life, including work (El Garah et al., 2012, p. 993).

Hofstede Insights (2022) describe Egyptian and Jordanian culture as having high levels of power distance, collectivism, and uncertainty avoidance, and as being very normative with great respect for traditions. Wursten (2019, pp. 52–57) links these characteristics to the mental image of a pyramid. It is defined top down what is right or wrong, whereby leaders are obliged to align their decisions to the needs of the collective. This corresponds with the observation of Metwally and Punnett (2017, p. 56) that Egyptian companies often resemble families. Patriarchal company leaders take care of their workers, while workers owe them loyalty and respect. Good relationships within the company are frequently considered to be more important than compliance with rules and regulations (Cullina, 2016, p. 51). This framing implies that decent work is an individual responsibility of company leaders who are obliged to take good care of their workers.

A similar characterisation of employer-worker relationships as family-like occurs in Islamic work ethics. Employers should respect their workers and treat them like family members (Possumah et al., 2013, p. 265), and human dignity and justice are to be honoured (K. Khan et al., 2015, p. 238). However, top-down decision-making contradicts Islamic ideals (Patel et al., 2019, p. 651). According to Islam, decision-making should be a participative process following principles of consultation, fairness, teamwork, and cooperation (Mellahi & Budhwar, 2010, p. 687). Employers are therefore obliged to consult with their workers on what makes a workplace decent, and they are subsequently responsible for implementing the jointly developed ideas. This is however an ideal procedure which is often not followed in practice (Patel et al., 2019, p. 652).
5.3 Research Methodology

5.3.1 Research context

This study focuses on the garment supply chain. Trade in the industry is organised in a highly globalised network of production (Fernandez-Stark et al., 2011, p. 7). The lead firm or global buyer, commonly a MNE located in Europe or North America, often exerts significant control over its network and commonly defines product and production requirements, lead times, production volumes, and prices (Jamali et al., 2017, p. 460). Suppliers, commonly situated in the Global South (Perry et al., 2015, p. 738), export directly to global buyers, sell their products via agents, or produce as subcontractors of direct exporters. Garment producers thereby face high competitive pressures (Anner, 2019, p. 724). Labour scandals occur frequently and the garment supply chain features prominently in the debate on decent work in global production (Anner et al., 2014, p. 40). While most studies focus on the main exporting economies in Southeast Asia, public debate and scientific research seldom address Middle Eastern and African countries such as Egypt and Jordan. The current study contributes to filling this gap.

The Jordanian garment export industry is deeply embedded in the garment GPN (Azmeh & Nadvi, 2013, pp. 1325–1327). A favourable trade agreement between Jordan and the United States motivated South and Southeast Asian companies in the early 2000s to establish garment factories in Jordan. They focus on the cut, make, and trim stage of production and employ predominantly South and Southeast Asian migrants (Azmeh, 2014, p. 505). Up to the present, most owners, managers, and workers in Jordan are migrants (BWJ, 2019a, p. 10). Jordanian law only mandates a 25% share of local worker. The volume of garment exports is small on a global scale, but important for the Jordanian economy, with 25% of total Jordanian exports being connected to the garment industry (BWJ, 2019a, p. 10). A distinguishing feature of the Jordanian garment industry is its intense work with global actors on decent work-related issues. After the revelation of severe incidents of labour abuse in 2006 (NLC, 2006), the global community and especially the United States began to scrutinise working conditions in Jordan. The international MSI BWJ came to Jordan in 2009 and collaborates with almost all garment exporters to improve working conditions (BWJ, 2019a, p. 11). International observers report significant improvements (Aissi et al., 2018, pp. 691–692; Robertson, 2019, p. 24).

The Egyptian garment export industry is deeply embedded in the local context (Azmeh, 2014, p. 502). Exporting garment manufacturers belong to a vertically integrated
industry community with strong historical ties (El-Haddad, 2012, p. 2). A private export industry focusing on the United States and Europe developed in the 1990s (Grumiller et al., 2020, p. 19) and was boosted in 2004 by a favourable trade agreement supporting exports to the United States (Azmeh, 2014, p. 498). While the volume of garment exports is small on a global basis, the industry is highly important for the local labour market as it employs 21% of Egypt’s manufacturing labour force (CAPMAS, 2018, p. 28, data: 2017). Family-owned firms dominate the industry and employ predominantly local Egyptian workers (Azmeh, 2014, p. 501). The factory landscape is thereby rather heterogeneous. Garments are manufactured in small, medium, and large factories that are located in residential areas or distinct industrial zones.

A comparison of Egypt and Jordan demonstrates that garment suppliers operate in differing industry contexts. While Egyptian suppliers are locally embedded and struggle with political unrest and a poorly developed social system, Jordanian suppliers are closely interwoven with the GPN and separate from the remainder of the economy. Only satellite unions that predominantly employ local workers are connected to local communities in Jordan.

5.3.2 Research design

A qualitative multiple case study was conducted in Egypt and Jordan to study cognitive decent work frames of owners-managers in the exporting garment industry. The qualitative approach allowed generating new context-sensitive insights on an under-researched topic of business ethics (Reinecke et al., 2016, pp. xiii–xiv). Semi-structured interviews with owners-managers served as the main data source. The interviews enabled establishing the confidential and friendly environment necessary to discussing the sensitive topic of decent work (Gaskell, 2000, p. 48). Sampling of interview respondents followed a maximum variation logic whereby common themes are likely to reflect the perceptions of the entire case (Patton, 2002, p. 235). Interview transcripts were analysed with a thematic analysis that helped to unearth implicit ideas or “patterns of meaning” from the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 86). To enhance the credibility of the analysis (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, pp. 295–296), data collection was triangulated. Expert and worker interviews, factory visits, and industry documents provided a better understanding of the research context and the validity of interview responses.
5.3.3 Data collection: Owners-managers and expert interviews

Thirty owners-managers from 23 factories were interviewed (see Tables 12 and 13 and Annex 26 for further details). The sample includes small, medium, and large garment factories from different industrial zones in Egypt and Jordan, and respondents differed in age, gender, nationality, and job title. The interview process started in May 2017, when the author conducted several pre-interviews with industry and labour experts. The experts helped select English and Arabic terminology for the interviews that was easily understandable in the local industry. For instance, the experts recommended talking about good quality of work for workers in Egypt instead of decent work. The final terminology and main interview questions were subsequently piloted with the English-Arabic translators who accompanied the interviewer to the interviews. The main interviews were conducted from September to October 2017 in Egypt and from April to May 2018 in Jordan. Respondents described what they considered to be a good quality of work for their employees, elaborated selected work practices and why they implemented them, and described what they envisioned as their “dream” work environment. Interview duration ranged from 35 to 93 minutes in Jordan and from 27 to 135 minutes in Egypt. The average interview was longer in Egypt than in Jordan because of translation requirements. Most interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. When participants declined recording, the interviews were documented thoroughly. During the transcription, Arabic interview answers were translated again so that they could be compared with the translation during the interviews. Transcription and translation were done by native speakers who additionally explained local figures of speech and other local specifics. All transcriptions were double-checked by the author, and unclear content was discussed with native speakers from the research contexts. The data was documented and organised in the research software MAXQDA which also aided data analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factory location</th>
<th>Factory size (workers)</th>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Jordan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Zone</td>
<td>0-499</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500-1499</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1500-5500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Area</td>
<td>0-499</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500-1499</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1500-5500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 12. Overview of participating suppliers (chapter 5)**

Source: Own creation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management role</th>
<th>Local/ migrant</th>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Jordan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>2 female, 6 male</td>
<td>1 male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>6 male</td>
<td>1 male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR and/or Compliance</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1 female, 2 male</td>
<td>1 female, 1 male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (exports, production etc.)</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1 female, 1 male</td>
<td>1 female, 1 male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 13. Overview of owners-managers interviewed (chapter 5)**

Source: Own creation

### 5.3.4 Data analysis: Thematic network analysis

A thematic analysis to unearth owner-manager frames from the collected data was carried out according to the six steps proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006). These steps guide the analyst to discover latent themes that recur within and across the data. Following the proposition of Attride-Stirling (2001), the themes were hierarchically structured into basic, organising, and global themes. Basic themes represent singular claims from the textual data and remain close to the interview text (Attride-Stirling, 2001, pp. 388–389). Basic themes are clustered into organising themes and subsequently into global themes, a process that helps to reveal implicit ideas grounded within the data (Attride-Stirling, 2001, p. 388). Several rounds of coding and research discussions were needed to establish and define the global themes of the analysis, the owner-manager frames, and the organising and basic themes. Naming the themes was especially challenging as the understanding of the theme concepts (e.g., family, social responsibility, human) differs.
across contexts. Global themes have to be considered in combination with the basic themes that define them (see Tables 14 and 15) to ensure a joint understanding. Please refer to Annex 27 for an overview of coded themes and Annex 28 for an excerpt of the coding frame.

In total, six owner-manager frames were discovered, with two of them dominating the interviews (see results section 4.1). Four organising themes served to further describe the discovered frames. The organising theme “Image” comprises basic themes about images that were used to describe a person’s decent work understanding (e.g., the image of a family). Under the organising theme “Objective”, basic themes were subsumed that provide information on why the respondent considered decent work to be important. The organising theme “Employer-worker relationship” provides information on how the relationship between workers and their employers was characterised in a certain decent work frame. Finally, claims about work practices that were typical for a specific decent work frame were subsumed under the organising theme “Typical practices”. Not all global themes included enough information to answer all organising themes. For the four global themes that only occurred sporadically, only the objective and the typical practices could be identified.

After the thematic network was developed, it was evaluated for consistency and country differences. The MAXQDA document portrait was used to check whether basic themes belonging to the same cognitive frame were made in direct combination. A re-evaluation was conducted for outliers to determine the extent to which they could be attributed to the cognitive frame in question. With the help of the MAXQDA Code-Matrix browser, one or two main cognitive frames were furthermore assigned to each interview that dominated this interview. All basic themes in an interview that did not belong to these main frames were also treated as outliers and re-evaluated. To detect country differences, codes were subsequently visualised separately for Egypt and for Jordan. The thematic networks were then compared between countries to see whether certain frames dominated in either country. As results were similar across country contexts, the results are presented jointly for both countries in this paper.

The interviews included further claims by the respondents about decent work which could not be attributed to a specific cognitive decent work frame. These claims were collected separately in the analysis (see results section 4.2). Collecting these claims was originally not part of the research purpose. However, they provided fundamental
information on local owners-managers’ decent work understanding and were therefore included in the results.

In a last step of the analysis, the discovered owner-manager frames were compared with the global frames described in the theory section (results section 4.3). Based on the ideas of Guest et al. (2012, pp. 161–171) about comparing thematic data, the owner-manager frames or their characteristics (basic themes in the analysis) were checked to determine if they matched the ideas encoded in global decent work frames.

5.4 Research findings

5.4.1 Cognitive decent work frames of owners-managers in the garment industry

Six cognitive owner-manager frames could be detected, whereby respondents frequently combined different frames in their responses. Decent work was framed as a (1) (paternalistic) family responsibility, (2) business responsibility, (3) regulatory or legal responsibility, (4) social responsibility, (5) religious, especially Islamic, responsibility, and (6) human responsibility. Figure 12 depicts the discovered frames and Tables 14 and 15 detail each responsibility.
5.4.1.1 (Paternalistic) family responsibility

Decent work was recurrently framed as a paternalistic family responsibility\textsuperscript{16} across interviews. Factories were described as “families” for local workers [E16F12, E26F21, ...

\textsuperscript{16} The term “family” was chosen for this theme to connect to the respondents’ own terminology as well as the terminology used in the literature on decent work (e.g. Soundararajan et al. 2018, p. 1325; Tran and Jeppesen 2016, p. 603), Arab management culture (e.g. Kabasakal et al. 2012, p. 528; Metwally and Punnett 2017, p.56) and Islamic work ethics (e.g. Patel et al. 2019, p. 658; Possumah et al. 2013, p. 265) where the same term is used to describe the observed phenomenon. The supplement “paternalistic” highlights that a paternalistic family culture is referred to.
or a “home” away from home for migrant workers [J07F04, J08F05, J18F12]. Owners-managers saw themselves as responsible for taking care of their workers and frequently characterised them as if they were children. Respondents not only took care of work-related issues but also helped if workers had personal, especially financial, problems. Furthermore, they offered food at work, accommodations for migrant workers, celebrated life events and birthdays, and organised leisure time activities.

There was a very, let’s say, synchronisation between the people, and we were working as a family. [J09F06, R1 about the good old times]

We as [factory 01] are a safe environment for the outside community, we do not have harassments, we do not allow with wrong relationships, no degrading treatment, everyone takes their rights. Everyone sends their kids safely to work at our factory. [E01F01, R1]

We are responsible for our employees 24/7, 365 days a year. Although they only work for us for 10 hours a day, but we are responsible for them even after working hours. [J07F04, R1]

Notably, respondents had a paternalistic family image in mind. They not only aimed to ensure the well-being of workers in all areas of life, but also to discipline and educate them. E25F20-R1 stressed the importance of rules to educate workers, and J07F04-R1 related that their migrant workers are taught how to make their beds and keep their living area clean. Honesty, respect, and loyalty were valued and expected from workers.

5.4.1.2 Business responsibility

Owners-managers recurrently framed decent work as a business responsibility across interviews. Thereby, they commonly referred to the image of a ‘win-win’ situation or a ‘give-and-take’ situation, as shown in the respective quotations:

Each interview was assigned an interview code to protect respondents’ anonymity. The code specifies the context (Jordan or Egypt) and interview type (Factory, Worker, or Expert). The seventh interview in Egypt, which was the fourth interview in a factory, was therefore labelled E07F04. For interview quotes, it is furthermore specified which respondent (R1, R2, etc.) voiced a certain claim. Especially in Egypt, frequently more than one owner-manager participated in the interviews.
I believe that we are just monitoring all the parameters around us to make the workers lives better because it is a win-win situation. [E07F04-R1]

If you need more quality, more good target, more discipline, you have to give the worker everything. [J19F13-R1]

If employers provided workers with working conditions that they liked, good workers could be recruited, retained, and motivated to work productively. A decent workplace was considered to be a workplace that made workers happy, for instance, as a Jordanian manager highlighted: “our aim is one, make the worker happy” [J19F13-R1]. Worker satisfaction was thereby recurrently said to especially depend on a decent income, fair and respectful treatment, and work amenities (especially transportation, food, accommodation).

However, not all respondents saw the employer-worker relationship as a constructive one. The business rationale also included responses that described the relationship between employers and workers as a battle. One manager [J18F12-R1] for instance said, “This is [an] army […]. Keep them […] happy. You don't have a choice today, really, if you ask me.” Workers were described as disrespectful, disloyal, and dishonest and needed to learn that employers could only offer them work opportunities if they helped to make a profit.

5.4.1.3 Regulatory responsibility

Some owners-managers framed decent work as a regulatory responsibility. They expressed that compliance with local laws and global standards makes a workplace decent or viewed local and global regulations as setting a benchmark for decent work practices. Thereby, local labour laws tended to be referenced more frequently than global labour standards. J05F02-R1 for instance proudly exclaimed that “everything is by law. Whatever we are practicing based on labour law” and considered legal compliance as signifying decent work. Most of the other respondents also referred to global standards and local laws during the interviews, however in disconnect with their personal decent work understanding. Discrepancies between owner-manager decent work understandings and local and global labour regulations are further outlined in section 4.2.

5.4.1.4 Social responsibility

In some interviews, respondents enlarged their decent work understanding to also include the well-being of the local community, society, and industry. This frame resembled the
framing of decent work as a (paternalistic) family responsibility, but the scope included social provisions that went well beyond the direct business sphere.

Our aim really is to help the society as well and the industry. [E30F24, R1]

[…] so that we can all live a good life, whether in our Egypt or elsewhere. All people must rise. [E17F12, R1]

Respondents felt responsible for such things as providing basic education to their workers [J07F04], participating in technical training initiatives [E30F24], hiring local labour [J09F06], or offering trainings [E17F12] and part-time work opportunities to rural women [E01F01]. This enlarged understanding of employer responsibility was frequently attributed to the failure of the state to provide for people’s basic needs, such as education, health care, or poverty support, especially in Egypt.

5.4.1.5 Human responsibility

Several interview respondents saw honouring human rights and basic human needs as their human duty. The words “human” and “humanity” were repeatedly used in reference to decent work; for example, “We respect human to the maximum” [J07F04, R1] and “We are all humans” [J18F12, R1]. Workers were said to have human rights such as the right to a decent income [J09F06] and respectful treatment [J18F12]. A Jordanian manager stressed, “We believe in [human rights]. It’s not only saying it, we believe [in it]” [J07F04, R1]. Respondents thereby acknowledged that the protection of human rights is not self-evident in garment production. Workers were furthermore said to have basic human needs that needed to be honoured; for example, working hours needed to be capped because workers needed to rest [E22F17, E26F21, J08F05, J06F03]. The understanding of what human rights or needs are, was subjective. One owner considered 11 working hours per day as humane [J06F03-R1], while another one found 8 hours to be enough [E26F21-R2].

5.4.1.6 Religious (Islamic) responsibility

In several interviews, respondents linked decent work to their personal religious beliefs, which were predominantly Islamic. An owner justified her company’s decent work efforts as follows: “this is our manner, this is related to our religion: We are here to help and we will take the benefit from God” [E25F20, R2]. Others added that they considered it decent to honour Zakat, the Islamic duty to give alms to poor people, or to adjust working conditions during Ramadan:
So, we provide the factory’s zakat to [their] employees. If one of our workers’ dad is in the hospital, I stand by them. At the end of the day, it’s my obligation. Those closest to me are important to tend to. [E28F23-R1]

In Ramadan, the working hours differ” [E12F09-R1]

Furthermore, owners-managers highlighted the importance of honouring the religious duties and occasions of their workers. J07F04-R2 explained that “we celebrate with Hindus, with Muslims, with Christians, with any religion that we have, we would celebrate with [the workers].”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Paternalistic) family responsibility</th>
<th>Business responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image</strong></td>
<td><strong>Image</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Win-Win</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home away from home</td>
<td>Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>Battle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure well-being of workers in all areas of life</td>
<td>Worker benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate and discipline workers</td>
<td>▪ Provide work opportunities/ income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Ensure worker satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employer-worker relationship</strong></td>
<td><strong>Employer-worker relationship</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer-workers as one unity</td>
<td>Constructive: Balancing employer and worker needs and demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers as parents; workers as children</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship values: honesty, respect, loyalty</td>
<td>Destructive: Clash between employer and worker needs and demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typical practices (selection)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Typical practices (selection)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping workers with personal (especially financial) problems</td>
<td>Providing decent earning opportunities, including opportunities to work overtime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering direct communication with top management/owner</td>
<td>– Treating workers fair and respectfully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting work-life balance of workers</td>
<td>– Providing transportation to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedding factory in local community, ensuring a short commute</td>
<td>– Offering (tasty) food at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering leisure time activities</td>
<td>Providing good facilities, including accommodation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Owner-manager decent work frames 1

Source: Own creation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory responsibility (local laws, global standards)</th>
<th>Social responsibility</th>
<th>Human responsibility</th>
<th>Religious responsibility (Islam)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Comply with local laws and regulations</td>
<td>– Support development of workers</td>
<td>– Honour human rights</td>
<td>– Honour local religious (Islamic) traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Comply with global standards</td>
<td>– Support development of local community</td>
<td>– Honour basic human needs</td>
<td>– Honour religious (Islamic) duties of workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typical practices (selection)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Typical practices (selection)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Typical practices (selection)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Typical practices (selection)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Paying salary according to legal requirements</td>
<td>– Developing workers’ work and life skills</td>
<td>– Providing financial support in case of need</td>
<td>– Celebrating local Islamic holidays in factory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Organising overtime according to legal requirements</td>
<td>– Providing job opportunities to poor/marginalised community members</td>
<td>– Allowing overtime to provide decent salary</td>
<td>– Celebrating religious holidays of migrant workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Providing food and accommodation according to CBA (Jordan)</td>
<td>– Offering in-house technical education opportunities</td>
<td>– Limiting overtime to protect workers’ health and work-life balance</td>
<td>– Shortening working hours during Ramadan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Ensuring non-discrimination according to law</td>
<td></td>
<td>– Ensuring non-discrimination</td>
<td>– Giving out (Islamic) holiday gifts and bonuses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. Owner-manager decent work frames 2

Source: Own creation
5.4.2 General claims about decent work

Four general claims about decent work were made across interviews (see figure 12).

First, decent work was characterised as a multi-dimensional concept that covers a plurality of work-related issues: “What makes out a good quality for workers [...]? Not only one thing, many things” [E07F04-R1]. Consequently, respondents did not see workplaces binarily as decent or indecent; instead, they considered them as being high quality in certain dimensions while lagging behind in others. Decent work frames and corporate resources (see next assumption) thereby influenced how owners-managers prioritised different aspects of decent work.

Second, making a workplace decent requires resources, whereby the amount and type of resources differ depending on the decent work dimension concerned. Among others, E28F23-R1 stressed the requirement of financial resources to improve working conditions: “In order for me to give them more money, I need to make more money, or else I’ll close up shop.” E01F01-R2 added that an increase in remuneration is more costly than treating workers with fairness and respect. Human and physical resources were also considered necessary: shorter working hours require additional staff [E22F17], supervisors need to be trained to treat workers respectfully [E28F23], and escape routes require space [E01F01]. Continuous improvement is therefore necessary to eventually achieve decent work: “We are focusing on much better issues today because the bar is raising in the industry” [J18F12-R1].

Third, several respondents highlighted contradictions between different understandings of decent work and explained how they can impede compliance with laws or standards or fulfilment of worker demands.

Local laws can contradict global laws: “Sometimes Jordan law is not matching with labour international law.” [J08F05-R1]

Local and global regulations can contradict owners-managers decent work understanding: “We [are] responsible, we [find] things [in global labour standards] that we cannot approve of.” [E12F09-R1]

Workers’ wishes can contradict owners-managers decent work understanding: “[Workers] do not really think about that [safety in the workplace]. But I struggle with them for their own sake.” [E28F23-R1]

Fourth, while some aspects of decent work were characterised as universalistic, others were considered particularistic by respondents. Decent work issues that were framed as human or religious responsibility were commonly considered universalistic. For most
other issues, it was highlighted that different priorities exist for different groups of workers, locations, and industries.

We have Nepali, Sri Lankan, Bangladeshi, Indian, Jordanian, and Syrian also. Each nationality has different thoughts, different minds, different traditions, different habits. [J08F05-R1]

It is not a single issue, it is about the culture, about the system, the laws, many things, and it is different between the capital and the small cities and the villages [E30F24-R1]

5.4.3 Comparison with global frames

The theory section highlighted three decent work frames that dominate the global debate on working conditions in global production. They are compared in the following to interview responses.

First, decent work as a human right was heavily supported by local owners-managers in the interviews. Several respondents noted the need to protect workers’ basic rights and to honour basic human needs (see section 4.1.5). Such rights and needs were considered universalistic for all people worldwide. The understanding of which rights and basic needs an individual has differed across interviews; only a few respondents referred to legal regulations to define human rights. The connection between human rights and needs and global human rights legislation was seldomly made.

Second, while some owners-managers explicitly linked their decent work understanding to global and local regulatory frameworks (see section 4.1.3), most owners-managers did not consider them as benchmarks for decent work. It was for instance repeatedly highlighted that capping working hours was against workers’ needs and business interests [E12F09, E25F20, E28F23, J12F08, J13F09] as workers needed the income and employers needed overtime to make shipment dates and to break-even. Some respondents, such as E08F05-R1, even highlighted that they break the law to establish what they considered a decent workplace: “We don’t abide by them [labour laws] because they harm the worker.”

Third, decent work was frequently framed as a responsibility across interviews. Most owners and top managers thereby phrased it as a personal responsibility rather than a corporate one. Responsibilities went further than common conceptualisations of CSR imply. Owners-managers considered themselves as responsible for helping workers who faced family emergencies [E25F20] or urgently required money [E28F23]. Furthermore, factory owners-managers frequently compensated for the failure of the state to provide
decent health care and education [E17F12]. While the adopted responsibilities differed, global studies and local respondents equally stressed the idea that decent work and CSR lead to business benefits (see section 4.1.2.). The terminology used by owners-managers in Egypt and Jordan can be traced back to global and local discourses. While the global CSR and sustainability debate commonly uses the image of a ‘win-win’ situation (Rodriguez-Gomez et al., 2020, p. 7), Arab management culture and Islamic work ethics centre a ‘give and take’ situation (Qasim et al., 2020, p. 182). To realise business benefits decent work efforts must be adapted to the needs of the workers and the local context [J13F09, E11F08]. This assumption contradicts the notion of universalistic decent work standards.

5.5 Discussion

This study aimed at identifying cognitive decent work frames of owners-managers of exporting garment factories in Egypt and Jordan. It built on and extended previous research highlighting clashes between global and local perceptions of decent work (Bae et al., 2021; Flanigan, 2018; Hoogesteger & Massink, 2021; S. I. Khan et al., 2019). The cognitive framing approach fostered understanding of which inner logics guide decent work sensemaking and decision-making in the research contexts. The results show that owners-managers framed decent work especially as a (paternalistic) family responsibility and as a business responsibility. Some respondents furthermore considered themselves responsible for societal development. Owners-managers thereby acknowledged the existence of private and public labour regulations, but only a few respondents drew their decent work understanding from them. Decent work was repeatedly expressed to be a human and religious obligation. The detected owner-manager frames recurred across respondents with different Arabic backgrounds and fit well to Arab management culture and Islamic work ethics where the family image represents good work ethics (Metwally & Punnett, 2017, p. 56; Possumah et al., 2013, p. 265).

Even though the presented owner-manager frames were identified in a very specific research context and have not yet been explicitly analysed in other contexts, they resonate with other supplier-centred research findings in global (garment) production: Tran and Jeppesen (2016, p. 603) quote a respondent from Vietnam who proposed that “the working environment has family-like elements.” The link between business benefits and decent work is noted by Huq et al. (2014, pp. 622–623), who find that advantages in worker recruitment and retention motivate suppliers’ decent work practices in
Bangladesh. In a study by Perry et al. (2015, p. 742) in Sri Lanka, managers linked their work-related actions to religion as “the Buddhist culture demands fairness and social justice and equity between all the people.” Fontana and Egels-Zandén (2019, p. 1059) “observed a strong human dimension” in suppliers’ perceptions of labour-related CSR in Bangladesh. Accord with global standards was expressed in India: “They [the buyers] demand for these standards. These things are good for workers and common people” (Soundararajan & Brown, 2016, p. 93); however, most owners-managers quoted in other studies voiced disagreement with global labour standards (de Neve, 2009, p. 70). The detected owner-manager frames are therefore likely to exist in similar forms in other developing country production contexts.

The identified owner-manager frames were compared with global frames informing the definition of global labour standards. Building on previous research that highlighted clashes between suppliers’ decent work understandings and work values imposed on them by global standards (de Neve, 2009; S. I. Khan et al., 2019; F. R. Khan & Lund-Thomsen, 2011), the results of this study further refine where global and local frames clash and where they agree. Owner-manager frames matched global frames in the idea that workers have human rights and basic human needs that are universal and should be protected and cared for by employers. However, respondents rarely linked these rights and needs to global labour standards and instead proposed their own definitions of universal human rights and basic needs. Similarly, even though the global idea that employers are responsible for the well-being of their workers corresponds to local owner-manager accounts, the understanding of which responsibilities they have differs significantly. Owner-managers’ decent work understandings included aspects such as the need to support workers financially in case of emergency that previous studies described as ‘informal’ or ‘silent’ CSR practices (Fontana & Egels-Zandén, 2019, p. 1050; F. R. Khan & Lund-Thomsen, 2011, p. 76). These practices are not acknowledged in the global debate but are crucial to developing country suppliers and their workers.

This study evaluated decent work frames of owners-managers, not actual practices. Discrepancies between ideal working conditions and actual working conditions in supplier firms were commonly attributed to owners-managers’ business responsibilities. Suppliers in the garment industry are caught between global competitive pressures and global demands to ensure decent working conditions (Jamali et al., 2017, p. 477). Most publications on decent work in the garment supply chain refer to the immense pressure on prices and lead times in the industry and link them to indecent work environments (e.g. Anner, 2019, p. 706; Bae et al., 2021, p. 655; Reinecke et al., 2019, pp. 7–8). Fewer
publications (e.g. F. R. Khan & Lund-Thomsen, 2011, p. 82; Perry et al., 2015, p. 749) address the inverse argument: If suppliers invest in decent work improvements and are not rewarded for this investment, they risk losing their competitive viability. This paper therefore underlines that suppliers need to balance business and worker interests to secure (decent) working opportunities in their factories. Considering contemporary business models of garment brands that focus on fast and cheap fashion rather than sustainable production (Reinecke et al., 2019, p. 8) and garment purchasing practices that do not reward suppliers for decent work improvements (Amengual et al., 2020, p. 817), it remains questionable whether global labour standards in their current form can be fully realised.

5.6 Implications for theory and practice

Global competitive pressures in the garment GPN incentivise or even pressure suppliers to save costs in the implementation of decent working practices. To balance adverse global pressures, global labour standards are necessary to prevent labour abuse in global production. However, the legitimacy and effectiveness of contemporary global standards are contested in local arenas. This study evaluated owners-managers’ decent work frames to find common ground for the definition and implementation of decent work and global labour standards. The results lead to a proposal to widen decent work understandings to include universalistic (rights-oriented) and particularistic (responsibility-oriented) aspects. Rights-oriented aspects of decent work refer to all work issues needed to protect, respect, and remedy workers’ rights. They should be directly linkable to universal human rights. Responsibility-oriented aspects of decent work go beyond rights-oriented aspects and include issues relevant to the well-being of workers in a specific context and the responsibility to ensure business survival.

For the setting of global labour standards, this implies that all global standards should be based on universal human rights. Although this proposition is increasingly shared by researchers (Giuliani, 2016) and practitioners (UN, 2011), current global standards still include paragraphs that are considered as Western ‘imperialism’, such as regulations to install a certain type of fire extinguisher or toilet (F. R. Khan & Lund-Thomsen, 2011, p. 83). To prevent such regulations, this paper advocates the following propositions. First, global scientific evidence should guide standard definition and empirically prove that standards serve to protect, respect, or remedy human rights. Second, suppliers and workers from the Global South who can evaluate how regulations play out in practice
should have a (loud) voice in standard setting procedures. Thus, further research is needed to identify decent work understandings of suppliers and workers in the Global South. Third, stronger efforts to align global standards are recommended to underline the universality of human rights.

In addition, the acceptance of global labour standards could be increased by including particularistic, responsibility-oriented regulations – not in the form of global norms for all suppliers worldwide, but in the requirement to formulate context-specific regulations that benefit the well-being of workers. Many contemporary global standards already include process requirements that aim to protect the interests of workers, such as the requirement to install transparent employer-worker communication processes (FLA, 2011, p. 5) or the obligation to install professional management systems (SAI, 2016, p. 4). However, suppliers are commonly not rewarded if they implement informal, locally specific decent work practices that benefit worker well-being. Exceptional scores in worker well-being surveys could for instance be permitted to enhance suppliers’ compliance ratings.

The decent work understanding proposed above also has implications for the implementation and monitoring of global standards. The study revealed a disconnect between intrinsic decent work motivations and global labour standards in addition to a lack of financial, human, and physical resources to realise decent work ambitions. MSIs operating at the local level can ease these problems (Holzberg, 2021; MacDonald et al., 2019). With their advisory services, they can (1) explain global standards and their positive impact on human rights to suppliers and (2) support suppliers in facilitating worker and business interests. If existing auditing systems are extended to include multi-stakeholder advisory services, they might not only be able to adequately judge the decent work footprint of a supplier firm but also guide the implementation and acceptance of universalistic rights-oriented and particularistic responsibility-oriented labour standards.

5.7 Conclusion, limitations, and future research

This study analysed cognitive decent work frames of owners-managers in the garment export industry in Egypt and Jordan. It found six frames to guide decent work perceptions and activities in the industry; some of them align with global decent work frames, while others are context specific. Decent work is therefore proposed to be understood as a multi-dimensional concept that has universalistic (rights-oriented) and particularistic (worker-business-responsibility-oriented) aspects. Propositions for standard setting and
implementation were derived from this understanding. It is acknowledged that normative contradictions between global labour standards and owner-manager decent work frames cannot be fully alleviated as some issues are perceived very differently across cultures (e.g. the role of women in society or the imperative of non-discrimination). Nevertheless, more culturally sensitive global labour standards are proposed to enhance their legitimacy and effectiveness in global supply chains. To alleviate limitations of this study, future research is needed to further develop understanding on decent work frames in the global debate.

A plurality of decent work concepts and global labour standards exists in theory and practice. The theory section of this paper focused on the most common decent work frames in research on the garment GPN. The scientific and practical debate could benefit from a thorough review of co-existing decent work concepts and global labour standards that highlights normative contradictions and similarities across concepts. This paper employed a social constructivist view on cognitive frames which implies that frames are time- and context-specific (Zimmermann et al., 2021, p. 2). The cognitive frames identified in the empirical part of this paper therefore need to be considered as snapshots of decent work understandings at the time of the analysis. Future researcher might evaluate how much owner-manager frames change over time; in particular, the Covid-19 pandemic might have changed views on decent work in global production. Furthermore, the study can be replicated in other production contexts to validate the presented findings across the Global South. This study focused on one local stakeholder group in global production. Research illuminating decent work frames of other supply chain stakeholders (buying agents, local employer organisations, auditors, workers, etc.) is recommended to continue the debate on cognitive decent work frames in the Global South.
6 Conclusion

This dissertation was driven by the interest to better understand the complex problem of ensuring decent work in the garment GPN and the wish to add insights for the promotion of decent work improvements. Complementing existing research insights, it focused on the under-researched perspective of supplier firms that need to meet global and local expectations and implement decent work on the factory floor. This conclusion revisits the guiding research questions asked in the introduction, deducts implications for theory and practice, and discusses research limitations and propositions for future research.

6.1 Revisiting the research questions

Three research questions guided the theoretical and empirical work of the PhD project:

1. How do glo-cal influences crossverge at the point of the supplier and motivate (in)decent work outcomes in the garment GPN?
2. How do crossvergence dynamics diffuse across different horizontal nodes and vertical stages of the garment GPN?
3. How do owner-managers of garment supplier firms frame their decent work perspectives?

The first paper published in the course of the dissertation (chapter 2) responded to the first research question and developed a theoretical crossvergence framework for understanding how glo-cal interactions shape work realities in supplier firms. The second paper (chapter 3) applied the developed crossvergence framework empirically. It illuminated how multiple-level developments support decent work progress in Jordan. The third paper (chapter 4) addressed the second research question and traced crossvergence dynamics across two vertical stages and two horizontal nodes in the garment GPN. Focusing on working times arrangements, it showed how buyer procurement demands counteract their labour standard demands and highlighted the importance of analysing supplier resources for understanding (in)decent work outcomes. Compliance with global labour standards was found to be higher in tier-1 compared with tier-2 garment factories in Jordan and differed between the textiles and garment stage of production in Egypt. The empirical analysis additionally traced the crossvergence of compensation and benefits practices in the research contexts. The results of this analysis were presented in a research seminar but are not (yet) published in a research article. The
analysis showed that crossvergence outcomes can differ significantly depending on the decent work dimension in focus. While Egyptian tier-1 garment suppliers operated with decent working times practices, they offered the lowest wages across the four research cases; the wages were evaluated by experts to be below living wages. Local socio-cultural factors and resource requirements motivated better earning opportunities in the textiles compared with the garment stage of production in Egypt, and strict local labour laws harmonised tier-1 and tier-2 compensation and benefits practices in compliance with global standards in Jordan. The fourth paper (chapter 5) responded to the third research question and dissected cognitive decent work frames of decision-makers in supplier firms. The identified discrepancies between global and local decent work understandings highlighted the need to rethink current designs of global labour standards. Cognitive framing theory suggests that ethical frames influence decision-making (J. P. Walsh, 1995, p. 281). The results of the fourth paper therefore also provided insights into the agency of suppliers when processing global influences and additionally contributed to answering the first research question. When analysing the crossvergence of working times arrangements and compensation and benefits practices, I additionally identified rationales of decision-makers for implementing certain practices. This analysis, which remains to be published, showed that the identified rationales resembled the decent work frames presented in chapter 5 and corroborated the theoretical link between decent work frames and decent work decision-making.

6.2 Implication 1: A crossvergence framework for supplier-centred research on decent work in GPNs

This dissertation theoretically developed and empirically refined a crossvergence framework for supplier-centred research on decent work in GPNs. Figure 13 presents an overview of the framework combining the research insights of all publications presented in this dissertation. The framework connects three theoretical perspectives, the GPN perspective (Coe & Yeung, 2015), the crossvergence perspective (Ralston, 2008), and the cognitive framing perspective (Cornelissen & Werner, 2014; J. P. Walsh, 1995), to explain the formation of (in)decent work practices in supplier firms. It highlights (1) the dialectic nature of buyer pressure on suppliers (see chapters 2–4) that Reinecke and Donaghey (2021, p. 470) linked to the “structured antagonism” of commercial versus governance interests of buyers; (2) the power of local institutional and socio-cultural dynamics that cannot be ignored when trying to understand labour outcomes in GPNs
(see chapters 2–5); (3) the impact of suppliers’ human, financial, intellectual, and physical resources (Osterwalder & Pigneur, 2010, p. 35) on decent work outcomes (see chapter 3); and (4) the importance of cognitive frames which influence how decision-makers in supplier firms evaluate global demands and justify their employment responses (see chapters 2 and 5). The framework furthermore assumes these four determinants of decent work to be constructed in the interaction of public, business, and social (esp. labour) stakeholders on global, local, and firm levels (see chapter 3).

**Figure 13. Crossvergence of decent work practices in supplier firms**

Source: Own creation

While the interaction of global and local influences on suppliers is well acknowledged in the debate on decent work in global production (Lund-Thomsen et al., 2016a, p. 11; Toffel et al., 2015, p. 219), the importance of suppliers’ human, financial, intellectual,
and physical resources to implement decent work\textsuperscript{18} and the mediating influence of decision-makers’ cognitive decent work frames\textsuperscript{19} are addressed less often. Two examples from this dissertation illustrate the importance of acknowledging resource differences across suppliers and cognitive decision-making processes. First, when looking at supply chain dynamics, it is logical to predict that global labour standards dissolve along the vertical stages and horizontal nodes of the garment GPN as buyers have the most power over their tier-1 garment suppliers (Gold et al., 2020, p. 1282; Grimm et al., 2016, p. 1972; Villena, 2019, p. 1149). However, this dissertation showed that labour standards can also be better in lower stages of the supply chain when firm-level resources in this stage of production favour decent work outcomes. Structural resource differences between the textiles and the garment industry in Egypt had a greater impact on decent work outcomes than global standard diffusion. Second, the dissertation confirmed that suppliers often face contradictory global expectations (Lund-Thomsen et al., 2012, p. 1234; Reinecke & Donaghey, 2021, p. 470), and it proposed an analysis of cognitive decent work frames to better understand which expectations decision-makers chose to meet. In the textiles industry in Egypt, decision-makers had to decide whether they should comply with global and local regulations and prohibit excessive hours or whether they should respond to resource limitations and worker demands and let their workers work 12 hours per day. A (paternalistic) family frame tended to incentivise suppliers to comply with global regulations, while a business responsibility frame motivated longer working hours. Integrating resource-based and cognitive framing approaches into the decent work debate is therefore expected to enrich our understanding of decent work decision-making in supplier firms.

The crossvergence framework unveils the illusion that buyers can control working conditions in their GPNs, especially in lower stages and nodes of the garment GPN. While buyers significantly influence work realities with their procurement practices, global private labour regulation was shown to have a limited reach. Tracing crossvergence

\textsuperscript{18} Notable exceptions can be found in publications linking the level of economic upgrading to decent work outcomes (e.g. Barrientos, Gereffi, and Rossi, 2011; Kaorringa and Pegler, 2006) and publications linking human resource characteristics to decent work outcomes (e.g. Azmeh and Nadvi, 2013; Barrientos et al., 2003).

\textsuperscript{19} Notable exceptions can be found in publications discussing the legitimacy of global labour standards (e.g. Bae et al., 2021; Reinecke and Ansari, 2015) and publications referring to actor decision-making in GPNs (e.g. Yeung and Coe, 2015; Stigzelius and Mark-Herbert, 2009).
processes highlighted the immense complexity of global GPN dynamics and their reception in supplier firms. This complexity makes it rather unlikely that any standardised global labour initiative can ensure decent work for all textiles and garment workers in GPNs. A synergistic cooperation-paradigm is therefore recommended to replace contemporary buyer-centred approaches for decent work improvement, as will be outlined in section 6.4.

6.3 Implication 2: Rethinking global labour standard regimes

The design and implementation of global labour standards was discussed throughout this dissertation. Chapter 2 highlighted the existence of global public, global private, and local public labour standards influencing decent work decision-making in supplier firms. Chapter 3 included the presentation of Better Work Jordan’s factory assessments as a good practice case for labour standard auditing. Chapter 4 showed that private regulatory power dissolves across vertical stages and horizontal nodes of the garment GPN, and chapter 5 questioned the claim to universality of existing standards. Taking all results together, this dissertation suggests the need to rethink contemporary global labour standard regimes.

Standard setting: In line with previous research, this dissertation found global standards to be only partially shared by local actors in garment production countries (chapter 5, Bae et al., 2021; S. I. Khan et al., 2019). It is therefore problematic that actors from the Global South are largely underrepresented in standard setting procedures (F. R. Khan & Lund-Thomsen, 2011, p. 87). Decision-makers in Egypt and Jordan acknowledged the existence of universal human rights and basic human needs but questioned many of the actual work standards proposed by global standards. Instead of linking their decent work understanding to global standards, they highlighted their (parental) duty of care for their workers and recounted local decent work practices, which are not acknowledged by global standards but also exist in similar form in other garment production contexts in the Global South (Fontana & Egels-Zandén, 2019, p. 1050; F. R. Khan & Lund-Thomsen, 2011, p. 76).

I therefore propose to combine universalistic rights-oriented norms with particularistic responsibility-oriented norms in global labour regulations (see chapter 5). Universalistic rights-oriented norms constitute minimum standards that ought to be complied with worldwide to prevent harm to the health and well-being of workers (maximum number
of working hours, minimum wages, minimum health and safety standards etc.). The norms should be derived from international human rights law and defined (e.g. under the patronage of the ILO) by public, private, and social/labour actors from garment buyer and garment supplier countries. Particularistic responsibility-oriented norms include local practices that benefit the health and well-being of workers (an extra reduction of working hours to allow for a better work-life balance, the traditional practice of Zakat, local factory events, etc.). They should be derived for each garment production context (e.g. under the patronage of the glo-cal initiatives proposed in section 6.4) by public, private, and social/labour actors from the local context.

**Standard auditing:** Practice multiplicity and decoupling have been highlighted by previous research as hindering the effectiveness of global labour standard implementation. Practice multiplicity refers to the problem that suppliers are commonly audited by different auditors as different buyers prefer different auditing standards (Kuruvilla et al., 2020, p. 848). It leads to audit fatigue of suppliers (Khalid et al., 2020, p. 2) and increases the costs of labour standard compliance. Practice decoupling describes the phenomenon whereby suppliers are recurrently found to showcase different employment practices during audits than they have actually implemented (Jamali et al., 2017, pp. 459, 477). Their actual practices are often invisible to auditors (Kuruvilla et al., 2020, p. 848). To counter these problems, Short et al. (2020, p. 903) highlight the importance of training auditors and Auret and Barrientos (2006) propose a participatory social auditing practice that involves business and social/labour representatives inside and outside the company as well as the local public labour inspectorate. Global private initiatives such as The Social and Labor Convergence Program (SLCP, 2022) furthermore work on harmonising auditing practices.

Building on these findings, I propose the factory assessments of the Better Work country programs to be a good practice case for labour standard auditing. In Jordan, Better Work factory assessments are increasingly replacing other audits. By assessing a wide range of decent work criteria, Better Work provides buyers with the necessary information to evaluate if suppliers comply with their company-specific decent work requirements. The program even started to involve the local labour inspectorate in their assessments which might open future pathways for joint global (private) and local (public) inspections. By involving business, public, and social/ labour actors in their factory assessments, Better Work adopted a participatory social auditing style as suggested by Auret and Barrientos (2006). The program furthermore addresses the points
Audit consequences: My research showed, in line with previous research, that the effectiveness of global labour regulation depends on how audit results are used. Amengual et al. (2020, p. 837) highlight that labour standard audit results often remain disconnected from buyer procurement practices. Accordingly, suppliers are often neither rewarded for compliance nor penalised for noncompliance; a disconnect also criticised by suppliers in Egypt. Short et al. (2020, p. 905) add that the effectiveness of private regulation increases if non-economic actors in buyer and supplier countries can use audit results to drive their initiatives for better working conditions.

I therefore propose to first put pressure on buyers to implement responsible procurement practices that are linked to supplier compliance ratings (see also section 6.4). As a short-term reaction, prices, lead times, and long-term order confirmations can be increased to reward high compliance ratings. In the long term, buyers can furthermore increase/decrease order volumes in response to audit results. Further, I want to highlight the importance of using audit results to drive decent work progress within each production context. The Better Work country programs publish aggregated assessment results per country and selected individual assessment results per supplier (transparency indicators). This allows for multi-stakeholder cooperation and discourse on decent work obstacles and enables non-economic actors (governments, media, labour unions, NGOs, etc.) to advocate for change. For the cases of Cambodia and Jordan, Robertson (2019, 2020) shows that Better Work’s transparency initiatives significantly contribute to improving labour standard compliance.

6.4 Implication 3: The need for synergistic cooperation to achieve decent work for all

In 2014, Lund-Thomsen and Lindgreen outlined a cooperation-based paradigm to promote CSR, including decent work, in GPNs that they found to be increasingly supported by a “broad-based coalition of actors” (p. 14), including researchers and practitioners. The main features of this paradigm resonate well with the findings presented in this PhD in three ways. First, the dialectic nature of buyer pressure is addressed by
proposing that buyers revise their purchasing practices (better prices, longer-term production planning, long-term trade relationships) and align purchasing and CSR departments. Second, the need to strengthen human and intellectual resources is acknowledged and investing in capacity development for decision-makers and workers is recommended. Third, the limited reach of global labour standards is addressed, and a locally embedded participatory social auditing system is proposed that involves workers and other labour stakeholders such as trade unions and NGOs. Reviewing how this cooperation-based paradigm was implemented at the time of their analysis, however, Lund-Thomsen and Lindgreen (2014, pp. 17–18) found it was not yet effective as it did not change power structures in GPNs.

The research results presented in this dissertation confirm cooperation to be the key for decent work improvements. The complexity illustrated by the crossvergence paradigm cannot be tackled by individual actors. To change power structures in decent work enforcement, I suggest redistributing the roles and responsibilities of the actors involved in Lund-Thomsen and Lindgreen’s (2014) cooperation paradigm. The paradigm in its original form focuses on cooperation or “close collaboration between international buyers and suppliers” (Lund-Thomsen & Lindgreen, 2014, p. 16). Global buyers ought to invest in capacity building and implement social auditing systems. As highlighted in section 6.2., this dissertation concluded that buyer-centred approaches might improve decent work outcomes in selected tier-1 supplier firms but fail to achieve decent work for all workers working in the garment GPN. In agreement with Gereffi and Lee (2016), it was found that decent work improvements are most likely if global and local public, business, and social/ labour actors in the garment GPN interact and if decent work improvements are pursued in a “synergistic” manner (Gereffi & Lee, 2016, p. 35). Therefore, a synergistic cooperation paradigm is proposed in which resource development and social auditing are not the responsibility of global buyers but rather glo-cal initiatives20, such as

_____________________

20 Glo-cal initiatives are understood to involve business, public and social (especially labour) stakeholders on global-, local- and firm-level and to cover all decent work dimensions. In agreement with Alois (2018, p. 139) five lessons learned from Better Work should be considered when designing glo-cal decent work initiatives: “Cooperation can be more effective than coercion; training complements the application of incentives; local ownership is critical for global initiatives; international organisations can anchor initiatives to prevent capture by powerful stakeholders; and multinational corporations can be responsible partners, but should not play a leading role.”
the BW country programs (see chapter 3), involving and facilitating cooperation across multiple-stakeholders.

In particular, roles and responsibilities are suggested to be redistributed as follows. First, international organisations (e.g. ILO, OECD) or global standard-setting MSIs define standards for decent business practices in the garment GPN, especially responsible purchasing standards, global labour standards, and global auditing standards. Actors from buyer and supplier countries are thereby equally involved in standard-setting procedures. Second, decent work advocates in buyer countries (governments, civil society, MSIs etc.) use their legislative, institutional, and communicative power to incentivise global buyers to procure responsibly. Third, global buyers focus on implementing responsible purchasing practices that include fair pricing, fair lead times, longer-term production forecasts, and longer-term trade relationships. Instead of investing in private regulatory regimes, they request and monitor the participation of their suppliers in global decent work initiatives (such as the BW country programs). Successful participation (high audit scores/significant decent work improvements) is rewarded with better purchasing conditions or volumes, while a proven lack of motivation to improve labour standards leads (after a period of grace) to the termination of business relationship. Fourth, global initiatives coordinate the promotion of decent work in production countries across all horizontal nodes and vertical stages of the garment GPN. They facilitate the definition of responsibility-oriented norms for each production context (see section 6.3); audit the implementation of global rights- and local responsibility-oriented standards; advise decision-makers in standard implementation; support decent work resource development in supplier firms; empower bottom-up labour activism pushing for decent working conditions; motivate an increased engagement of the state in ensuring decent work; and facilitate dialogue between business, labour, and public actors on firm, industry, and global levels. Their work should be monitored and connected across countries by international standard setters, and it could be financed by global brands and retailers (main share) and local suppliers. Fifth, decent work advocates in supplier countries (governments, civil society, etc.) cooperate with global initiatives and use their legislative, institutional, and communicative power to promote economic and social upgrading in their exports’ sectors. Figure 14 graphically summarises the presented roles and responsibilities.
The proposed paradigm responds to calls for a rebalancing of power structures regarding decent work in GPNs (e.g. Anner, 2020b, pp. 341–342). Actors from buyer and supplier countries are to be involved in global standard setting procedures as called for by F. R. Khan and Lund-Thomsen (2011, p. 87) and Bae et al. (2021, p. 654) (see also section 6.3). Buyer countries focus on improving business models in the garment GPN and purchasing practices to become more responsible – a prerequisite for enabling decent work improvements in supplier firms (Anner, 2019, p. 723; Reinecke et al., 2019, p. 7). The monitoring and advisory of decent work practices are re-embedded into local contexts and facilitated by neutral glo-cal initiatives involving business, public, and social/ labour actors on global, local, and firm levels. This approach enables responding to crossverging glo-cal influences on suppliers, acknowledging local decent work frames and practices, and developing resources needed in the local context for decent work improvements.
6.5 Research limitations and propositions for future research

Future research is needed to further develop the crossvergence framework, the presented ideas on global labour standards regimes, and the synergistic cooperation paradigm, as outlined below.

1. While a multitude of theoretical glo-cal influences on suppliers could be identified in chapter 2 of this dissertation, an empirical analysis of their practical crossvergence was only possible for two decent work dimensions, in two garment production contexts, across two horizontal GPN nodes and two vertical GPN stages. Future research is especially recommended to trace crossvergence processes further down the supply chain to the harvesting extraction of raw materials, to look at informal labour enclaves, to analyse crossvergence processes in the main garment production contexts in South/Southeast Asia, and to examine decent work process standards (freedom of association, collective bargaining, etc.) which were previously found to show lower levels of labour standard compliance than the outcome standards analysed in this dissertation (Barrientos & Smith, 2007, p. 728).

2. In the course of the empirical analysis, the resource-based approach proved useful to explain crossvergence outcomes across different types of suppliers. It is therefore recommended to further dissect the impact of human, financial, intellectual, and physical resources on decent work outcomes and to discuss which resources suppliers need to implement decent work. Interdisciplinary research can subsequently widen the debate and discuss how local technical and management education systems, financial systems, construction regulations, and so forth currently support or obscure the development of required resources. Focusing on the synergistic cooperation paradigm and analysing how existing glo-cal initiatives such as the BW programs foster resource development can furthermore contribute insights on how to stimulate decent work improvements.

3. My analysis of decision-makers’ decent work frames contributes first insights into cognitive determinants of supplier agency. However, this represents only a first step into the investigation of cognitive management processes in supplier firms. Future research is needed to analyse the social construction of cognitive decent work frames and cognitive decision-making rationales and to link them with decent work outcomes. A better understanding of these processes can provide us with deeper insights into what decision-makers need to establish decent work environments.
4. This dissertation showed that local and global actors in the garment GPN share the idea of universal human rights and basic needs, but it did not identify specific labour rights and basic needs. This falls into the realm of legal and political research, combined with studies on how decent work-related aspects have an impact on the health and well-being of workers. For instance, no recent study could be found that analyses the impact of excessive overtime on the health and well-being of workers in the textiles industry compared with the garment industry or the living wage value in Egypt or Jordan. Context-specific research is furthermore called for to identify informal or silent decent work practices (Fontana & Egels-Zandén, 2019, p. 1050; F. R. Khan & Lund-Thomsen, 2011, p. 76) that are common in garment production countries and not yet acknowledged in global standards. These insights are thereby not only valuable for the definition of global standards but also necessary for convincing local actors of their legitimacy.

5. Based on the success of Better Work Jordan, this dissertation recommends global initiatives in production countries to facilitate decent work improvements. Even though the Better Work program has also been found to be successful in other countries (Alois, 2018; Blackett, 2015; Pike, 2020; Pike & English, 2022; Robertson, 2020; Arianna Rossi, 2015), future research is recommended to systematically analyse all Better Work country programs as well as other global MSIs and to discuss the extent to which such initiatives can replace private regulatory initiatives of global buyers. Arnold (2013) for instance highlights that Better Work program participation is voluntary in most countries and monitoring results are often not enforceable – two factors that impede decent work progress. How to motivate local governments to make program participation mandatory for exporters (as in Jordan) and how to involve global buyers in sanctioning suppliers that refuse the implementation of decent work improvements remain topics for future scientific research and international debate.

6. In general, the synergistic cooperation paradigm is a best practice paradigm that can guide decent work initiatives of individual actors. It is not yet fully realised in any country of the world. In Egypt, for instance, the restriction of industrial relations (see section 1.7.5) impedes successful cooperation among public, business, and social/labour actors, and it was found to halt the expansion of the Better Work Egypt program. Social and political processes in garment buyer and supplier countries need to be considered to evaluate which aspects of the synergistic cooperation paradigm
can be implemented or where alternative solutions must be found. While power imbalances in economic GPN relations have been found to persist (Anner, 2019, p. 706), it remains to be evaluated how far power structures in the promotion of decent work can be rebalanced to achieve synergistic cooperation.

7. This supplier-oriented dissertation specifically focuses on decent work. For global buyers, however, decent work is only one aspect in their sustainability strategy, which includes social, environmental, and economic concerns (Koberg & Longoni, 2019, p. 1085). In consequence, global standards and global sustainability initiatives commonly do not focus solely on decent work issues as I did in this dissertation, and it remains to be evaluated how the findings of this dissertation can be applied to other social issues as well as environmental concerns in the garment GPN.

8. After the field research for this dissertation was concluded, the Covid-19 pandemic disrupted economic, social, and political processes worldwide. It revealed the shortcomings of current governance mechanisms protecting workers in the global garment GPN and caused severe decent work deficits (Anner, 2020b; Crane & Matten, 2021; Kabir et al., 2021). Future research can use disruptions caused by the pandemic to evaluate the benefit of the synergistic cooperation paradigm. It can analyse whether garment production countries with functioning glo-cal initiatives (e.g. Jordan) were better able to protect workers during the pandemic than countries without such initiatives (e.g. Egypt). In addition, it can trace how buyer purchasing practices contributed to decent work deficits caused by the pandemic. It furthermore needs to be noted that the pandemic and the resulting global supply chain crisis (Garnio & Goodman, 2022) significantly affected crossvergence dynamics in the garment GPN. Trends towards nearshoring, automation, and flexibilization of production are expected to accelerate (McKinsey & Company, 2018, p. 7, 2021, pp. 64, 75; Zhao & Kim, 2021, pp. 165–166). How these trends influence decent work outcomes in the garment GPN could not yet be addressed in this dissertation and remains subject to future research endeavours.
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Annex
Annex 1. Profiles of interviewed factory owners-managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factory Code</th>
<th>Factory location</th>
<th>Factory type</th>
<th>Approx. no. of workers</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Local/ Migrant/ Refugee</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E01F01</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>IT Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E05F02</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Integr. tier-1</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E06F03</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>TEX tier-2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E07F04</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E08F05</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>RMG tier-2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E09F06</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>TEX local</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Import Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10F07</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>TEX tier-2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11F08</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12F09</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13F10</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>TEX tier-1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>HR manager</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>HR manager</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E16F11</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Integr. tier-1</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17F12</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Egyptian female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>HR Administration</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E18F13</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Integr. local</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Planning Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Production Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E19F14</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Integr. tier-1</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E20F15</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Integr. tier-1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Egyptian female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E21F16</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E22F17</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>RMG tier-2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner 1</td>
<td>Egyptian female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Owner 2</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E23F18</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>TEX tier-1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Technical Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24F19</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Export Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E25F20</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner 1</td>
<td>Egyptian female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Owner 2</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E26F21</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>RMG tier-2</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E27F22</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E28F23</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner 1</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Owner 2</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E30F24</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E31F25</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>TEX tier-1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Son of owner</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Export Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory Code</td>
<td>Factory location</td>
<td>Factory type</td>
<td>Approx. no. of workers</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Local/ Migrant/ Refugee</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J01F01</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>RMG local</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J05F02</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>HR &amp; Compliance</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J06F03</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>RMG tier-2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J07F04</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J08F05</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>Jordanian female</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J09F06</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>COO</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J10F07</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>RMG local</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J12F08</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>RMG tier-2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J13F09</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>RMG tier-2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J14F10</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>RMG local</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Migrant (Refugee)</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J16F11</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Factory Manager</td>
<td>Jordanian female</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J18F12</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J19F13</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>HR &amp; Compliance</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 2. Profiles of interviewed experts

### Expert interviews EGYPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type of expert</th>
<th>Type of organisation</th>
<th>Local/ International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E02E01</td>
<td>Labour expert</td>
<td>Development organisation</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E03E02</td>
<td>Industry expert</td>
<td>Development organisation</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E04E03</td>
<td>Industry &amp; labour expert</td>
<td>Development organisation</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14E04</td>
<td>Industry expert</td>
<td>Chamber</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15E05</td>
<td>Labour expert</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E29E06</td>
<td>Industry expert</td>
<td>Federation</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expert interviews JORDAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type of expert</th>
<th>Type of organisation</th>
<th>Local/ International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J02E01</td>
<td>Industry expert</td>
<td>Employer organisation</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J03E02</td>
<td>Industry expert</td>
<td>Employer organisation</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J04E03</td>
<td>Labour expert</td>
<td>Development organisation</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J11E04</td>
<td>Labour expert</td>
<td>Training organisation</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J15E05</td>
<td>Industry expert</td>
<td>Employer organisation</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J17E06</td>
<td>Labour expert</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J21E07</td>
<td>Labour expert</td>
<td>Development organisation</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Annex 3. Profiles of interviewed workers

### Worker interviews EGYPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Local/ Migrant</th>
<th>Factory type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E32W01</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>TEX tier-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E32W02</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>TEX tier-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E33W03</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E33W04</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E34W05</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E34W06</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E34W07</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Worker group interview JORDAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Local/ Migrant</th>
<th>Factory type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J20W01 (Group interview with 20 workers)</td>
<td>mixed, approx. 60% female</td>
<td>18-35</td>
<td>95% Migrant, 5% Jordanian</td>
<td>RMG tier-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 4. Overview of analysed documents (selection)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Int.D01</td>
<td>Public standards</td>
<td>ILO (2013), Decent Work Indicators: Guidelines for producers and users of statistical and legal framework indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int.D03</td>
<td>Public standards</td>
<td>Better Work (2018), Better Work’s Compliance Assessment Tool (CAT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int.D06</td>
<td>Public standards</td>
<td>Council of Europe (1996), European Social Charter Revised (ETS No. 163)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int.D09</td>
<td>Private standards</td>
<td>Ethical Trading Initiative (2014), The ETI Base Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int.D10</td>
<td>Private standards</td>
<td>Ethical Trading Initiative (2014), Base Code Guidance Working Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int.D11</td>
<td>Private standards</td>
<td>Ethical Trading Initiative (2014), Base Code Guidance Living Wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int.D13</td>
<td>Private standards</td>
<td>Fair Wear Foundation (2012), Manual for factory members of Fair Wear Foundation – October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int.D14</td>
<td>Private standards</td>
<td>Fair Wear Foundation (2012), Audit Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int.D16</td>
<td>Private standards</td>
<td>Sedex (2017), Sedex Members Ethical Trade Audit (SMETA) Best Practice Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int.D17</td>
<td>Private standards</td>
<td>Sedex (2017), Sedex Members Ethical Trade Audit (SMETA) Measurement Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int.D19</td>
<td>Private standards</td>
<td>Clean Clothes Campaign (NN), Gütesiegel im Vergleich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E35D01</td>
<td>Legal info</td>
<td>Egyptian Labour Law No. 12/2013 (April, 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E37D03</td>
<td>Legal info</td>
<td>Egypt Law No. 213 of 2017 on promulgating the Trade Union Law (December, 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E38D04</td>
<td>Legal info</td>
<td>ILO (2011), Traval legal database, Working times regulations in Egypt 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D39D05</td>
<td>Legal info</td>
<td>L&amp;E Global (2017), Employment Law Overview Egypt 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E40D06</td>
<td>Legal info</td>
<td>WageIndicator foundation (2017), Minimum Wages Regulations in Egypt 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E41D07</td>
<td>Legal info</td>
<td>The Legal 500 (2018), Egypt’s new labor union law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E42D08</td>
<td>Legal info</td>
<td>Oxford Business Group (2018), Review of regulations for international companies in Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E46D12</td>
<td>Report/economic</td>
<td>American Chamber of Commerce in Egypt (2018), Revamping the Textile Industry: A Sound Investment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E47D13</td>
<td>Statistics/labour</td>
<td>CAPMAS (2015), Income, Expenditure and Consumption Survey 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E51D17</td>
<td>Statistics/labour</td>
<td>Abughattas (2016), Hiring challenges facing employers in SMEs in Egypt’s Textiles sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E52D18</td>
<td>Study/labour</td>
<td>GIZ (2016), Interventions for employment creation in Egypt: A sector analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E53D19</td>
<td>Study/labour</td>
<td>Regional Labour Market Observatory (2016), Labor Market Analysis: Chemical and Textile Industries in 6th of October City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E54D20</td>
<td>Study/labour</td>
<td>GIZ (2016), Improving Job Quality in Suez Canal Zone: Labour Market and Needs Assessment Baseline Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E55D21</td>
<td>Study/labour</td>
<td>Center for Trade Union &amp; Workers Services (2016), Bitter Harvest: A Report about the Violations against Labour Freedoms in 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E56D22</td>
<td>Report/labour</td>
<td>Center for Trade Union &amp; Workers Services (2017), Report on the Violations of Trade Unions’ Freedoms: In the Darkness of the Tunnel, January to June 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E59D25 Report/labour Frontline Defenders (2019), Striking back: Egypt’s attack on labour rights defenders
E61D27 Report/labour Center of Trade Unions and Worker Services (2019), A Draining Year-Report about the Violations of Trade Unions’ Freedoms January 1st - December 31st 2019
E62D28 Report/DW ILO (2018), Decent Work in Egypt 2017 Results
E63D29 Report/DW ILO (2016), Promoting Worker Rights and Competitiveness in Egyptian Export Industries Project
E64D30 Report/DW ILO (2017), Better Work: ILO improves working conditions in 30 factories in Egypt
E65D31 Report/DW ILO (2017), The 3rd Awards Ceremony: Recognizing companies for decent work
E69D35 Mgmt. manual ILO (2017), Promoting Workers’ Rights and Competitiveness in Egyptian Exports Industries: Occupational Safety and Health Management System manual
E70D36 Mgmt. manual ILO (2017), Promoting Workers’ Rights and Competitiveness in Egyptian Exports Industries: Workers Rights and Responsibilities manual
E71D37 Corporate doc. Factory E01F01: Worker Guidebook 2017
E72D38 News article Al-Masry Al-Youm (2013), PM sets new minimum wage for government employees at LE1200 [translated by the Egypt Independent]
E73D39 News article Ahram Online (2014), Q&A: Egypt labour remain thorn in the side of autocrats, despite lethargy
E74D40 News article Ahram Online (2015), Despite strike ban, Egypt's labour movement could regain momentum
E75D41 News article Ahram Online (2015), Kamal El-Fayoumi speaks about demands, challenges and fears of Egypt's workers
E76D42 News article Al-Masry Al-Youm (2015), Labor unions prepare massive September protests over controversial law [translated by the Egypt Independent]
E77D43 News article Al-Masry Al-Youm (2015), Alexandria textile company employees strike over delayed salaries [translated by the Egypt Independent]
E78D44 News article Al-Masry Al-Youm (2015), Mahalla textile company on strike over bonuses [translated by the Egypt Independent]
Daily News Egypt (2017), Egypt annual inflation rate falls to 26.7%

Egypt Independent (2017), Manufacturers in Egypt turn to local sourcing as prices soar

Al-Masry Al-Youm (2017), Manpower minister target, LE2,000 minimum wage for private sector workers [translated by the Egypt Independent]

Al-Masry Al-Youm (2017), Businessman Magdy Tolba: The textile industries suffer from opposing entities and their interests (interview) [translated with google translate]

Egypt Independent (2017), Walt Disney lifts ban on merchandise produced in Egypt: Trade minister

Egypt Independent (2017), ILO puts Egypt on black list due to violations against laborers

Al-Masry Al-Youm (2017), Labor leaders demand amendment of 8 articles of the draft law on trade union organizations

Al-Masry Al-Youm (2017), President of the Union of Workers in the Private Sector: «Ministry of Manpower» is managed by interests (interview) [translated with google translate]

Daily News Egypt (2017), Egypt makes progress on new labour laws: ILO country director

Daily News Egypt (2017), Parliament approves Labour Syndicates Law

Al Ahram Weekly (2017), New terms on labour

Al-Monitor (2017), New trade union law undermines freedom of association in Egypt

Al-Masry Al-Youm (2017), Chinese investments to proliferate in textile and car industries: Minister of Trade [translated by the Egypt Independent]

Al-Masry Al-Youm (2018), Largest textile city in Egypt to be established in Monufiya: minister [translated by the Egypt Independent]

Al-Masry Al-Youm (2018), Minister of Industry: Textile City $ 2.2 billion dollars - 84% of them are foreign [translated with google translate]

Al-Masry Al-Youm (2018), Head of the Textiles Industry Chamber: Egyptian product faces unfair competition and needs protection (interview) [translated with google translate]

Al-Masry Al-Youm (2018), The Future of Textile Industries in Egypt "The Last Chance" [translated with google translate]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J29D05</td>
<td>Legal info</td>
<td>Collective Labour Contract (2017) between (1) Jordan Garments, Accessories &amp; Textiles Exporters Association (JGATE), The Association of Owners of Factories, Workshops and Garments (AOFWG) and (2) General Trade Union of Workers in Textile, Garment and Clothing Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J30D06</td>
<td>Legal info</td>
<td>Collective Agreement (2015) between (1) Jordan Garments, Accessories &amp; Textiles Exporters Association (JGATE), The Association of Owners of Factories, Workshops and Garments (AOFWG) and (2) General Trade Union of Workers in Textile, Garment and Clothing Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J31D07</td>
<td>Legal info</td>
<td>A standard contract for Non-Jordanian workers in Textile, Garment and Clothing Industry (2015), developed by (1) Jordan Garments, Accessories &amp; Textiles Exporters Association (JGATE), The Association of Owners of Factories, Workshops and Garments (AOFWG) and (2) General Trade Union of Workers in Textile, Garment and Clothing Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J32D08</td>
<td>Legal info</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding on Equalizing Payment of Wages and Benefits for all Workers (2014) between (1) Jordan Garments, Accessories &amp; Textiles Exporters Association (JGATE), General Union of Garment Factories and (2) General Trade Union of Workers in Textile, Garment and Clothing Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J33D09</td>
<td>Legal info</td>
<td>Collective Agreement (2013) between (1) Jordan Garments, Accessories &amp; Textiles Exporters Association (JGATE), The Association of Owners of Factories, Workshops and Garments (AOFWG) and (2) General Trade Union of Workers in Textile, Garment and Clothing Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J37D13</td>
<td>Report/labour</td>
<td>Union (unknown), You are not alone: Worker Leaflet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Business and Human Rights Resource Centre (2018), Jordan’s Garment Sector: How are brands combatting worker exploitation and abuse?

Clean Clothes Campaign (2009), False Promises: Migrant workers in the Global Garment Industry, Discussion Paper

Institute for Global Labour and Human Rights (2011), Sexual predators and serial rapist run wild at Wal-Mart supplier in Jordan

Institute for Global Labour and Human Rights (2011), Another crisis in Jordan: Workers strike the IBGM Factory over illegal sweatshop conditions, strikers beaten and threatened with forcible deportation

Institute for Global Labour and Human Rights (2012), Ten years into the U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement: Brutal sweatshop conditions endure at the Taiwanese-owned Rich Pine Factory with gruelling mandatory seven-day 96-hour work weeks

Institute for Global Labour and Human Rights (2013), President Obama may very well clean up the U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement


FIAS (2008), Competitiveness and Corporate Social Responsibility in the Jordanian Apparel Industry


Tufts University (2014), Better Work Jordan Impact Assessment: Manager Report

Al Jidara (2013), Final Independent Evaluation of Better Work Jordan – Phase 1


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J62D38</td>
<td>Report/DW</td>
<td>BWJ (2019), Celebrating a ten-year journey in Jordan: Highlights and achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J64D40</td>
<td>Study/DW</td>
<td>BW (2013), The Collective Bargaining Agreement in Jordan’s Garment Industry: Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J65D41</td>
<td>Study/DW</td>
<td>BWJ (2014), Addressing Sexual Harassment in Jordan’s Garment Industry: Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J66D42</td>
<td>Study/DW</td>
<td>BWJ (2013), Garment Industry Baseline Report: worker perspectives from the factory and beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J69D45</td>
<td>Study/labour</td>
<td>BWJ (2019), Worker Voice Survey Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J71D47</td>
<td>BWJ info</td>
<td>BWJ (2016), Better Work Public Reporting: Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J72D48</td>
<td>Industry strategy</td>
<td>Ministry of Labor Jordan (2007), Labor Compliance in Jordan’s Apparel Sector: Actions to date and next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J73D49</td>
<td>Industry strategy</td>
<td>EU (2014), Strategic Plan of the Garment Manufacture Sector in Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J74D50</td>
<td>Industry strategy</td>
<td>Al Jidara (2013), Sustainability Plan for the Better Work Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J75D51</td>
<td>Industry info</td>
<td>Amman Chamber of Industry (2018), Directory of Jordanian Exporters 2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J76D52</td>
<td>Mgmt. manual</td>
<td>BWJ (2012), Good Practices: Apparel – Better working conditions, better business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J77D53</td>
<td>Corporate doc.</td>
<td>Company profile of factory J05F02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J78D54</td>
<td>Corporate doc.</td>
<td>Company profile of factory J10F07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article ID</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J80D56</td>
<td>News article</td>
<td>Jordan Times (23 October 2014), Culture of shame, low salaries driving Jordanians away from industry sector jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J81D57</td>
<td>News article</td>
<td>Jordan Times (05 April 2015), Jordan’s garment sector offers more benefits to guest workers — report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J82D58</td>
<td>News article</td>
<td>Jordan Times (16 May 2015), Int’l survey highlights strong impact of refugee influx on employment among Jordanians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J83D59</td>
<td>News article</td>
<td>Jordan Times (13 July 2015), Garment factory workers strike to demand higher salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J84D60</td>
<td>News article</td>
<td>Jordan Times (18 August 2016), Violations at garment factories ‘minor’ — Labour Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J85D61</td>
<td>News article</td>
<td>Jordan Times (10 November 2016), Officials, activists act swiftly to rescue ‘abused foreign labourers’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J86D62</td>
<td>News article</td>
<td>Jordan Times (22 November 2016), Syrians’ reluctance to work in industrial sector threatens future of ‘rules-of-origin’ deal with EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J87D63</td>
<td>News article</td>
<td>Jordan Times (25 February 2017), Minister orders factory closure after alleged abuse of guest workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J88D64</td>
<td>News article</td>
<td>Jordan Times (24 July 2017), Only two Jordanian companies benefiting from EU relaxed rules of origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J89D65</td>
<td>News article</td>
<td>Jordan Times (22 February 2018), Minimum wages need to be increased to cope with price, tax hikes — experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J90D66</td>
<td>News article</td>
<td>Jordan Times (04 August 2018), Stakeholders join forces for effective partnerships in garment sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 5. Overview of documented field observations

**Observations - EGYPT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E35O01</td>
<td>Site visit in factory E01F01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E36O02</td>
<td>Site visit in factory E05F02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E37O03</td>
<td>Site visit in factory E06F03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E38O04</td>
<td>Site visit in factory E07F04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E39O05</td>
<td>Site visit in factory E09F06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E40O06</td>
<td>Site visit in factory E10F07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E41O07</td>
<td>Site visit in factory E11F08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E42O08</td>
<td>Site visit in factory E12F09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E43O09</td>
<td>Site visit in factory E17F12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E44O10</td>
<td>Site visit in factory E18F13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E45O11</td>
<td>Site visit in factory E21F16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E46O12</td>
<td>Site visit in factory E22F17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E47O13</td>
<td>Site visit in factory E23F18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E48O14</td>
<td>Site visit in factory E24F19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E49O15</td>
<td>Site visit in factory E25F20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E50O16</td>
<td>Site visit in factory E26F21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E51O17</td>
<td>Site visit in factory E27F22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E52O18</td>
<td>Site visit in factory E28F23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E53O19</td>
<td>Site visit in factory E30F24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E54O20</td>
<td>Site visit in factory E31F25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E55O20</td>
<td>Management training organized by the Federation of Egyptian industry and the ILO in cooperation with the Egyptian Ready-Made Garments Chamber (10(^{th}) of Ramadan, 20/10/2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations - JORDAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J22O1</td>
<td>Site visit in factory J06F03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J23O2</td>
<td>Site visit in factory J14F10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J24O3</td>
<td>Garment industry get-together at the Jordan Chamber of Industry (Amman, 21/04/2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J26O5</td>
<td>Union workshop for garment union representatives organized by the General Trade Union of Workers in Textile, Garment and Clothing Industries in Jordan and conducted by IndustriALL (Amman, 15/05/2018)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 6. Interview outline for factory owner-manager interviews

**INTERVIEW OUTLINE: INTERVIEWS WITH FACTORY OWNERS-MANAGERS (SHORT)**

**Introduction**
- Introduction of myself + translator
- Purpose of my research + interview
- Confidentiality + Recording

**A. Supplier Firm + Interviewee**
- Company
- Interviewee(s)
- Organization of production

**B. General understanding:** What makes out the quality of work for workers? Why?

**C. Working hours:** How is it organized? Why? What needs to be observed? What has changed?
- normal and maximum number of hours per working day or week? rest periods?
- design of shift system?
- existence/ form of flexible time arrangements?
- overtime provisions?
- information-/negotiation-process between company and worker?

**D. Compensation:** How is it organized? Why? What needs to be observed? What has changed?
- organisation of pay (e.g. per piece, per hour, per day, per month)?
- organisation of pay increases (e.g. no increases, increase by seniority or skill)?
- additional non-cash benefits for workers (e.g. insurances, pensions, education, nursery)?
- information-/negotiation-process between company and worker?
- (sensitive) amount of base pay (normal, minimum, maximum – just an average range)?

**E. Dialogue:** How is it organized? Why? What needs to be observed? What has changed?
- What do you communicate with your workers? How? Why? What to observe? What has changed?
- What do your workers communicate with you? How? Why? What to observe? What has changed?

**F. Other and missing efforts/ “dream work environment”**
- Other efforts you would like to highlight?
- Missing efforts that would be beneficial to have? “dream work environment”

**G. Motivation/Support for change**
- What prevents you from realising your “dream work environment”?
- What could other stakeholders do to support you?

**Closing/ Referrals**
- References to other potential interviewees (companies/organizations)
- Documents // Workers // Visit
- Consent form
- Contact data/ Further contact
### INTERVIEW OUTLINE: INTERVIEWS WITH FACTORY OWNERS-MANAGERS (LONG)

#### A. Introduction and general information about interviewee/supplier firm

1. Welcome/ Thank you/ Small talk
2. Introductory information about the interview:
   2.1. Introduction of myself
   2.2. Introduction of translator (if there is one)
   2.3. Purpose and current stage of my research
   2.4. Purpose and anticipated duration of the interview
   2.5. Assurance of confidentiality/ explanation of how the results of the interview will be used
   2.6. Permission for recording / Signing of consent form
   2.7. Questions?

3. General information about interviewee/supplier firm (warm-up questions)
   3.1. Can you tell me/us a bit about your background and your function in the company? (current/previous roles in the firm, current responsibilities, educational background etc.)
   3.2. Can you tell me/us a bit about your company? (size, foundation ownership, age, export country focus, product focus etc.)
   3.3. Can you tell me/us how you organize production in your factories? (functions? technology? processes?)
      → ask whether it is possible to have a look at factory after the interview

[Section B is about the interviewee’s general understanding, not actual work practices in the factory]

#### B. Questions on interviewee’s quality-of-work understanding

1. In your opinion, what does a factory job need to have in order to be good for the workers?
   Alternatives:
   - What aspects of the work environment are important for a good quality of work for factory workers?
   - What is a good quality work environment for factory workers for you?

2. Where does this understanding come from? Why do you see it like this?

[Sections C-F are about work practices in the interviewee’s factory]

#### C. Questions on Working-Time Arrangements

1. How do you organise working time of factory workers in your firm?
   1.1. normal and maximum number of hours per working day or week? rest periods? Why?
   1.2. design of shift system? Why?
   1.3. existence/ form of flexible time arrangements? Why?
   1.4. overtime provisions? Why?
   1.5. information-/negotiation-process between company and worker? Why?

2. Which factors do you have to observe when you organise the working time in your firm? Can you freely decide just by yourself on the time arrangements, or what influences your decisions? (e.g. laws, order situation, worker’s availability…)

3. In how far did working-time arrangements change since you started working in the firm? Why?
D. Questions on Compensation and Benefits

1. How do you organise compensation and benefits for factory workers in your firm?
   1.1. organisation of pay (e.g. per piece, per hour, per day, per month)? Why?
   1.2. organisation of pay increases (e.g. no increases, increase by seniority or skill? Why?
   1.3. additional non-cash benefits for workers (e.g. insurances, pensions, education, nursery)? Why?
   1.4. information-/ negotiation-process between company and worker? Why?
   1.5. (sensitive) amount of base pay (normal, minimum, maximum – just an average range)? Why?

2. Which factors do you have to observe in regard to compensation and benefits in your firm? Can you freely decide just by yourself on the pay arrangements, or what influences your decisions? (e.g. laws, product sales prices, worker’s demands…)

3. In how far did compensation-and-benefits arrangements change since you started working in the firm? Why?

E. Questions on Employer-Employee Communication

1. What do you communicate with your workers (e.g. current business situation, new products, new production lines, business decisions)? [this concerns overall communication + day-to-day communication]

2. How do you organize this communication (are there any formal/organized forums)? Why?

3. What do your workers communicate with you (e.g. suggestions, personal issues, concerns)?

4. How do you organize this communication (are there any formal/organized forums)? Why?

5. Which factors do you have to observe in regard to communication/dialogue with your workers? Can you freely decide just by yourself on the dialogue fora, or what influences your decisions? (e.g. laws, workers’ demands, buyers’ demands)

6. In how far did these communication arrangements change since you started working in the firm? Why?

F. Questions on other work practices/ “dream work environment”

1. Are there any other work-practices/ aspects of your work environment that you would like to highlight?

2. What do your workers especially value about working in your firm?

3. Are there any changes you would like to make in regard to your work practices/ work environment?
   What would the “dream work environment look like” for you and your workers?

G. Questions on factors motivating/supporting improvement

1. What would motivate you to improve the work environment according to your dreams?

2. What prevents you from doing it?

3. How could other stakeholders (buyers, public institutions, legal institutions, other supplier firms, unions, employees etc.) support you in this endeavour?
## H. Follow-Up/ Closing

1. Can you recommend any documents on the issues that we discussed during the interview (e.g. corporate documents, publications of national institutions/business associations/NGOs)?
2. Can we have a quick look at the factory?
3. Can I conduct interviews with some of your workers to obtain their view on what makes out the quality of work in production? [only for some interviews]
4. Questions?
5. In case I require further information at a later stage in my research, could I contact you again?
6. Re-assurance of confidentiality/information that interviewee will receive summary of research results
7. Thank you/ Small talk/ Goodbye
Annex 7. Interview outline for expert interviews (sample)

**INTERVIEW OUTLINE: INTERVIEWS WITH INDUSTRY/LABOUR EXPERTS**

*Note: This sample outline was adapted for each interview to address the specific expertise of the expert and the information that I still required for my research. Expert interviews conducted towards the end of my research additionally served to validate the information that I gathered in the supplier interviews.*

**A. Introduction and general information about interviewee**

1. Welcome/ Thank you/ Small talk
2. Introductory information about the interview:
   2.1. Introduction of myself
   2.2. Purpose and current stage of my research
   2.3. Purpose and anticipated duration of the interview
   2.4. Assurance of confidentiality/ explanation of how the results of the interview will be used
   2.5. Permission for recording / Showing of consent form
   2.6. Questions?
3. General information about interviewee (warm-up questions)
   3.1. Can you tell me/us a bit about your background, your work and your field of expertise? (current/previous roles in the organization, current responsibilities, educational background etc.)
   3.2. *if relevant:* Can you tell me/us a bit about your organization?
   3.3. *if relevant:* Can you tell me/us a bit about your project?

**B. Questions on the local labour/quality-of-work debate**

1. In your opinion, what are currently the greatest economic/business concerns/debates in the T&C industries?
2. In your opinion, what are currently the greatest labour-related concerns/debates in the T&C industries?
3. How about the quality of work? Is this a topic? What is debated in this regard?
   - Which job characteristics are especially important for workers in the local industry?
   - What is debated in regard to working time arrangements?
   - What is debated in regard to compensation & benefits?
   - What is debated in regard to employer-employee dialogue?

**C. Drivers of crossvergence and factors motivating/supporting improvement**

1. Which aspects of the firm environment influence the quality of work in local factories? *(in case further clarification of the question is needed: e.g. economic/trade/cultural/legal factors and organizations)*
   *Questions for further clarification of the interviewees’ answers:*
   - In how far do these aspects influence quality-of-work decisions in T&C companies?
2. In your opinion, what would motivate company owners and managers to invest (further) into the quality-of-work in their factories? What prevents them from further investments?
3. How could other stakeholders (buyers, public institutions, legal institutions, other supplier firms, unions, employees etc.) support them in this endeavour?
D. Information about the industry/stakeholders/programs → Individual questions per interviewee

E. Questions to identify further contacts and relevant documents

1. Which decision-makers from supplier firms would you recommend me to interview? Could you facilitate the contact? [specific types of interviewees (e.g. female owners) to be requested if needed]

2. Which other members of business associations or (international) organisations would you recommend me to interview? Could you facilitate the contact? [specific types of interviewees (e.g. labour expert for textiles) to be requested if needed]

3. Can you recommend any documents on the issues that we discussed during the interview (e.g. publications of national institutions/ business associations/ NGOs)?

F. Follow-Up/ Closing

1. Questions?

2. In case I require further information at a later stage in my research, could I contact you again?

3. Re-assurance of confidentiality/ information that interviewee will receive summary of research results

4. Thank you/ Small talk/ Goodbye
**Annex 8. Interview outline for worker interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEW OUTLINE: INTERVIEWS WITH WORKERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### A. Introduction and general information about interviewee/supplier firm

1. Welcome/ Thank you/ Small talk
2. Introductory information about the interview (briefly, with easy words):
   - 2.1. Introduction of myself and the translator
   - 2.2. Purpose and current stage of my research; purpose and anticipated duration of the interview
   - 2.3. Assurance of confidentiality/ explanation of how the results of the interview will be used
   - 2.4. Questions?
3. General information about interviewee/job (warm-up questions)
   - 3.1. Can you tell me/us a bit about yourself? (name, living area, age, family situation, time in company)
   - 3.2. What is your job? Can you tell me what your work day usually looks like? (function in company? common day?)

### B. Quality-of-work understanding

1. What do you like about your job? Why?
2. What don’t you like about your job? Is there anything you would like to change about your job? Why? In how far would you change it?
3. How important are following aspects of a job for you? Why?
   - [on a scale from 1 (not important) to 5 (extremely important)]
     - (1) Working hours that fit your needs? (2) Pay and other benefits? (3) Job security?
     - (4) Safety at work? (5) Training & development? (6) Relationship with co-workers
     - (7) Relationship with supervisors (8) Motivating work tasks/ design of job
     - (9) Equal treatment and fairness (10) Support of family obligations/ Work-life balance
     - (11) Possibility to voice concerns/ be heard by the company

### C. Details about specific work practices

1. Working time: When do you start working? Until when? How many days/week? Breaks?
2. Compensation: What does your pay look like? Has it increased in last years? How? Other benefits you get?

### D. Follow-Up/ Closing

1. Questions?
2. Re-assurance of confidentiality
3. Thank you/ Small talk/ Goodbye
Annex 9. Sample factory visit documentation (factory E18F13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checklist for site visit</th>
<th>YES or NO or N/A</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry points to premises and buildings are well secured (locks, alarm systems, guards, light at night)</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking spaces are well lit and secured</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objects that could be used as a weapon are well secured</td>
<td>probably no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsecure areas in or around the premises are communicated to employees</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate transportation exists to ensure secure commute to/ from work</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate transportation exists to ensure secure work-related travel/ field trips</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are adequate emergency exits and evacuation areas, and sufficient first aid kits</td>
<td>saw only few signs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The required fire extinguishers are present, recognisable and accessible in all areas</td>
<td>don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency procedures are in place and well communicated (signs, evacuation routes etc.)</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are protected from clients who might be aggressive or violent (through windows, guards, security cameras, pepper spray, emergency buttons etc.)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>no client contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are properly protected against risks that may arise on field work/ sites/ business travel</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>no field work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The floors are even, clean and level (no risk of slipping)</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors, stairs and elevators are clean, safe and easy to operate</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interior of the building is cleaned properly</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work areas are free from draughts</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees have a smoke-free (tobacco-free) work area</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adequate (day)light in the workplace, and incoming sunlight can be shielded</td>
<td>rather gloomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures are taken to reduce harmful noise and/ or protect hearing</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>in Textiles, there was noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality is acceptable (no fumes, odours particles, adequate ventilation)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>the air was bad, especially in textiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture is in adequate condition and has no sharp edges</td>
<td>rather no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plugs, sockets and cables are affixed appropriately and free of obvious defects</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External spaces are free of tripping hazards, in adequate condition, clean, sun protected and well lit</td>
<td>not really</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous/hazardous substances are handled appropriately</td>
<td>It did not seem so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees have adequate space to enable ease of movement</td>
<td>not really</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All workers can regularly alternate between working in a standing, sitting or walking position</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work benches are at a comfortable height</td>
<td>don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs are comfortable and chair backs and seat heights are adjustable</td>
<td>not adjustable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special lighting is provided for close and/ or detailed work</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work equipment (computers, machines, trolleys, counters etc.) is adjusted to avoid body strain</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work tasks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy lifting (&gt;23 kg) is prevented (e.g. with the help of trolleys, hoists, lighter packaging)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The correct personal protective equipment is used</td>
<td></td>
<td>There were signs to wear masks/boots, but nobody wore masks/boots; and in weaving section they didn’t have professional ear protection (just ear plugs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in an unfavourable posture is prevented</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work involving the use of equipment that causes vibration is prevented</td>
<td>don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work rate, work supply and time pressures are adequately balanced</td>
<td>work seemed very slow</td>
<td>Owner seemed to put pressure on workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks are rotated to avoid repetitive work</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities, gear and equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms are equipped adequately and available in adequate numbers (for women and men)</td>
<td>don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A relaxation area (canteen or break room/ space) exists and is separate from the workplace</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canteens/ kitchens/ affordable restaurants are available near-by for lunch breaks</td>
<td>no, they bring food from home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is sufficient storage space for (employees’ individual) work clothes and equipment</td>
<td>no, they hang it in some corners behind the machine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is sufficient storage space where employees can keep their personal belongings safe</td>
<td>no, they put it in some corners behind the machine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All spaces are well organised and regularly cleaned up</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkways and pathways are sufficiently wide and free of boxes/ litter etc.</td>
<td>not so good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature is maintained at appropriate (comfortable) level throughout indoor areas</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>ventilators were not on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required work uniforms are clean and suitable for work task and employee</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>no uniforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The resources (equipment, tools) needed for work are available in time and work well</td>
<td>don’t know, don’t think so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and equipment are stored safely</td>
<td>don’t think so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment that is regularly used is within easy reach</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery and equipment is safe and adequately maintained, handled and stored</td>
<td>didn’t see so, very old machinery/equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factory consists of different halls:
- RMG in main building with administration
- Weaving, dyeing and washing in other buildings (halls)
RMG:
- The room was pretty crowded and hangers with clothes (on Verteilerschienen) blocked the entrance a bit
- They produced different parts of the garments in different rooms (bottoms in one room, jackets in the other room)
- Workers were male and female, many old workers, many injured/slightly disabled workers
- They sat separately but there was a relaxed atmosphere and some chatting
- They seemed to work much slower than in other garment factories I visited
- Some emergency signs, but no codes of conduct, ILO information signs etc.
- It was rather hot and stuffy in the rooms and the ventilators were not turned on
- There was stuff lying around on the floor
Textiles:
- It was mostly men working there but the manger showing me around was female
- Salam didn't come with me into the halls because she couldn't endure the smell and fumes
- Large/old machines were used, only few people needed to operate the machines
- Nobody wore gloves/ only some workers wore heavy boots
- It was very smelly, stuffy and gloomy, lots of fumes
- She showed me different types of machinery for the different steps and fabrics
- Weaving: Very loud, a series of workers wore ear plugs but no proper ear protection
- Dyeing/Washing: rather smelly and air full of fumes, the floor was rather wet and there were probably chemicals in the water; nobody wore masks or boots (even though there were signs to wear masks or boots)
- Most workers were sitting somewhere, chatting and taking breaks; again there were a series of older
Atmosphere seemed relaxed
Annex 10. Sample factory owner-manager interview transcript (Egypt E01F01)

1. Welcome/ Thank you/ Small talk

2. Introductory information about the interview:
   2.1. Introduction of myself
   2.2. Introduction of translator (if there is one)
   2.3. Purpose and current stage of my research
   2.4. Purpose and anticipated duration of the interview
   2.5. Assurance of confidentiality/ explanation of how the results of the interview will be used
   2.6. Permission for recording / Signing of consent form
   2.7. Questions?

[start of recording]

I: I would like to start by just getting to know more about you and your position in the company. So, can you tell me about your job?

T: *She would like to get to know you, what is your position in your company? What do you do?

R1: *I am [R1], factory manager, the company is divided into three parts, the textile factory, the finished garments factory here in Dar El Salam and the management that encompasses, the planning and follow-up, HR, finance, sales, transportation, security.

T: *Welcome, what about you? (to R2)

R2: [R2], IT Manager

I: What different departments do you have in the factory?

T: *what are the different departments you have in the factory?

R1: *We have all management production departments, production planning, quality management, maintenance, total quality management, production management, and samples department.

R2: *We export ready-made garments.

I: And what do you produce exactly?

T: *What do you produce?

R1: *T-shirt, pyjama, underwear, lingerie, everything that is knitted, it can be for women, men, or children.

I: and they get the fabrics and then they produce them?

T: *Do you get the fabric and then produce them?

R1: *So the journey starts with buying the spinning, it then goes to the textile factory to be made into fabric, then it is dyed in the dying houses, then it comes back to the factory to be cut and sewed.

R2: *the part related to the textile, we produced in another company that is ours, but the dying part is outsourced, we buy the yarn from abroad.

T: They import the yarn.

R1: *we import the yarn, turn it into fabric/textile and then it becomes the materials we use in production.

I: so they do this in another company?

T: *in another company?
R1 and R2: *yes

R1: *for the dying, it is another company

Interruption: ([Ms X] just came in, she is a quality manager, informing the factory manager with something regarding the factory operations)

I: You source out the dying?

T*: You do the dying in another company?

R1*: Our group has other companies, one of them is a dye house in 6th of October

T: They have a company in 6th of October that does the dying

I: How is production organized? How many workers do you have? What kind of machines do you have? How do you organize this?

R1: you are asking about worker or machine?

T*: How many workers do you have? What are the kinds of machines that you use in production?

R1*: We have 600 around 600 workers both women and men which also includes textile workers. We have 400 machines. We work according to the orders we get from our clients. All the production capacity is mainly for Europe so, the production lines are not fixed.

T*: What do you mean by the production lines are not fixed?

R1*: We don’t have fixed production lines all year, we don’t have fixed lines with fixed production.

T*: So, it is according to the orders?

R1*: So, it depends on the order that we change those lines, sometimes it’s a lingerie line, others male underwear. It depends.

T: They do not have fixed production lines, it depends on the order, what they get in terms of order and then they start producing depending on the order, whether it is lingerie, underwear or something else.

R1*: besides, we help the rural areas.

T: rural areas?

R1*: We open training centres and then we turn them into production units.

T: they open training centres in rural areas and then turn them into production units

I: So, the production is not all done here?

R1*: yes, we have other places that we open in a way of helping those who are in need. Also, I am a consultant in something called TVET, this project is between the European countries and the Egyptian government.

T: He is part of an organization called TVET which he works with as a consultant between Europe and Egypt, and he is saying that those training centres like they establish it in rural areas and then they change it into production units in order to help people who are less privileged to make a living out of it.

R1*: Besides, I am also a consultant in something called Traintex, there is a cooperative triangle between the industry, the government and the civil society organizations.

I: Thank you for this background information. Now I would like to go into the main topic of the interview, the work environment and HR management. My first question is not specific to your company, but in general, about your experience, your understanding. What do you think makes out a good quality of work, a good work environment?
T*: In your opinion, what makes a good quality of work in the factory? What makes out a good work environment?

R1*: there are three main elements of production, material, men, and machines. Those three elements are processed to get an output. The main and most important element that has problems is the HR.

T*: You need material, men, and machines. Most problems exist concerning the HR.

I*: Why?

T*: What does it have problems with?

R1*: Egypt’s first industry crisis is getting workers. It is easy to get materials and machines. Getting unskilled workers and then training and developing their skills. If you are not a place that attracts workers, having a good work environment, always improving work conditions, the worker will not come.

R2*: the main challenge in industry is the turnover, our turnover rate was 7% and we managed to drop it to 3%. What did we do to decrease this rate? A lot of things were applied in the factory for the 7% to be 3%.

T: The challenge is about recruitment and retention.

T*: What did you do to drop this rate?

R2*: Communication policies in many ways. Number one, the open-door policy, any worker has the right to simply meet with the factory manager and also the factory owner. We have also put two complaint boxes, one in the cafeteria and the other at the gate. The complaints are discussed in a private manner even if the worker submits a complaint anonymously.

T: They have an open-door policy and two complaint boxes, one in the dining hall and another at the gate. So, if one of the workers have any concerns or any feedback or they have a problem, they can just write it down and put it, it can be anonymous.

I: Do the workers use it?

T*: Do workers use these boxes?

R2*: not regularly, they were worried if someone put something with their name on it something will happen to him/her. But we started to take action towards the things that has been written and put in the box. We discussed with them what they are complaining about and what are the consequences and they started to feel safe. However, they use it rarely, because the open-door policy is stronger, instead of writing my complaint, I can voice it out directly.

T: So, he is saying it was very hard at the beginning to put papers inside the boxes because they were worried that something might happen but when they assured them that they would take action, they started to put their stuff and they actually read their stuff and told them this is what is going to happen in terms of what you’ve written. But he is saying that they didn’t write much in the papers and put it in the boxes because of the open-door policy, because it is easier to communicate directly.

R2*: We also assigned five of the workers as representatives, the ones who are closest to the workers and the oldest and most loved, anyone that has a concern to address speaks to them.

T: They have five they have chosen to be representatives of the workers, they’re the most trusted between them, and they are more friends with the workers.

I: And do you meet them regularly?

T*: Do you meet them regularly?

R2*: Yes, every month and they tell their feedback
T: They have a monthly meeting and they give their feedback
I: Management and workers?
T*: Does this meeting involve managers and the 5 representatives?
R2*: This monthly meeting is for the 5 representatives together to see what the complaints of the workers are and pass it to the management, so we start taking action.
T: So, the meeting involves just the five workers who represents the other workers who discuss with each other if the workers have any sayings throughout, and they decide they would take this to the upper hand or not. He emphasized that the five actually work within the company like the other workers and they are just representatives.
R2*: The worker has the right to speak to their supervisors directly, and the supervisor can take the complaint to the manager or the owner. The worker can surpass the supervisor and go to the owner/manager if he feels that he is treated unfairly.
T: He is talking about the communication line. He is saying that it is a smooth process between the worker and the supervisor. The worker can speak to the supervisor and if the worker thinks that the supervisor is treating him/her unfairly he can take this back to the manager
R2*: There is also the fairness policy; there is no discrimination between workers unless he/she are more skilled than the other.
T: He is saying there no discrimination whatsoever between the workers unless he is more skilled than the other. This is the only determinant factor.
R2*: The main reason for the turnover rate is the fact that there are other places that offer more money. That is why there should be a work environment that is good and also other benefits since… we are not the best in terms of salaries. So, we had to offer other non-monetary benefits for the workers. For example, we have incentives, discipline incentives, a nursery, daily meal, and an hour break.
T: ok, he is saying that in order to decrease this turnover rate, despite the fact that are a lot of actually companies that offer higher wages, higher pay, they had to introduce other benefits for the workers as well not to just stay for the money but to stay for the environment the factory has created for them and not just to leave, so they had to be more attractive not in terms of money but in terms of other benefits, so they have a nursery, they have a one hour rest during the day and they have a meal that is given to them during the day and also like he said before the establishment of the open door policy that decreased the turnover rate.
I: This is very interesting to hear about how you organize communication in the factory. You also started talking about compensation. Can you tell me more about the non-wage, non-salary benefits like, for example, do you have insurance?
T*: She is saying, she is really interested in all what you have said. She is asking whether the workers have insurance.
R2: *Of course.
T: They do have insurance
R2: *We have other benefits
T: He is going to say the other benefits
R2: *We give out Ramadan packs, Eid payments/grants. There is also production incentive, we have a very fair production incentive. The worker can make double his earned wage if he produced over the target.
T: Ok, the worker can actually get the production incentive if he can produce more than what is expected from him and it is really high, and he can actually obtain the whole wage… can you repeat again?

I: So the normal wage is per hour or what?

T: *What determines the workers wage is it per shift or per hour or per piece?

R2: *no, no, no, the wage is per shift, not per month, but the production incentive is for the increase in production.

T: So, the salary basically depends on the shift, the working hours, and it isn’t per month but the production incentive is a different thing

I: Is it per piece?

T: *The production incentive is per piece?

R2: *We say for example: in one hour, we need 100 pieces, if he gets the 100; he gets the money, if he gets more than what we want, the money increases.

T: So, if they set like a number of pieces that they want to produce in a specific time and you actually reach this goal then he takes the money for it but if he produces more, then, he gets the production incentive.

I: This is good to know. And how many shifts do you have?

R1: No shifts, only one.

I: And how many hours in a shift?

T: *How many hours in a shift?

R2: *8 hours plus 1 hour break, so it is 9 hours

T: Ok, eight hours plus one hour of rest, so it is nine.

I: Ok

R2: *And if there is extra time, the maximum is two hours per day, and this is if we need the worker after their working hours.

T: Extra time is usually two hours

I: And the rest of the machines stand, so at night, no shift?

R1: No work after 7 pm.

T: They usually finish work at 5, but if they are going to stay for the extra time, you usually stay till 7 pm. That’s the maximum hour.

I: And the extra time depends on how much is the order or how busy it is?

R1: Production order and shipping dates.

I: Thank you. Can workers also work for half shifts? What is the flexibility of the shift?

T: *Is this applied on all the workers? Or some workers can work half a shift, fewer hours?

R2: *Half shift? No, it is a complete shift unless he requested to leave on this day

R1: *Sometimes we accept temporary and part-time workers.

T: They do accept temporary workers and part-timers

R2: *We don’t obligate them, they ask.

R1: *Sometimes, we accept people to work part-time.
T: *So how does the part-time system works? How many days per week do they work?
R1: *It is 6 days per week. They are calculated based on the number of hours they work.
T: *So how long does the part-time work?
R2: *Same time, but their day is not 8 hours, it is usually 5 or 6 hours.
T: Part-time can be 6 hours or 5, it depends on the hours, like they, they give an hourly based salary.
R2: *Part-time workers are usually women who support a house.
T: Usually, part-time jobs are given to women who need a source of income
R2: *She cannot come the whole day; she just wants to work a couple of hours.
I: How many women do you have working here?
R1: Most of workers are women
I: And are they married and have children?
R1: Singles and married, all of them, we need all of them
R1: *The full-time workers here, the insured ones, work for 8 hours, and they like that they work this amount of hours and even more if needed, in order to, improve or increase their income.
T: Ok, he is talking about the full timers, the insured workers, who like to work the whole working hours so they can improve like their income or their standard of living
R2: *The extra-time is not obligatory; the extra-time people need it to increase their income.
I: How does it work with the extra hours? Do they ask and they work more? Or do you ask them, we have a big order, we want to work more. How does the information/communication work there?
T: *She is asking if they voluntarily ask to work the extra-time, or does it depend on the order coming?
R2: *I have an order, so I say I need people to work extra-time, so they say that they want to and if someone cannot, it is ok.
T: Ok, he tells them that they have a big order, who wants to work extra? And usually people approve to working extra hours
R2: *75% from the workers want to work the extra-time
T: 75% of the workers agree on working the extra hours
I: We talked now about your work practices. Now I am interested in why you organize it like that. Are there any specific rules you have to observe or experiences you made that motivated you to design it like that?
T: *She is asking you, why do you organize work in this way? Is there some sort of rules you have to adhere to? Or is it because you have seen this happening elsewhere, so you started doing the same? Or are there any other reasons?
R2: *Temporary workers do not have laws to regulate them, but we need temporary workers. Regarding the working hours and the extra-time, it is according to the laws.
T: So, the working hours are imposed by the laws and regulations and the extra time as well falls under the laws but the temporary workers…. *Can you please tell me more about the temporary workers?
R1: *Look, look, the temporary workers are season based. They can be once per year or twice. But we are open to recruit as much workers as we can. There are workers who come, asking to work part-time, a lot of factories objects on that. But we take them as they benefit us, and we also help them.
T: They are talking about temporary workers and part-time workers; that they do accept temporary workers, even though other companies do not accept this sort of thing, but because they want to share the mutual benefit as a company, the benefit from more workers, the extra-hands and for them that they help them with their life

R1: *But this is not a determinant factor that we depend on*

T: They do not depend on temporary workers unless it is seasonal

R1: *But, since we are located in a rural area that is highly populated, we accept this as a kind of “courtesy” and also help for the civil associations that cooperate with us.

T: They are saying that because this is practically a rural area, he is saying that it is a populated area, it is full of people, and they do want to help people and they are doing this because some NGOs ask them to contribute in those rural areas and help those people who are looking for jobs.

I: So for the community?

T: Yes

R1: *These civil associations help a lot of girls and families, we help these associations in training, training and recruiting, recruiting part-time and etc… so it is a help from us to those associations for them to continue, and at the same time, in the future, they get us workers that we benefit from.

T: He is saying that they are helping the NGOs in terms of training and developing the workers, if they someday want to have a job in this company, they can come and work here because, they have been trained and developed here, they are helping the NGO because they are helping them, so it is a mutual benefit.

I: So it is a win-win?

T: *So you think when you help those associations, they are benefited and you are as well?

R1: *I surely benefit from them. There are people whom we have helped open small factories and we give them materials and technical support. When the association is active and running, they are capable of sending workers to work, and therefore, the benefit is mutual.

T: He is saying it is a mutual benefit because when they help the organizations, eventually, they send them workers that could help them in their company, so it is a win-win situation.

I: This was about the working hours and temporary and part-time workers. Thank you. You elaborated at the beginning that you have an open-door policy and feedback boxes. Can you tell me why did you implement them? How does that help you?

T: *She is asking, why did you create the open-door policy and the boxes?

R2: *The boxes were before the open-door.

T: They have established the boxes first, and then, they did the open-door policy

I: Why?

T: *Why? Just for the turnover?

R2: *Yes of course, it was the main goal for decreasing the turnover rate and to help myself if someone else is giving a higher wage.

I: And this is also apply, we talked about the non-salary benefits, like the nursery, like the extra days of holidays

T: *And the nursery, the meal, the hour break, all of this to decrease the turnover rate?

T: Yes, it is all benefits to decrease the turnover rate
R2: *The goal also, if the worker is happy of the working conditions, he can disregard any monetary benefit that he can get from another place.

T: Because if a worker is happy here of the working conditions and the benefits he is getting, he might actually disregard the monetary benefit that he can get from outside

R1: *Of course the salary is the main element, but there are other things that are very important. There was a common stereotype about the supervisor that prevailed long time ago. But we managed to train and develop the skills of our middle managers, how to deal with workers. Because you can lose a worker if they are treated badly, unfairly, or didn’t take their rights, so we try to make our middle managers and engineers to go outside a lot, to get exposed to the outside world which is very important. You can visit a factory and find its people never going outside its parameters, didn’t read a new book, never got oriented together, collective work always gives better results.

T: He is saying we don’t only give training in development to workers, we also train middle manager, supervisors, so they can enhance the relationship between the worker and the supervisor because sometimes workers might leave because mistreatment or unfairness or injustice of his supervisor and this is why, they like to give them trainings and develop their communication skills between them and the workers and he is also emphasizing that sometimes, the middle managers and supervisors in other companies do not go out and do not see what is happening outside…. There was a common stereotype about the mm and the supervisors that they have to be strict and stuff like this and here in this company, they don’t want this

R1: *We depend on collective thinking, and collective work. We use some methods to educate workers to work collectively, for example: the fish bone critical thinking (Ishikawa).

T: *What is Ishikawa?

R1: *One of the methods that educate people how to think collectively.

T: They are talking about how they are collectivist, how they have a collectivist environment, they like to have a collective kind of thinking.

R1: How to make teamwork *we make workers participate in this process as well.

T: They like workers to contribute also to this process

R1: *And in turn, there is collective involvement from all work parties in looking for any problems and their solutions.

T: If they have a problem and they want to sort out a solution, they emphasized that they encourage a collective contribution and participation from everyone so, they try to train them into this mindset

I: How long do your employees usually stay here?

T: *How long does the worker stay here?

R1: *There are people who have been here for 20 years and even 30 years.

T: They have people who have been working here for 20 years and 30 years.

R2: *I have been here for 30 years.

T: He is saying he have been here for 30 years.

I: And you also (to the R1).

R1: Yes, 15 years and before that was [old owner] father of [current owner] and [sister of current owner].

T: *When was the factory established?

R1: *Since 1979
T: The factory has been established since 1979.

I: It was very interesting to learn so much about your company. Now I would like to speak about the future. Is there something you would like to change? To improve? Or something that you are so happy with, that you would like to keep it?

T: *Do you think that there is something that could be improved or adjusted from your point of view?

R2: *There can be improvements every day.

R1: *The problem we have as [F01] is the shipping dates; it is not proportionate with the number of days available for production so there is some kind of pressure…. loading, this is our outside clientele problem and planning and how to yarn and materials… many problems maybe knitting

T: They face, their main problem is the dates of shipping, it is not the same dates as here, and they always face pressure in terms of orders, delivery time pressure

R1: Clients, maybe we need approval, we need agreements, we need so, maybe dating is not fitting here

R1: *The crowdness and jam that occur in the factory is always due to the dates which add a load on the workers. We calculate production rates on the bases of the line balance, there is something called the line balance, time-study and motion-study, we know the production rate, and sometimes we ask the workers for high production rates.

R2: *Improvement here has two sides.

R1: *Sometimes the main problem is that we want production rates that are higher than the normal; this is the main problem here at [F01].

T: They use statistics to be able to estimate how long the production will need but most of the time it doesn’t fit with what has been asked by the clients, they ask shorter times, and this is what creates the pressure.

R1: *The factory size is not proportionate with the production capacity, we want a high production capacity that is bigger than the factory and, therefore, you can find piling materials.

T: So, he is saying that the factory is not as big as the production orders, so you usually find it very crowded

R1: *So, this is the problem that we have, but we try to take other places, but we have to keep this original place, because it is situated among the people, and it gets us workers.

T: They are saying that sometimes they use other places to store stuff that they have because this place is very small, but they cannot compromise this place because it is the main area/hub to attract workers. So, they cannot leave this place because of this.

I: So, how do you solve that basically, do you just fit additional people in and additional chairs in or do you let them work longer or how do you do it?

T: *How do you manage if there are a lot of workers if the factory is too small for the production capacity? How do you organize this?

R1: *So, we started to make space for storing, when we sent the machines to training and production units. We also started to get rid of a lot of waste and we have also used materials to produce cheap garments and we sell them to get rid of them, and in turn, more space was freed.

T: For them, to like use the place efficiently, they started to take all the materials that they have and put them into production units that was explained earlier. And they started also find ways to produce cheap garments with their waste materials to free space.

R1: But we have plan to have more stores.
R2: *The problem for space is with storing and not the workers. Regardless of how many workers there are, the place can fit them, but the storing is the problem.

T: The main problem is storing the materials itself. But the problem is not because of too much workers, it is not the main thing creating the problem, it is actually the amount of things they have in the factory that needs to be stored

I: If you could change something you don’t like, what would you do?

T: *If you have the freedom to change something in the factory, what would it be?

R1: *Look, let’s make it the opposite, you have to have workers, the industry crisis, we try to always get workers, what is important is the skilled workers. If there is space, I will store better, but to increase the production, I need more workers?

R2: *If we have a chance of expanding, storing will change completely, because it is delaying everything, the stairs are being used for storing; we pile the fabrics on them because we don’t have space when we are timely pressured. During, normal times, we have space to store. But when we have a lot of orders, we face a storage problem.

T: He is telling us about the problem of space, it is creating problems, and this is one thing that he would change in the factory if he can and he is saying also, the problem is with finding skilled labour.

R1: *Employment and economic crisis.

T: He is talking about the economic crisis.

R1: *They want more money, so they revert to jobs that require less effort and more money.

T: They want more money, so they go to places that offer more money and less work.

R1: *And this is a nation’s problem, the price gets higher and higher.

I: In what currency do you sell your products, if you sell to Germany, do you sell in Euros or do you sell in Egyptian pounds?

T: *What currency do you get when you export to Germany?

R1: *We get Euro and Dollar, but the workers get Egyptian pounds of course.

T: The workers take in Egyptian pounds

I: In that sense then, the devaluation wasn’t that bad?

R1: *We try to create a balance between the price increase and the wages. The price increase involves, electricity, gas, water, transportation. Everyone is facing more or less the same crisis. This is the problem, but we also have costs to cover. But we have workers who have been here for 20 years and are still working and sticking to the place. But any industrial zone (Obour, 6th October, 10th of Ramadan), have serious problems getting workers because they need to transport them. There is a place in Mokattam called hay el asmaat, they placed people who used to live in rural areas there, but they cannot work since they need early transportation to the workplace at 6 am at least, and then they are back home by 7 or 8 pm. The parents are scared for their kids, and they don’t want to send them to work. They live there without work, so, we started going to them and establish production units and people are very happy now. Money is important, wages are important, but some sort of parity needs to exist. The government and the state need to help but they do not.

T: He is saying that it is an economic crisis and they are trying to understand that it is a country problem, and they want to increase the salaries for the workers, in order to, cover the inflation happening as much as they can. There is actually a problem in how people want to increase their salary but despite this problem, they still have people working for them. To give you an example, there is a worker that has been working here for 20 years and he didn’t leave and that means that they are treating everyone fairly
and giving proper salaries etc… And he is talking about that there are some factories that are established in the outskirts of the city so, in order to go there, you have to take transportation, and they cannot attract workers anymore, because there is cost of transportation and he is emphasizing that they have to maintain a good salary because of the inflation and the economic situation but at the same time they do have a high cost that is also a problem for them (the electricity price that is increasing, the gas prices, all the utilities prices are increasing not only on the workers but also on the factory) and so they have to maintain paying their costs

I: Thank you for all this information. I learned a lot from you. Is there anything else that you would like to tell me that you think is important for me to know in regard to my research? Anything I should know about work-related issues?

T: She is asking, is there something else you want to tell her that will help her in her research?

R1: *She has to visit a lot of factories; she can go to factories in industrial areas (Obour, 10th of Ramadan, 6th October). In these areas, you’ll find nice factories, good dorms, gardens, fancy gates because they are new factories but, they cannot find workers.

T: He is telling you that you have to visit more factories across Egypt and he is telling you to go to 6 of October and 10th of Ramadan, you’ll find industrial towns that has gardens, gates, good dorms and everything but they cannot find workers

I: Because they are so far out?

T: *They cannot find workers because they far from the city or why aren’t they finding workers?

R1: *Look, it is a process of supply and demand. I am a factory that wants 1000 workers, but I cannot find more than 500, where to get them is the problem. The problem is workers abandon industry, all industries not just textiles. They abandon it because there are other options. Industry has rules, discipline, and hard-work. So, people instead work in shops, serve at homes or drive tuktuks and microbuses.

T: He is saying that people nowadays want work that does not require much effort because in industrial work, like the environment itself, requires discipline and hard-work. And people nowadays would revert to being a driver or in a shop, working in something easier because of this mindset.

R2: *Most people working in this industry are girls and girls, unfortunately, because of the culture, a lot of them, when they reach the age of marriage, they stop working. So, you have workers leaving because they get married.

T: He is saying that most of the workers in this industry are women, especially women that has not been married yet and need to support their families, and once they get married, they just leave the job.

R1: *But after the economic crisis, they go back to working again.

T: But because of the economic crisis, people go back to work again

I: Does the nursery help in that, because you said you have a nursery

T: *Does the nursery help?

R2: *Yes of course, and this attracts most married women to come and work.

T: This is the main thing actually that attract married woman to come back again.

R2: *But it is a lifestyle, the man decides that he doesn’t want his wife to work or because the place of work is in another area completely.

T: They are saying that women leave their jobs in this factory because of cultural reasons, because the man usually doesn’t want his wife to work again, because she might be living far away so she would need transportation to the factory
R1: *The community system in Egypt, unfortunately, the government with the media and etc… the less effort and the more money. But the problem as I tell you is with society diseases; they want the male to work in art and football. The rate of deviation is really high. I can put males to work, but they prefer to run after jobs that would them more money and less effort.

T: He is saying that the media and the culture and the government are affecting that they do want men to come and work in their factory, but men nowadays want the work that would require less effort and more money and that is why they revert to something else outside the factory work, but women because they support a house they would come here.

T: *Can I ask a question? Why do women like to work in your factory?

R1: * We as [F01], are a safe environment for the outside community, we don’t have harassments, we don’t allow with wrong relationships, no degrading treatment, everyone takes their rights. Everyone sends their kids safely to work at our factory.

R2: *She has seen an export factory, she can see a local factory as well, the perspective differs.

R1: I am talking about the workers from a society’s perspective, why we didn’t have these problems before? The problem exists, because society as a whole, doesn’t respect the value of work, the value of education, and in turn, there is not enough people to appreciate the meaning of acquiring a skill, a talent.

T: I was asking him, why do you think most of the people that work here are women? He saying it is a very safe and secure environment for women to work here and this is why because there is no harassment, it’s not a public space, it more like a home, their second family and that is why they choose to work here.

I: I asked all my questions. Thank you. Could you just ask them if there are any company documents which they think I should read to better understand their company. And the second thing, if we can have a look at the factory.

T: *Is there any documentation she can look at that could help her in her research?

R2: *There is our management policy and vision and also the guidebook we give to new workers, so they know the factory and the places in it.

[end of recording]
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[Start of recording]

I: I started the recording now. I would like to start by learning a little bit about the background, just to get a picture of the background of this factory. Where's your factory? What you do? Whom you produce for? What kinds of garments you produce? How many workers you have? Things like that, and also hear about your position in the firm so I can get an impression.

R1: The company has been working in Jordan since [year]. Until I would say, different phases in life. It was owned by a [North American] firm producing -- at the beginning were producing underwear and lady's panties for export to the U.S. always. We were under the QIZ agreement. Then we shifted as of 2010 to the FTA agreement. We shifted the production because through life the production of apparel in Jordan has shifted from basic production to a more value-added production, where we are today, in the active wear business.

Currently, a few years ago, a [Southeast Asian] company acquired this company with the people, and we shifted into a single customer sourcing, which is called [large global brand]. Of the record, but that we service one customer now. It's all sportswear. It's all export to the U.S. under the free trade agreement. We have 2,000 employees as of now working in two plants. One plant, which is this one, the one you're in, has 1,500 employees. We have one more, which is called Satellite Factory, where it's 100% Jordanian. It's in [rural location in Jordan] that has 450 Jordanians working there.

Overall, we have around 700 Jordanians and the rest 1,300 are migrants. Mainly, Sri Lanka is the biggest population around 600, Nepal is number two around 500, and then we have around 200 to 250 between Bangladeshis, Indians, Egyptians, Pakistanis are a few of them. Really, we are Sri Lankans and Nepalese in totality. We produce, what else should I say? We produce all active wear garments poly-like stuff for active wear for [large global brand]. We export 95% to the U.S. The balance 5% goes to Canada, Europe, to other countries. Essentially, the customer dictates where it's going.

I: What stages of production do you do here?

R1: We are full of contractors. The term that the buyers use for us are contractors because the designs are developed at headquarters. The fabric makers and the suppliers are nominated by the buyer. We are contractors. We are contracted to buy the fabrics and the threads from certain places, then we bring it here and you cut, make, embellish, pack garments, and ship it out to the U.S.

I: This is good for me to get an overview. One more question about your workers. You already mentioned the nationalities. How is it with male, female?

R1: I would say 70% females.

I: 70% female, okay. Most of them are females. Thank you for the information about the organization. How about your position?
R1: I'm the CEO of the organization. As I told you, that’s when the [Southeast Asian] company, [name of group] bought the company, I was with them. I have been running the company for all these years. I’ve been in the garment sector since 1994 after graduating as an industrial engineer.

I: You are here since 2000?

R1: 2008. I have been in this position since 2008. I am in the [industry organisation]. I’ve been in the industry since inception. Before even the QIZ and the FTA, I was in the industry.

I: This is very interesting, very good for me to know. One more question about the garments you produce, do you do everything here in these factories or do you further sub-contract?

R1: We don't sub-contract.

I: At all, okay.

R1: If we need to sub-contract, which rarely happens, but it does happen, we sub-contract, for example embroidery, it is a service that we don't have. We sub-contract embroidery. It's a value addition of sub-contracting. We don't subcontract the garment because one, [our buyer] does not allow it. It has to go, one, we have to go and audit any other sub-contractor who does any work for us. Even in embellishment, like in embroidery place, we have to audit them, make sure that they are paying salaries as per the law, they are paying people on time, they are not working the people more than the allowed hours.

We audit even our sub-contractors.

I: Okay, I see. This is good for me to understand. Most of my questions are going to be about your HR practices, work practices here in the factory. Are they the same here in this main unit as they are in the satellite unit, or should I ask separately for both units?

R1: 100% the same. The only difference that you have would be working hours in this plant because it is full of migrants. They come here to earn a living. They don't have families. For them being in the job helps. Yet, we make sure nobody violates the 60-hour rule, a 60-hour week rule. Maximum, a person should work 60 hours per week. We work--

I: Set by? Who set the rule again?

R1: [Our buyer] and our own code of conduct. We have a code of conduct of [our buyer], we have the labour law, the borderless rules, the code of conduct of our customer and code of conduct of [our group] that we apply to our employees. We make sure we don't work more than 60 hours, which is 10 hours per day into six days a week and eight hours of normal working hours, plus two overtime. We work 48 hours of normal hours and 12 hours per week of overtime.

I: That's different in the Satellite?

R1: In [the satellite] many Jordanians have obligations, have families. They work eight hours into six days a week. They work only for 48 hours. Saying that, they do overtime, but not all of them. It's a voluntary-- overtime voluntary in both plants, but migrants choose to work overtime. Few of them don't while Jordanians is the other way round. Most of them choose not to work, some of them choose to work.

I: Can they do overtime in the other plant as well or do they need to come here then?

R1: Of course. No, they don't go to the other plant. It's a fully separate plant, fully separate.

I: That’s good for me to know that I know if I ask questions for both plants and if there's a difference, you could just clarify.

R1: Exactly, when you ask-- if there's a difference, I will notify you that there's a difference between the plants.

I: This is good. Otherwise, I'm not sure what to attribute the questions here. Before we go into your actual work practices you have in the firm, my first question is about your general, your personal, very
personal general understanding. I would like to ask you what you consider personally to be good HR practices, good work environments that benefit workers. What do you think is most important for them to create a good quality of work in your factory in your personal opinion?

R1: Sure. That's our, I think, our motto. My personal opinion, my company's opinion from the chairman to the last person in the company, we are a 95,000-employee company all over the world. We follow the same code of conduct everywhere and it's built in our culture. It's built in our DNA. It's not something that I think. If you sit with me and go sit with anybody else in the company, they will tell you the same thing. We respect human to the maximum in the sense we create a home away from home for all our employees wherever they are.

Whether they are located-- Regardless of their race, regardless of their gender, regardless of their where they are living, they are Jordanian or migrants, they are equal. We treat them equally, we pay them equally, we create the best possible atmosphere for them to be in, safe and productive for them. That's the philosophy that you find everywhere. That's why our goal metrics are the best in Jordan.

That's why our factory structures are the best, the way our lines are built. We call our employees team members. They are part of a team. They feel that we are together. We take them out on field trips every year. We take one day off for each plant, and we take them out and do only, what should I say? Team building activities, plus enjoyment for them as a reward for the year's work. We do, we celebrate all the religious, all the holidays.

I: For all nationalities?

R1: For all nationalities, for all ethnic backgrounds because we have the same nationality, different religions, different ethnic beliefs, and we celebrate all of them. We celebrate with Hindus, with Muslims, with Christians, with any religion that we have, we would celebrate with them. Any nationality, the national holidays we celebrate with them.

I: This is what makes up the best workplace or are there any other aspects that make up the best workplace for you?

R1: Safety is number one. That's what we make sure, that safety. We have a motto that if we take care of our employees, they take care of our customers. We don't worry. The quality will come right for sure if we take care of our people. If the people are happy, then our product would be good. That's the motto.

I: Thank you very much.

R1: Sure.

I: This is very true.

R1: We believe in it. It's not only saying it, we believe. We walk the talk on this aspect, especially the human rights.

I: Okay. This is very nice. Thank you for sharing your general understanding. Now, I would like to go into specific work practices. We already touched the issue of working hours and working time arrangements. You explained what the general working times are. You said 60 hours, 10 hours per day, six days --

R1: Six days.

I: Six days a week, if they've selected to overwork over time, is that including excluding a break?

R1: Excluding the break.

I: How long is the break?

R1: A half an hour.
I: A half an hour, which goes on top and that's the same in Satellite plant.

R1: Same as Satellite.

I: Same as Satellite plant. Your working days are probably from Saturday to Thursday?

R1: Yes. They are different working hours between the Satellite plant and here, we start here at 7:30 and the Satellite plant we start at eight, but the total hours are the same.

I: The total hours are the same. Does everybody who works for you works on this fixed hours or do we also have part-time arrangements, small, flexible work arrangements?

R1: We don't have part-time employees, but it's flexible. There is no requirement for them to work overtime. Every day they sign off on working overtime. For them, it's the time that is chosen by them.

I: Okay. The eight hours, they are fixed and then it's flexible in how far whether they want to work overtime?

R1: Yes. Although the break is only a half an hour, they have freedom of movement. They want to go toilet; they want to go pray. They are always free.

I: Everything, okay. Everybody works on fixed contracts, or do you also have part-time arrangements, small, flexible work arrangements?

R1: We don't have part-time employees, but it's flexible. There is no requirement for them to work overtime. Every day they sign off on working overtime. For them, it's the time that is chosen by them.

I: Okay. How do you organise the vacations?

R1: According to labour law, 14 days per year or 21 days after five years.

I: Who chooses when the holidays are taken?

R1: The employees.

I: The employees themselves.

R1: Usually, Jordanians choose wherever they want. Migrants what happen to them is by choice also, but what happens they accumulate, and they take it when they go home and come back.

I: There's more time to- [crosstalk]

R1: They don't do the vacation here; they go back to their country. They accumulate two years, and they take 28 days, and go.

I: As I said in the beginning, I've always interested in the why. Why do you organize it like that? Are there any reasons?

R1: Regarding what?

I: Why you organize working times like that? Why did you have the 60 hours here, the less hours in the Satellite plant? Why do you have to vacation days? Why?

R1: Probably I answered you on this, which is Jordanians have obligations. They opt not to work overtime. While migrants don't have obligations, they stay in the dorms. Although we have created for them a recreation center here, but still, they do that every night after 6:00. We work from 7:30 to 6:00 in this plant. After 6:00, they go down to the dorms and enjoy their time, not in their dorms, but in our recreation center. We created the worker center for them to enjoy their evenings.

I: The maximum of 60 is because of the buyer and depreciation as pertaining labor law. These are the main reasons?

R1: Yes.
I: Okay. Thank you very much. The next topic I'm interested in is compensation and benefits. I'm not necessarily interested in how much you pay, but how to organize it. Is it fixed? Is there a bonus? Is there an incentive? How do you organize compensation and benefits?

R1: Upon joining, they start on a fixed number, which is in the case of migrants, they take 115-- No, 125 JDs cash. 125 JDs in kind.

I: But isn’t the total 220? Or not?

R1: Total 220, so what? It's standard, which is the minimum wage of the country.

I: And what is your salary then?

R1: 125 in cash and 95 in kind. The total is 220.

I: Yes.

R1: Plus, they get 5 JD of what we call the fixed bonus, plus attendance bonus of 10 JODs, plus production bonus that ranges from 5 JDs to 60 JDs. Some people get 60 JDs.

I: How do you calculate the production bonuses?

R1: Based on the group. It's a group incentive based on the whole line.

I: How much pieces the line produces?

R1: Yes. It's based on efficiency, but the team members understand that in pieces. We extend it to them in pieces. Jordanians are the same, but they get 220 in cash. Instead of the split of cash and kind, they get it done in 220 in cash, plus attendance bonus, plus production bonus, which again ranges from 5 to 60 JDs, plus transportation. In Jordanian case, we pay transportation. In migrant case, we pay plane ticket, improvement fees, work permits, residences, medical, everything is paid.

I: All these things. The attendance, when are people eligible for the attendance bonus?

R1: When they attend a full month, they're allowed for an attendance bonus, even if they take one day off as, what should I call it, with permission, they still are eligible for the attendance bonus.

I: The 10 Jordanian fixed bonus, what is that about?

R1: The 5 JD fixed bonus?

I: Sorry. 5 JD.

R1: We give it to everyone. It's like upcharge.

I: Okay, so that you pay above minimum.

R1: Yes. Plus, in the past, we had the CBA, collective bargaining agreement, where we pay people every year an increment of 5 JD. Some people who are committed more than what I said. I spoke of the starter.

I: The starters.

R1: Now we have a minimum wage that has covered the annual incomes. They start at 220 while the previous people are higher because they got annual increments.

I: How does it work with annual increments now for starter?

R1: Now, the next problem would be in March 2019. They’ve just received an increment in March 2018, which is 15 JD for both locations and migrants. The next, let's say, increment would be in March of 2019 where we would have another CBA. Now we are starting negotiation on the new CBA.

I: This is also for also the new joiners. Is there anything that people who stayed at this factory for a long time that they start earning more or less?
R1: Sure.
I: Yes?
R1: They used to get that, but because they receive the last 15 JDs, no. They’re already the salaries are higher than the rest, already the base is higher because they’ve received many increments before. Now, the next increment will be next year.
I: The labour law increment?
R1: Not labour laws. There's nothing in the labour law.
I: I see. Okay.
R1: Based on a CBA that we will sign.
I: Based on the CBA this is. This is for everybody or only the people who worked here already for one year?
R1: For anybody who completed one year.
I: For anybody who completed one year. Okay, that’s what I was getting at.
R1: Next March. In March 2019, for anybody who completed one, will get that.
I: All of this is the same, especially, except for the split between in kind and in cash.
R1: Yes.
I: Okay. Why do you organize it like this? Are there specific reasons? Why you have the bonuses? Why you have the increments?
R1: The fixed pay is because of the labour law. That’s the minimum that the person should get for working in this industry. Then, we have what we have additional, which is to incentivize people to produce more and to work as a team rather than an individual. That’s the incentive that we give our employees to generate more money. The idea is to try, eventually, to have people make 50% out of bonus and 50% out of basics, hopefully.
I: This is the goal in the end.
R1: This is the ultimate goal.
I: Since you started working at this factory, has it always been like that or have some of these, like the incentives, for example, have they been in start or later?
R1: Incentives have been there since the beginning, but we changed them. We change the systems, we changed methodology to make it easier to the team members, to make their people are and, let’s say, more experienced make more money. It makes an incentive for others that I want to be like this person. I want to learn more. I want to become here. You keep running and making them want to generate more money through more experience.
I: What did you have and what did you change to make it better? I’m interested in good practice experiences.
R1: For example, we have one more incentive which I did not say. Multi-skill, which is a skill-- The more machines you know how to run, the more money you’ll make. That helps. You become more of what we call it joker, but rather than multi-skill operator. Once you are multi-skill operator, you make more money. That makes people want to learn more on different machine.
I: Okay, very good. This is something you--
R1: We introduced.
I: You introduced. In your opinion though, do these incentives work?

R1: A lot. We have people who are now generating-- they've reached the 50/50. They've reached their 50 basic, 50 bonus. They are there. Not everybody, but a very small margin have reached that target.

I: You said the productivity bonus is based on the team, based on the line. How, because I’ve heard people who had that system and they complained that sometimes then there are negotiations between the team because one operator in the team wasn’t fast enough as the others and slowed down the entire line basically and then there was struggles and things like that. Have you encountered that or how do you solve that?

R1: The famous statement is the team is as strong as its weakest employee. That weakest person will take the team's strength down or will push the team. What we do, we find that person, we call them bottlenecks. We help them. If it’s a bottleneck, that’s temporarily. We'll either see what’s the problem with this employee. Maybe they have issues at home, maybe they need a machine that higher or lower. Some, it’s going to makes that then they need a higher chair or lower chair, maybe they are big or small, or they are tall, or they are short. You try to help them in that way.

Then you try to automate the machine, to make it more automated, to help the operator become less dependent on their own skill and depend more on the machine itself. We try to give more training on them, bring out the operator who is expert in it to show her or him how. That’s what we do.

I: Thank you very much. I have heard of a lot of factories have these challenges.

R1: Certainly. This I am sure of course.

I: Regarding, you just said, you'd train them. Do you have training schools here or how does the training go?

R1: We have a training upon on induction. When they come here, we have six weeks of training until they start touching commercial production.

I: Is it technical or soft scholar training?

R1: Both.

I: Both, okay. What are the most crucial issues you teach them in regard to soft skills?

R1: How to live in a dormitory with others, on the soft skills. They've been with their parents or most of them are young, between the age of 20 and 30. They come here, they've been living with their parents. If they are married, with husbands, and they are all females. Some of them have children, have left children behind and came single here. Soft skill is they are living six in room. This is your cover; this is your bed. You have to take care of your bed, organize everything. You are not living alone.

Clean your areas, help others. Toilets, they have to share toilets, share bathrooms. They have to learn how to leave in this atmosphere, that’s one. Then, coming to the environment in factory. The safety, in case of fire, what do you do, how to use the toilets, how to use the showers. A lot of our people have never seen a shower the way the shower is. They are used to buckets. Especially coming from this culture, they come-- they’re used to bath using a bucket, not using showers.

We have to teach them the rigors. There’s a big chance for us is, the sexual harassment, verbal harassment, their views culturally. What’s accepted in [Southeast Asia] might not be accepted in Jordan. A male shaking hands with a female in Jordan is something that is--

I: The female has to offer, right?

R1: Exactly. For me, that’s overdue. I never offered my hand unless the female offers in Jordan while in [South East Asian country] it’s okay to tap female on the back. That’s a good job while a Jordanian female will not accept that. You have to teach them this culture, that’s on the soft skill part.
I: Side. Technical is the operation of machines.

R1: Of course.

I: They start with one machine?

R1: Yes. A simple operation with a single need just to follow the concentration, they do colour-- what is it called? Colour test, eye blindness.

I: Colour blindness.

R1: Colour blindness yes.

I: If they notice they want-- would like to use and learn working on a different machine, they approach their supervisor or how does that work?

R1: Probably, that’s why they are on the line, not why they are in the training. In the training, we are focused on learning something of all machines, but they would see where is their best. The trainers will take them to where the need is also. We know what they need is the lines. They need more flat team operators; we'll take them on the flat team.

I: Then when they are on the line, this might come up that they say I could.

R1: They know about the multi-skill operations. They would start after six months, after one year, usually after one year, they start looking at multi-skill.

I: Okay, I see. One other question I am interested-- No, sorry. I think what you talked about was mainly now soft skills also for the foreign workers. Is that the training and the soft skill and hard skills is the same for Jordanians?

R1: Yes. Without the dormitory part, that’s not required. As a time, it’s six weeks. What we do, we split the day into two. We do technical training in the morning, soft skill in the afternoon and then because there is a dorm here. While the Jordanians, shorter working hours. They only do the technical training part. Even that there is a soft skill training for Jordanians, not living together, but being in an environment where is industrial.

Industrial safety, how to take care of yourself. You have certain access, how to the use eye guards, the gloves, the googles, there are certain things that you should use, masks.

I: This is also in the Jordanian training, but of course not the how do I treat women in Jordanian context. That was about training. Now about recruitment. What are your-- is it difficult or is it easy for you to recruit migrant workforce and to recruit Jordanian workers?

R1: Jordanians, we have a good waiting list because we have become the employer of choice. People, especially females, they prefer our company. Even for migrants. Whichever country we go to, especially Sri Lanka and Nepal, we have become the employer of choice in these countries. If a person wants to leave the country, the first employment opportunity would be, they want to come and work here because of what we do to all people, the way they are living, the activities that we do for them.

All the other companies envy us for what we do, the workers. The administration, they hate us because of what we do to our people, because of the amount of effort that we put in making their lives better. We’re creating a home away from home. We understand they are leaving families behind; they are coming here; we're giving them full freedom. Yet, freedom has also a lot of issues also. They are too young; they have issues when there's too much freedom because there is no curfew in our dorms. Females can leave anytime; males can leave anytime. There is no curfew for them. We just give security to make sure it’s safe, but people come in and out anytime of the day.
I: There are—probably sometimes problems come up. You said you are also the employer of choice for Jordanians. What do you think is the one, two or three things you do what make you the employer of choice for Jordanians?

R1: We are very fair in what we pay people. We are fair in payment, firm in our treatment, we take care of our employees. We take care of their safety. We have a day care in our facility. Working mothers take their children in this day care, air-conditioning plants. The environment itself is green. The first thing we did was renovate the whole—do the toilets for them, do access for people with who are challenged. We have wheelchair accesses. It helps people to be happy where they are.

I: Well, that sounds very nice. That makes you the employer of choice. What is for you the worker of choice? What does a worker have to bring with him or her to be a good worker for you?

R1: With all that—everything we do—As an employer of choice, I forgot to tell you, for migrants in particular, for the last three years, we have been practicing zero recruitment fee. The employees come here paying zero, that’s another. For them, they are paying nothing to come to Jordan.

For me, that’s a question I have never been asked before. What’s an employee of choice? In the locals, an employee who is teachable. An employee who wants to learn, who wants to be better, who wants to support the family.

I have many of those and I have many who are not. They are coming here just to enjoy time, make buck and go buy a smoke or do something. I have a lot who are really employees who want to support their family and create a career for them. This is a Jordanian employee of choice. Immigrant employee of choice, the problem with migrants is that they don’t stay for long. They are coming on a three-year contract. In reality, we have 33% turnover every year. One third of my employees will leave. A lot renew their contract.

I: That’s what I wanted to ask.

R1: A lot renew, but still, you don’t maintain knowledge. You are training them, they stay for three, maybe they renew for another three at max, but they go back to their country. They want to open a house, they have generated enough money, bought a land, build a house. Either they want to get married or go back to support their families. An employee of choice in my view, only a person who wants to come, earn money and who work. Be decent, that’s what we ask.

I: How long do you order a Jordanian come to stay?

R1: I have employees for 18 years, who has been with us for 18 years. This company although registered in 2005, but also, they bought machinery and a running company from a previous owner. I have people who have in this setup for the last 18 years.

I: You have been employing Jordanians much longer than other firms in Jordan?

R1: Yes.

I: If I started working in your company today as a Jordanian and I intend to stay, what kind of career could I do if I start as an operator?

R1: Operator? Give yourself—From every 22-team members who are the startup, you will get one team leader. Eventually within a year, you could become a team leader. If you’re ready for the challenge, you will be responsible for the 22. From the 22, one will graduate to be a team leader out of-- Each group will have a team leader. Out of every six team leaders, you will create one group leader who is responsible for the six.

That would be taking another year or plus, or year and a half to do that. Then, from there, you can become responsible for the whole, for like 13-14 others.
I: Operation, like a full-- Like cutting or sewing or?

R1: Sewing, we stick to only sewing. Switching to cutting is another career, but in the sewing career you can jump from that, from team member to a team leader to a group leader. Then to a sewing manager or sewing responsible, and then you can become a factory manager. I have a factory manager who started as a team member.

I: As a team member, okay, I see.

R1: We prefer people from inside. We train people from inside.

I: The multi skilling is within the sewing department, in the cutting department, was in-- It's not that I sew and cut or sew and I--

R1: No, it doesn't work, no. You have to work within a team. A multi-skill sewing operator, I know multiple machines. It's not that I know cutting or I know quality. If I know quality, it's a career shift. You change your career from sewing to quality. Cutting, it is a career change.

I: How many, just roughly percentage-wise, let's look at the sewing department. How many of your operators are multi-skilled?

R1: Good question. I think around 15%.

I: Doesn't need to be exact. 15%. That's a very good percentage, and this is among Jordanians and among migrants.

R1: Migrants, both, yes. We also divide them to do that, to become multi-skilled.

I: Yes, a lot of factories I talked to have these problems that they didn't have enough multi-skilled ones. Then if somebody's absent, that's a problem.

R1: That's what they do in my Jordanian one in the Satellite. Who's absent? I have a small pool of multi-skilled operator who fills in. In the morning, they-- Especially vacations that are unannounced. What happened? If you tell me that you're absent tomorrow, I know who I'm going to put in front of you. If you surprise me in the morning for whatever reason, we have to find on that minute a person to replace. That's what your multi-skilled operator are.

We have an additional net of multi-skilled operator.

I: This works? It sounds like it works.

R1: It was a big challenge for us, especially mothers. Of course, absenteeism is high. My absenteeism is not bad. It's 8%. My absenteeism here is 0.5%. Half a percent because it's all migrants.

I: The absenteeism in the Jordanians is higher. What about the turnover? Is that the turnover is higher here because they leave after three or six years?

R1: You are right, yes. I would say the same, even in [location of satellite]. Every year we lose 30%, but some people stay.

I: I think I understood about recruitment now. One other topic is communication, com bottom, up, top, down like communication between managers and supervisors and workers. How do you organize communication at such a big firm?

R1: Besides a system, which is an immediate communication modelling, but we have all our policies are on board.

I: On board means printed out, hanging.

R1: Printed out, hang everywhere in all languages. In five different languages, so anybody can pick up the paper and read it. Our pay slips are translated to all languages.
I: Can everybody read and write here?

R1: We have few who don't. We have Jordanians who don't read and write, and we have a school for them, and we have graduates now. 10 people who have graduated from illiterate to become literate. Six graders. We try to help them that method. We have some Jordanians who are learning English language. We do some training for them on English language. We've tried to teach migrants Arabic or English.

I: How does that work?

R1: Not really good.

I: [laughs] Yes, I'm struggling myself with Arabic, so I feel with them. Back to the communication. You have the boards where you hang information?

R1: Yes, that's general politics, but as a hierarchy, you have the hierarchy, where information flows from managers to supervisors, supervisors to team members to team leaders. You have that chain of command where it goes down the drain and it goes up again.

Also, what we try to do is instead of having to triangulate where the bottom, the team members are servicing us, we try to flip the triangle where the lower number of people are servicing the most in the sense the 22 team members in a production floor, the job of the team leader, who is their boss, is to serve them and make their lives easier. The group leader, who's responsible for six, his job or her job is to serve the six and make their jobs easier, and vice versa going through everybody.

I: As a mentality.

R1: As a mentality. That's the mentality that we try to create.

I: What kind of stuff do you communicate? Let's start with top-down. Do you communicate down to the workers, the policies for one thing? What else?

R1: Grievances, whatever we have. We have team members that are elected by the employees. We have what we call PICC, which is a committee that represents everybody in the company. We meet once a month through their suggestions. Each person is responsible for 66 employees. They go to them, “What are your commands?” If they are mentioning anything to be solved immediately, it gets solved by itself without coming to the meeting.

There are general requirements like required-- needing toilets. We had a five-story building, for example. I'll give you a nice, simple example. All the toilets on the ground floor. People working on the fifth floor, they need to go to toilets, they have to drop down five floors and go up again. They're losing a lot of production because it's all based on productivity. They got in. What we decided to do now, we'll build, constructing toilets on the roof to be used by the fifth and the fourth floor.

Rather than going down, they go up one floor, two floors, and they have toilets there. It's accessible for them. Such a big thing.

I: This came up in the PICC meetings?

R1: Yes. This came up in the PICC.

I: When did you institutionalize, implement these PICC meetings?

R1: Since long time with the labour union. They've got more organized with Better Work Jordan, when Better Work started. Better Work started in 2009. That's when it got official, more documented.

I: Why did you initially implement them?

R1: That's the way to communicate with people. That's how we hear their grievances.

I: The idea came from the unions, or it came from Better Work, or it came from the buyers?
R1: From the unions before.
I: From the unions before.
R1: Unions before.
I: What did Better Work do to improve them?
R1: Made it more officiated, documented, structured, I would say. It became more structured. They brought in external knowledge, so it became more structured.
I: In your personal opinion, I'm not here to control you or anything. I'm just interested in what works and what doesn't work right from the law and stuff like that, from an HR perspective. Do you think these committees are a good way to communicate? Is that helpful, or would you rather have a different way of communicating?
R1: I don't know any other way. When you have that mass of people, I don't see any other way. There is a way for them to communicate with us. We have suggestion boxes. We have Kaizen boxes. Kaizen is improvement boxes. Whatever you see is simple improvement, maybe not related to my area. Something in-- the floors can be cleaner if we do this.
If we put a trash bin here, people will stop throwing whatever on the floor. Simple things, and these are Kaizen, continuous improvement. You throw your ideas in it, and we have people who read them, prioritize based on real need, based on money, based on investment. We do them just to improve the lives of the people and to improve the factory.
I: This is good to get suggestions up there?
R1: Yes, of course. This is beside the PICC, and then if you want-- have a grievance, somebody is harassing a person verbally, physically, sexually, we have a system for that. My phone number is written on the policy. My boss's phone number who sits in [Southeast Asian country] is written on the policy. People, if they are justified, can call even the customer.
I: Do you have to do them, or do you do them because they worked and you came up with them?
R1: These are our code of conducts.
I: These are your codes of conduct.
R1: They arrived from the buyers, but the buyers are not that detailed. We have 95,000 employees. We have learned through time how to take care of them. We're not always right. We change, we keep updating them whenever there's a potential to change. Whenever we see something, but then we do change. We're looking at now creating an application because most of the team members, not most, all of them now carry smart phones. Create an application to communicate up and down with our team members.
I: They can just do it right out the smart phone. Okay. This is good. Sorry. You are answering so many questions I wanted to ask. I'm struggling with finding what you haven't answered yet. I think communication-wise in your suggestion box, in your PICC meetings, you mentioned some examples would come up. What are generally the topics that come up? Is it more technical issues, is it more like about transportation and accommodation? What kind of issues?
R1: Frankly, everything, but what happens? When there is a technical issue, we do not discuss it in the PICC. We will not waste time to discuss it. We will transfer it to that technical department to take care of it. Who raised issue, for example, module number five; Module number five, we will send you a technical team to answer your question because it's a specific issue. We try to keep the meeting for general issues that benefits everybody.
We try to talk about cleanliness, maintenance, safety, these general issues. Then you have some transportation issue. If it affects everybody, we talk about it. If it affects certain person or certain group of people, we'll address it separately. Food issues, we are responsible for their food, three meals a day. There are food issues. We have a food committee that meets once a week. We'll transfer it to the food committee. We try to make it five to six points that interests everybody. There are other meetings that will take specific issue.

I: Okay, and the PICC, is there one for this unit and one for the Satellite or one for both?
R1: One for each.
I: Does it work the same in the Satellite?
R1: Yes, but it's easier in the Satellite because it's one language. Here when we speak, English, Sri Lankan, Nepali, Bangladeshi, so it's longer.
I: How do you do that?
R1: We have translators for all languages.
I: You have translators sitting in the meetings who help with it.
R1: Yes.
I: Okay, is that tough?
R1: Imagine, you want to say something in five minutes, multiply that by five. It becomes 25 minutes. The English person would have to listen and wait until the Bengali, the Hindi, the Arabic, all the other languages are finished, and then you can continue with your statement.
I: Then you answer and then it needs to be translated. That's one. How does all these people from different nationalities working together here, how does that work language-wise? Is it different nationalities in different teams, or do you make--?
R1: Language person. We try to reduce our nationalities frankly. That's why I said the biggest potential is Sri Lankans and Nepalese. Yet, it is a struggle when you have a Sri Lankan supervisor over Nepali team member, it's a struggle. They learn after a while, but first it's difficult. We have translators in the human resource department. When there is a struggle, we call them in, but give them three, four month. They're living together, eating together, playing together. They become friends. They will learn from each other. It becomes easier in time. Go to many Nepalese, they will speak Sri Lankan now. Go to many Sri Lankans, they speak Nepalese now.
I: Over time, they get integrated, I see. That is quite some challenges you have.
R1: Can I tell you a challenge that is nobody think of? In the dormitories, we don't mix people. Of course, we don't mix gender, for sure. We have different buildings for different genders. Put that apart. Within the gender, we don't mix nationalities within the room. The room, this room is Sri Lankan. This room is Indian. This room is Bangladeshi. Then within that nationality, we don't mix religions in the room. Why? If I'm a veg, and you eat beef, you can't accept it, so we separate it. That's I think my biggest struggle.
I: Do you have many rooms, which are not full?
R1: Not many because you always end up with one room that is not full. Not one room, one room per group.
I: One room per group, exactly, that is not full.
R1: Are not full.
I: I hadn't thought about that.
R1: It is a struggle, yes.

I: That is true, but it also makes life interesting, doesn't it? To have many different nationalities. These are the main HR practices I wanted to talk to you about. Now, it's more about maybe time to look into future, time to look into dreams. Your personal point of view, what would you like to change? What would be your dream ideas to even improve, even though you already have a great standard, but maybe there's something you would like to change?

R1: No matter what standards I'll tell you, there is always room for improvement. That's what Kaizen is about. Kaizen is about continuous improvement. There's always room to improve, but your question is related to human resource or general?

I: Human resource first.

R1: What should I say? Our next step. As a sector or as me?

I: As you and your company.

R1: Organization?

I: Organization.

R1: Definitely, we are a trailblazer in the sector. We have changed the industry a lot. What we do the others are copying. Yet, there are still areas that we need to look at. I'll tell you what they are. A lot of soft skill training that I'm asking Better Work and other entities to help me out with, which is we are responsible for our employees 24/7, 365 days a year. Although they only work for us for 10 hours a day, but we are responsible for them even after working hours.

I'm not allowed to put on a curfew because it's not the prison. Yet, when there's a problem, it becomes our problem, and we're often talking about relationships. There's a lot of relationships that takes place outside of work, which we can't control. We give them the freedom. Then, they come here, and they get pregnant. You are living six in a room. It is not an environment for a pregnant mother. You can't have a child. One, besides the law.

The law does not allow you here to be an unmarried in the sense of single and pregnant. Religious reasons.

I: If you live here, even if you're foreigner.

R1: If you're married and you're a single mother, that's fine. If you are not married, and you're having a birth, that's not allowed by law. If they become pregnant, they do abortion on their own. Abortion is not allowed by law in the country. They do abortion through practices that I don't know where they learned it. When do we know about it? When there is medical case, when there is a duty. This is a big issue for me.

It happens probably three times a year, but that's something I need to work on. When you have 1,300 females, it happens. They have relationships. There are boys and girls at the age of-- They're young, at the age of 20s. They're young, they want to have-- They come to freedom, and they came from their families, and they're free here. That's part of our soft skills training, yet it doesn't resonate. When somebody was drinking--

I: They're young and crazy.

R1: Young and-- exactly, you can't control it. I would love to have, and I'm asking Better Work to help me in that too, find for us and telling them to use preservatives also. I cannot do that as the company. That's not allowed because it shows that we are encouraging them to do it, which cannot be seen, so maybe bring a third party to help us in this.

I: Better Work could do that.
R1: Help us in creating that awareness. Thank God, I don't have any suicide cases, which is something for the sector. We don't have that. It shows the way we treat people that it pays back with all there’s there.

I: Otherwise, you have suicide cases here in Jordan?
R1: In the sector, we do.
I: Where do they come from?
R1: What's the background?
I: Yes.
R1: Probably, fall into relationships. A lot happens out of that because we have too many females and less males. It happens.
I: It's usually personal reasons.
R1: Personal reasons.
I: That is one issue where you say I--
R1: That's one issue I would love to see better. Recruitments, I’m happy about it, it's at zero. I can't complain about it. I think taking the sector to the whole level builds the whole sector up because there's a lot of comparisons.
I: How do you mean that? Can you elaborate?
R1: Yes, you have a disparity in the sector that people are good people, and there are others, let's say, that are treating the workers differently. There's a lot of comparisons here. We bring the whole sector up, it brings the whole industry up, and we can compete at equal grounds. Buyers should help us in doing that. Sometimes buyers will ask you to do things that are right, but then when you come to payment, “No, we want it at a cheaper rate.” Somebody else is doing it for me cheaper, so you are not comparing apple to apple. The amount of effort that we put to give you this product, the amount of care that we put in our people, the buyers should pay for it.
I: How is your experience, you have only one buyer now, but you've probably worked with other buyers before. How was your experiences and your cooperation with buyers in that regard? I know they ask a lot, but I also heard they often don't pay for it. What’s your经验?
R1: They don’t pay for it. Your left hand does not know what your right hand is doing. Compliance people are asking for things that the businesspeople will say, “What’s the price? I’ll give it to the cheapest.” It happens a lot.
I: This happened all through your experience.
R1: Of course.
I: Does it make it easy that you’re such a large supplier, operating in many companies so that you have a better, bigger--?
R1: It helps me in keeping the factory full all the time, but it does not help me that we get paid higher. We don’t get paid more than others. How do you compensate? Through productivity, through incentives, that’s how we compensate for it.
I: The pay you get is fixed. The demands you get-
R1: Are more.
I: -are more, and you need to be as productive as possible to actually-
R1: To compensate for it.
I: -to compensate for that and to fulfil that.
R1: Exactly, well said, yes.
I: That’s for me to understand.
R1: Well said, well done.
I: Okay, thank you. We were talking about what you would like to improve. You said one thing was
problems involving pregnant ladies and that maybe Better Work get integrated in this training. You
mentioned that Better Work supports you with training. Which are the stakeholders around you that
support you in regards to HR?
R1: Labour Union, Better Work, I can’t say the government supports us in HR. They don’t. It’s all our
own initiatives that we try to do. We approach the government that we want support like a medical day.
Especially in our Jordanian plant, we do free medical day for the society that we’re in, so part of our
CSR activities. That’s what we seek government support. With the external support that we get in our
internal stuff is mainly Labour Union and Better Work Jordan.
I: How does the Labour Union support you?
R1: Creating awareness, trainings to some people. We give them access to our plant. We’re all part of
the union where everybody pays a contribution every month. They’re part of the union. Officially, there
is one union, but it represents all the workers in that kind of sector.
I: Here in Jordan, you consider Labour Union actually a corporative part, because there are many
countries where there is no--?
R1: Of course, we are like this, but six years ago, we were the first company probably to do a collective
bargaining agreement, where both the Labour Union and the private sector are working together for the
betterment of the sector. I can tell you that the Labour Union is taking us in the middle. They understand
if they push us too much, the sector will break, and they will have no job. They understand that they
can’t push too much, but they push, but to certain extent. We work for the better life of the employees
also. That’s another thing as a sector.
I: That’s interesting to hear because there are many countries or many sectors where it's not that--
R1: Even in [Southeast Asian country], which is my country where my company comes from, labour
unions do not work with the investors.
I: You’re Jordanian, right? Or, used to be.
R1: Personally, yes
I: What does Better Work do for you?
R1: Better Work has three jobs. One, the audits, which the annual assessments for our plants. Number
two, they do the trainings, and they do the advisory. Number three is the advisory. The findings is through
the assessment. The advisory is what they work with us through the year on what’s been found, how to
improve things. The training is what either they bring to us or what we ask them to do for us.
I: What is the most helpful for you in your opinion?
R1: I would say the advisory. It’s continuous. It’s every month. They work with us. It’s very helpful.
I: I know some buyers nowadays take the report from Better Work instead of doing their own audits.
R1: All our buyers do that.
I: They don’t do their own audits any longer.
R1: They depend only on Better Work.
I: Only on the Better Work audits. The Better Work audits, do you consider them fair? Do you consider them accurate?
R1: Yes.
I: These are supporters. Basically, you see them as supporters, not as people who demand or make difficulties for you.
R1: No. They don’t demand anything that is not logical. If I see anything that’s illogical, we discuss. They’re open-minded that they’re going to accept criticism as well as other ideas.
I: They make your life easier. Are there any stakeholders that make your life difficult?
R1: I want to say the government. Probably what makes our life difficult is seeing long term for the sector. Being in the government sector, we are so vulnerable that we don’t see long term ahead of us.
I: Why you’re so vulnerable?
R1: One, we don’t have any raw material being produced in the country. We import all our raw materials. We are dependent on migrant workforce. Accordingly, it’s easy to migrate. The industry itself migrated from the Gulf. Most of the owners are not Jordanians. They are coming from Pakistan, Sri Lanka, India, China, and Taiwan. That’s where the investors are from. Workers are from outside. The raw material is from outside. You can easily take the industry somewhere else, and it’s happening.
Haiti is coming up. El Salvador is coming up, Honduras is coming up, Ethiopia is coming up in Africa. Vietnam, if they find free trading into the US, they will come up. You have many countries that if we are not competing with ourselves, we’re competing with the world. It is a migrating industry. The investor, they want nothing, pack the machines and go somewhere else, send them somewhere else. It’s very easy to migrate.
Now we go to where the Chinese, which is the government and the laws, and the cost. If I cannot project my cost for the next three to five years, if I cannot project the laws that I’m working under for the next three to five years, it’s a very sceptical concept. You know what’s going to happen. Income tax, we’re not subjected to income tax, next year we’re subjected to income tax. Social security law, today, that boat is 22%. Next year, it might be 30, because the social security department is about to back out.
Then you have other problems; it is that much you don’t know, electricity price, water prices, minimum wage, what’s going to happen to it, a lot of variables that you’ve no control.
I: I want to come back to one thing you just said. You said the industry is so vulnerable and all the difficulties that you have to procure your fabric, and so on and so on. What would you say in your opinion, not just for the factory, but more general, is the USP of the Jordanian?
R1: You said what?
I: The unique selling proposition? What is your--?
R1: What’s our pitch?
I: Yes, what’s your pitch of the garment industry in Jordan?
R1: To what? To the US customer or the European customer?
I: To the world. If there is a difference to the U.S. than to the European, then please tell me--
R1: It is different.
I: Then tell me the difference in the pitch.
R1: Let’s start with U.S. Let’s start why do we have the garment sector in Jordan. That’s the question.
I: That’s the free trade?

R1: There is an appetite from the customers who come to Jordan. For the U.S., there is a free-trade agreement that brings them to us. Now, as a sector, what am I selling to U.S.? I’m selling them a garment well made, on time, but that’s not only important. Quality, price, delivery is important. The fourth element is made with heart, made in a compliant way, made in a way that my people are not being slaved to produce this. They work with dignity. It’s a garment made with dignity across our Emirates.

With Europe, I’m not able to see the same statement, because I’m losing one item, which is the price. I’m not able to compete on the price. I’m able to compete on dignity, I’m able to compete on quality and delivery, but I’m not able to compete on the price for Europe.

I: Why?

R1: We’re more expensive than many other countries. The duty on Europe on garments is only 12%, while the duty on the garments we produce in the U.S. is 30%. We get a free-trade agreement, our customer is saving 30%. While in Europe, they’re saving 12%. Jordan is already more expensive than Bangladesh and other countries.

I: For the U.S., the others have to pay 30% or 20%?

R1: 30.

I: 30%. You have a 30% gap difference where labour cost can be more expensive than others. In Europe, you have-

R1: 12%

I: only 12% and that’s not enough.

R1: We’re already more expensive than others by 15%. You can’t compete in Europe.

I: You see any future for Europe or not personally?

R1: That was also asked by the European Bank, and I told them no. I told them there is only one way. You have to give an incentive not to me. Let’s give an incentive to the European buyer to say, “I want to buy out of Jordan. Why? It is recruiting Syrian workforce. It’s helping the refugee crisis of Syria. I want to buy out of Jordan.” Dignity, price, delivery, we can do it. Sorry. Dignity, delivery, quality, we can do it, whatever the European buyer wants. If they are looking at the price, who is the cheapest? Jordan is the not place. We’re not the cheapest company.

I: I took my previous interviews in Egypt.

R1: Exactly. Compared to Egypt--

I: Yes, labour costs are completely different.

R1: $100 in Egypt, $400 Jordan. We’re four times Egypt. You have, the agreements with U.S., they’re at equal competition.

I: Yes, but they don’t have that many foreign workers. They have the--

R1: They have abundance of workforce cheaper than us.

I: They do still have recruitment challenge. They have problems with productivity, turnover, incentive fees challenges more in this regard.

R1: Two people, two in Egypt.

I: We covered all the questions I have from my side. I’m very grateful for your answers. Is there anything that you would say that I need to know, what I missed to ask, but what is crucial for me to know for my research?
R1: If that research would have been read by the government of Jordan, my message is this is a sector that recruits 70,000 people. There’s big potential for the sector to grow. Growing the sector to 1.6 billion to 3 billion, to 3.2, let's double it. Doubling the 70,000 to become 140,000 is a great opportunity in front of us. Even to the US without Europe, we’re exporting to the US 1.6 billion. The US imports 110 billion worth of apparel.

Doubling it to 3 billion is nothing. It's very easy to the US. We just need to see the future. We need to see that there is a future in that sector. If the government would believe in the sector and would take the sector to the next level in allowing the sector to grow, double the 70,000 to become 140,000. We have 50,000 migrant, let them be 100,000. With 20,000 Jordanian, they will become 40,000. We are getting jobs for other 20,000 Jordanian. It’s an industry that could never be dependent on Jordanians only. It has to be co-dependent on Jordanians and migrants.

I: In this regard, I have one question. Do you consider it feasible to have, I think they're trying the 30%. At the moment it's 25%, but they back off.

R1: They back off. They back off.

I: They want the 30%. You think it's feasible for the industry with 30% Jordanian workers or do you think that's already asking too much?

R1: No, 30 is feasible, but more than 30 would not be.

I: Would not be feasible. You say that that's the maximum. Eventually, it's they will find enough companies, they will find enough Jordanian workers they leave.

R1: If you see long term, you would stop thinking of the future, of creating more jobs to Jordanian and training them. When people don't see long term, I’m staying in the country for 20 years, they see that I’m only here for a hit and run, I want to make as much money as I can. Of course, I'd prefer migrants. Yes, migrants are more expensive. We pay food for them, we pay accommodation, incentives, but they're more productive.

The theory that migrant are more expensive than Jordanian is not true. It's true on paper, but the output that you get from a migrant, if we hire them, in Jordan.

I: Net productivity.

R1: Net to net, apple to apple. Migrants is less expensive than Jordanian.

I: Regarding the Jordanians, do you think that there are enough Jordanians who would work in the industry? Are there jobs attractive enough for Jordanians?

R1: Depends on the location. In the capital, no. Go rural, yes, of course.

I: Yes, of course.

R1: When you go rural, yes, of course. South, North, East, West, yes.

I: In [location of the satellite], it’s okay?

R1: I don't have a problem recruiting in [location of the satellite]. I have a waiting list.

I: That's very interesting. It helps my general understanding of the industry. Anything else you would like to highlight?

R1: No, I’m good. That’s all.

I: Thank you.

[End of recording]
Overview of Research Project:
The Quality of Work in Global Supply Chains – Voices from Egypt and Jordan

Background
The quality of work is an important factor of success in today’s business environments. Especially in the production context, it has been shown that a better work environment can enhance a firm’s competitiveness significantly. Studies demonstrate that Human Resource (HR) practices that cater to the well-being of workers reduce turnover and absence rates and boost labour productivity.

However, little research looks at the quality of the work environment in in the Jordanian and Egyptian production contexts. Which job aspects define a high quality of work in these contexts? Which kinds of HR practices are implemented in factories? And which contractual, legal or cultural factors do owners and managers have to pay attention to in order to design successful HR practices? In my research, I want to answer these questions and identify success factors for a quality of work in production in Egypt and Jordan that is good for the competitiveness of the manufacturing firm and good for its workers.

Project
My research project is on HR practices that determine the quality of the work environment in:

- export-oriented firms
- the textiles and clothing industry
- Jordan and Egypt

In my research, I focus on the point of view of the employer (factory owners and managers) and want to look at their perceptions, needs and solutions in regard to the quality of work. I especially want to discuss the question of working time arrangements, compensation & benefits and employer-employee relations and find out which practices are implemented and why. For this purpose, I would like to interview (1) owners & managers of firms and (2) industry & HR experts. If encouraged by factory owners and managers, I will add interviews or focus groups with workers to the research.

Benefits for participants
I will provide a summary of my findings to all participants. They aim to benefit them in following ways:

- **Transfer of successful practices** – The research identifies HR practices impacting on the quality of the work environment in two countries and stages of the supply chain. Successful practices will be highlighted and can serve as references for other companies.

- **Identification of needs for change in the business environment** – The research is one of few existing studies focusing on the employers’ perspective. It identifies factors that support/impede employers in creating a quality of work that benefits the company as well as its workers. The results can be used to develop recommendations for the global or national regulatory/policy environment.

Sponsors
My research is supported by Prof. Dr. Uta Wilkens, Chair for Human Resources and Work Process Management of the Ruhr-University Bochum in Germany and Prof. Dr. Peter Knurring, Chair for Private Sector Development of the Erasmus University Rotterdam in The Netherlands.
Participant Information:
Firm owners and managers

I am pleased to invite you to take part in my PhD research project on the quality of the work environment in global supply chains. As businessmen, you have first-hand experience in managing workers and creating a work environment that serves your economic and your workers’ needs. Thus, I would like to interview you in order to discover what determines a high quality work environment for you and which HR practices are implemented in your company. Thereby, I am especially interested in how you organize working time, compensation & benefits and employee relations. In total, I am conducting 30 interviews with owners and managers in the textiles and clothing industries in Egypt and Jordan.

Interview Format and Topics

- The interview will take approximately 60 minutes.
- The interview will be conducted as a semi-structured interview. This means that there is no fixed questionnaire. Instead, I would like to talk with you about different issues regarding the quality of work in Jordanian clothing factories along three guiding questions.
  - Guiding Questions:
    - Which job aspects define – in your opinion – a high quality work environment for workers?
    - How do you organize working time of factory workers in your firm? Why do you do it like this?
    - How do you organize compensation and benefits for factory workers in your firm? Why?
    - How do you organize employee relations and communication with your workers? Why?
    - Do you face any challenges in regard to the quality of work? How do you overcome them?
- The interview will be conducted in English or with an Arabic translator – as you prefer.
- The interview is voluntary. You have the right not to answer any question, and to stop the interview at any time or for any reason.

Confidentiality and Anonymity

- All information collected from you will only be used for research purposes. The interview minutes/transcripts will be treated strictly confidential and will not be shared with anyone outside my research team which consists of my sponsors, my translators and me.
- Only with your consent, I will use information/quotes from the interview in my dissertation or in any other scientific publications.
- I will anonymise your name and any information that might identify you in the interview minutes/transcripts and in any publications.
- It would help me if I could tape-record our interview instead of having to take notes during the interview. However, I will only do so if you explicitly permit it at the beginning of the interview. Nobody outside my research team would have access to the recordings.

Please contact me with any questions or concerns.
Britta Holzberg  +962-78 1698 712  britta.holzberg@rub.de
نظرية عامة على مشروع البحث:
جودة العمل في سلسلة التوريد العالمية - أصوات من مصر والأردن

خلافيه

جودة العمل هو عامل مهم للنجاح في بيئة أعمال اليوم. ويصبح خاصة في سياق الإنتاج، تبين أن تحسین نوعية العمل يمكن أن تancement الفرصة التنافسية للشركة بدرجة كبيرة. وتشير الدراسات أن ممارسات الموارد البشرية التي تخدم نظم العمل وتقل من معدلات الdefaults وتعزز الإنتاجية العام.

وعلي ذلك فإن القليل من البحث بحث في جودة العمل في سياقات الإنتاج الأردنية والمصرية، ما هي الجوانب الوظيفية التي تحدد جودة عامة للعمل في هذه السياقات؟ ما هي أنواع ممارسات الموارد البشرية التي تتم تطبيقها في المصانع؟ وما هي العوامل الثقافية أو القانونية أو الثقافية التي تحدد على المشاركين والمديرين إدراكهم من أجل التحسين ممارسات موارد بشرية للنجاح في بحثي أردن الإجابة على هذه الأسئلة وتحديد عوامل النجاح لجودة العمل في الإنتاج في الأردن ومصر المجيد للنماذج بين شركات الصناعية والعمالة.

مشروع بحثي هو على ممارسات الموارد البشرية التي تحدد جودة العمل في الإنتاج في:
- الشركات الموجهة للتصدير في صناعة المنسوجات والملايين في:
- الأردن ومصر

في بحثي، أركز على وجهة نظر صاحب العمل (أصحاب المصانع والمديرين) وأريد النظر إلى تصوراتهم واحتياجاتهم وحلولهم فيما يتعلق بجودة العمل. وأورد بصفة خاصة مسالة مسألة ترزيت وقت العمل، التوقيتات والمزايا والعلاقات بين صاحب العمل والموظف ومساحة العمل. يصف هذا الخرط، أورد أن النماذج (1) أصحاب ومديري الشركات و (2) خبراء الصناعة والموارد البشرية. إذا شجع من قبل أصحاب المصانع والمديرين، سوف أضع مجموعات أو فوائد للمشاركين

سأقدم موجزاً عن استنتاجاتي إلى جميع المشاركين. وهو يهدف إلى الإستفادة منها بالطرق التالية:
- تقل الممارسات الناجحة - يحدد البحث ممارسات الموارد البشرية التي تؤثر على جودة العمل في بلدان ومحالي سلسلة التوريد. ويساعد تحليل الوضع على الممارسات الناجحة ويمكن أن تكون بمثابة رؤية لمنظمات الأخرى.
- تحدي الإحتياجات والفقر في بيئة الأعمال - البحث هو واحد من عدد قليل من الدراسات القائمة التي تركز على عوامل الأداء. وهو يحدد العوامل التي تدعم رفع أرباب العمل في حق جودة العمل التي تعود على الشركة وكذلك عمالة. ويمكن استعمال النتائج لوضع توصيات لهذه القطاعات/السياسات العالمية أو الوطنية.

الرعاية

ويدعم بحثي الأستاذ الدكتور أولا وبكتر، رئيس الموارد البشرية وإدارة العملية والعمل في جامعة روتردام في هولندا والأستاذ الدكتور بيتز نورينغ، رئيس تطوير القطاع الخاص في جامعة إيراسموس روتردام في هولندا.
معنويات للمشاركين
 أصحاب الشركات والمديرين

يسمح ان يدعمك للمشاركة في مشروع لبحث الدكتوراه حول جودة العمل في سلسلة التوريد العالمية. كرجال أعمال، لدينا
خبرة مباشرة في إدارة العمل ولعل بينكم طابع اختياراتكم الاقتصادية والعمالية. أيضًا، أود أن أجري محادثة معكم
من أجل اكتشاف ما يحدد بين عمل عامل الجودة بالنسبة لكم ومارسات المواد الشترورية التي يتم تنفيذها في شركاتكم. وبالتالي،
أنا مهتمة بشكل خاص في كيفية تنظيم وقت العمل، والعوامل والعلاقات مع الموظفين. وسأجري مقابلة مع أصحاب ومديرين في صناعة المنسوجات والملاس في الأردن ومصر.

تنسيق المقابلة والمواعيد

- ستستغرق المقابلة حوالي 60 دقيقة.
- ستجرى المقابلة كمكملة ثقة منتظمة. وهذا يعني أنه لا يوجد استمارة ثابتة. بدلاً من ذلك، أود أن أتحدث معكم عن
فصول مختلفة في عالم العمل في مصانع الملابس في الأردن ومصر.

- توجيه الأسئلة:

- ما هي الجوانب العملية التي تحدد - في رأيكم - جودة عمل عامل لعمال الإنتاج؟
- كيف تنظر عن عمل عامل المصانع في شركاتكم؟ ماذا تفعل بذلك؟
- كيف يمكن تجنب التوترات والنزاعات لعمال المصانع في شركاتكم؟ ماذا تفعل بذلك؟
- كيف يمكن تجنب الاعتصامات والتوصل مع عمالكم؟ ماذا تفعل بذلك؟
- هل تواجه أي تحديات فيما يتعلق بجودة العمل؟ كيف تتعاملون عليها؟

- ستجرى المقابلات باللغة الإنجليزية أو مع مترجم عربي - كما تفضل.
- المقابلة تطوعية. لديك الحق في عدم الإجابة على أي سؤال، ويمكنك وقف المقابلة في أي وقت أو لأي سبب من
الأسباب.

السريرية وعدم كشف الهوية

- ستتم استخدام جميع المعلومات التي تم جمعها منكم فقط لأغراض البحث. سيتم التعامل مع نص المقابلة بسرية نامية ولن يتم
مشاركتها مع أي شخص خارج فريق البحث الذي تكون من رعاة ومترجمة في.
- عند انتهاء هذا الدراسة، سوف نستخدم المعلومات/الإفصاحات من المقابلة في نشر بحثي أو في أي منشورات علمية أخرى
- سأقوم بإعداد سكين، وأي معلومات قد تحدث في نص المقابلة لأي منشورات.
- سيستغرق إذا أجريت أسئلة سهلة المقابلة، لأن من الضروري أن تكون الأسئلة المغلقة. ومع ذلك، لن أفعل ذلك
- إذا كنت لميكنك في بدء المقابلة، لا أقدر التوجه وحيدًا لوصول إلى هذه النتائج.
Overview of Research Project:
The Quality of Work in Global Supply Chains – Voices from Egypt and Jordan

Background
The quality of work is an important factor of success in today’s business environments. Especially in the production context, it has been shown that a better quality of work can enhance a firm’s competitiveness significantly. Studies demonstrate that Human Resource (HR) practices that cater to the well-being of workers reduce turnover and absence rates and boost labour productivity.

However, little research looks at the quality of work in in the Jordanian and Egyptian production contexts. Which job aspects define a high quality of work in these contexts? Which kinds of HR practices are implemented in factories? And which contractual, legal or cultural factors do owners and managers have to pay attention to in order to design successful HR practices? In my research, I want to answer these questions and identify success factors for a quality of work in production in Egypt and Jordan that is good for the competitiveness of the manufacturing firm and good for its workers.

Project
My research project is on HR practices that determine the quality of work in production in:

- export-oriented firms in
- the textiles and clothing industry in
- Jordan and Egypt

In my research, I focus on the point of view of the employer (factory owners and managers) and want to look at their perceptions, needs and solutions in regard to the quality of work. I especially want to discuss the question of working time arrangements, compensation & benefits and employer-employee relations and find out which practices are implemented and why. For this purpose, I would like to interview (1) owners & managers of firms and (2) industry & HR experts. If encouraged by factory owners and managers, I will add interviews or focus groups with workers to the research.

Benefits for participants
I will provide a summary of my findings to all participants. They aim to benefit them in following ways:

- Transfer of successful practices – The research identifies HR practices impacting on the quality of work in two countries and stages of the supply chain. Successful practices will be highlighted and can serve as references for other companies.

- Identification of needs for change in the business environment – The research is one of few existing studies focusing on the employers’ perspective. It identifies factors that support/impede employers in creating a quality of work that benefits the company as well as its workers. The results can be used to develop recommendations for the global or national regulatory/policy environment.

Sponsors
My research is supported by Prof. Dr. Uta Wilkens, Chair for Human Resources and Work Process Management of the Ruhr-University Bochum in Germany and Prof. Dr. Peter Knorringa, Chair for Private Sector Development of the Erasmus University Rotterdam in The Netherlands.
Participant Information:
Industry/ Labour Experts

I am pleased to invite you to take part in my PhD research project on the quality of work in export industries. I selected you because of your extensive experience in the garment industry in Jordan. I would like to interview you in order to learn about current work-related ‘hot-topics’ in the garment industry as well as the current (institutional/cultural/trade/economic) context of local firms and its impact on HR practices and the quality of work in factories.

Interview Format and Topics

- The interview will take approximately 60-90 minutes.
- The interview will be conducted as a semi-structured interview. This means that there is no fixed questionnaire. Instead, I would like to talk with you about different issues regarding the quality of work in the Jordanian garment industry along three guiding questions.
  - Guiding Questions:
    - What are currently work-related ‘hot-topics’/debates/concerns in the garment industry?
    - What does the (institutional/cultural/trade/economic) context of garment companies look like in Jordan?
    - In how far does the (institutional/cultural/trade/economic) context of garment companies influence HR practices and the quality of work in their factories?
- The interview will be conducted in English
- The interview is voluntary. You have the right not to answer any question, and to stop the interview at any time or for any reason.

Confidentiality and Anonymity

- All information collected from you will only be used for research purposes. The interview minutes/transcripts will be treated strictly confidential and will not be shared with anyone outside my research team which consists of my sponsors, my translators and me.
- Only with your consent, I will use information/quotes from the interview in my dissertation or in any other scientific publications.
- I will anonymise your name and any information that might identify you in the interview minutes/transcripts and in any publications.
- It would help me if I could tape-record our interview instead of having to take notes during the interview. However, I will only do so if you explicitly permit it at the beginning of the interview. Nobody outside my research team would have access to the recordings.

Please contact me with any questions or concerns.

Britta Holzberg  ☎️ britta.holzberg@rub.de.

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN INTERVIEW
PhD Project: The Quality of Work in Global Supply Chains – Voices from Egypt and Jordan

April/May, 2018

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to interview you on HR practices that determine the quality of the work environment your company. The interview is part of my PhD project at the Institute of Development Research and Development Policy of the Ruhr-University Bochum and the Institute of Social Studies of the Erasmus University Rotterdam. You have been briefed about the purpose of the study and why you were selected as a possible participant. Please read the information below and ask questions about anything you do not understand, before deciding whether or not to participate.

• This interview is voluntary. You have the right not to answer any question, and to stop the interview at any time or for any reason. I expect that the interview will take about 60 minutes.
• You will not be compensated for this interview.
• Unless you give me permission to use your name and organization in any publications that may result from this research, the information you tell me will be confidential.
• I would like to record this interview so that I can use it for reference while proceeding with this study. I will not record this interview without your permission. If you do grant permission for this conversation to be recorded, you have the right to revoke recording permission and/or end the interview at any time.

This project will be completed by March 2020. All interview recordings will be stored in a secure work space until 1 year after that date. The recordings will then be destroyed.

I understand the procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

I give permission for this interview to be recorded.
I give permission to use direct quotes in publications resulting from this study.
[ ] I want my name and organization to be mentioned in publications resulting from this study.

Name ____________________________ Date ________________ Signature __________________________
Participant

Name Britta Holzberg Date ________________ Signature __________________________
Researcher

Please contact me with any questions or concerns:
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Britta Holzberg
Fax +49 172 4419900
britta.holzberg@rub.de

DATA PROTECTION OFFICE OF THE
RUHR-UNIVERSITY BOCHUM
Data Protection Officer
Universitätstrasse 150, 44780 Bochum

Dr. Kai-Uwe Loser
Fax +49 (234) 322-8720
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نموذج موافقة على المشاركة في المقابلة
مشروع الدكتوراه: جودة العمل في سلسلة التوريد العالمية - أصوات من مصر والأردن

أشكركم على إعطائي الفرصة لمشاركتي في ممارسات الموارد البشرية التي تحدد جودة العمل في الإنتاج. المقابلة هي جزء من مشروع الدكتوراه في معهد بحوث التنمية وسياسة التنمية من جامعة رويه بيوخوم ومعهد الدراسات الاجتماعية من جامعة أبرسموس روتردام. لقد تم إطلاقنا على الفرص من الدراسة وسبب اختياركم مستمرين محتفظين. يرجى قراءة المعلومات أدناه وطرح الأسئلة حول أي شيء ليس مفهوم قبل اتخاذ قرار بشأن المشاركة أو عدم المشاركة.

- هذه المقابلة تتبع. نود أن يكون في عدم الإجابة على أي أسئلة، ووقف المقابلة في أي وقت، ولا يمكن من الأسباب. زمن المقابلة لهذه المقابلة هو 45 دقيقة.
- ليس هناك مقابل ماني أو معوي من هذه المقابلة.
- لما تميزت، إذا لم تستخدم أسمك أو اسم شركتك، عواملك أو أقتباسك في أي منشورات قد تفتح عن هذا البحث، فإن المعلومات التي تديرها بها ستكون سرية.
- أود أن أستعرض هذه المقابلة حتى أتمكن من استخدامها كمرجع أثناء السير في هذه الدراسة. لن أحل هذه المقابلة بدون موافقة معلقة. إذا تم منح إذن السجل، لذل نفس الحق في الدراسة إصدار السجل أو إبقاء المقابلة في أي وقت.

سأتقدم من خلال هذا المشروع من قبل مارس 2022. سيتم تخزين جميع التسجيلات المقابلة في مكان عمل آمن حتى سنة بعد ذلك التاريخ، ثم سيتم تدمير جميع التسجيلات.

أنا أفهم الإجراءات المذكورة أعلاه ثم الرد على أسئلتي، وأنا أوافق على المشاركة في هذه الدراسة. وقد أعطيت نسخة من هذا النموذج.

ناء موافق بتسجيل هذه المقابلة
أوافق على استخدام البيانات المذكورة من هذه المقابلة في المنشورات الناتجة عن هذه الدراسة. [ ]
أوافق على استخدام اسمي أو أسم شركتي في المنشورات الناتجة عن هذه الدراسة.

الاسم — آلة الموافقة
التوقيع

الاسم — بريتا هولزبرغ
التوقيع

لا بحث

يرجى الاتصال بي لأي أسئلة أو استفسارات.

INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT POLICY
PhD in International Development Studies
Universitätsstr. 105, 44789 Bochum

Britta Holzberg
Fon +49 172 4419900
britta.holzberg@rub.de

DATA PROTECTION OFFICE OF THE
RUHR-UNIVERSITY BOCHUM
Data Protection Officer
Universitätstrasse 150, 44780 Bochum

Dr. Kai-Uwe Lauer
Fon +49 (234) 322-8720
dbo@rub.de
### Annex 15. Profiles of interviewed experts (chapter 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type of expert</th>
<th>Type of organisation</th>
<th>Local/ International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>J02E01</td>
<td>Industry expert</td>
<td>Employer organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>J03E02</td>
<td>Industry expert</td>
<td>Employer organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>J04E03</td>
<td>Labour expert</td>
<td>Development and training organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>J11E04</td>
<td>Labour expert</td>
<td>Development and training organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>J15E05</td>
<td>Industry expert</td>
<td>Employer organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>J17E06</td>
<td>Labour expert</td>
<td>Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>J21E07</td>
<td>Labour expert</td>
<td>Development and training organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annex 16. Profiles of interviewed factory owners-managers (chapter 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Firm type</th>
<th>Factory location</th>
<th>Approx. no. of workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>J05F02</td>
<td>HR &amp; Compliance</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>Direct exporter</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>J07F04</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>Direct exporter</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>J08F05</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>Direct exporter</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>J09F06</td>
<td>COO</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>Direct exporter</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>J16F11</td>
<td>Factory Manager</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>Direct exporter</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>J18F12</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>Direct exporter</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>J19F13</td>
<td>HR &amp; Compliance</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>Direct exporter</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>J06F03</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>Ex subcontractor</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>J12F08</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>Subcontractor</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>J13F09</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>Subcontractor</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>J01F01</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>Local market</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>J10F07</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>Local market</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>J14F10</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>Local market</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 17. Overview of analysed documents (selection) (chapter 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MoU-2014 Memorandum of Understanding on Equalizing Payment of Wages and Benefits for all Workers (2014) between (1) Jordan Garments, Accessories &amp; Textiles Exporters Association (JGATE), General Union of Garment Factories and (2) General Trade Union of Workers in Textile, Garment and Clothing Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CBA-2013 Collective Agreement (2013) between (1) Jordan Garments, Accessories &amp; Textiles Exporters Association (JGATE), The Association of Owners of Factories, Workshops and Garments (AOFWG) and (2) General Trade Union of Workers in Textile, Garment and Clothing Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>MoL-2007 Ministry of Labor Jordan (2007), Labor Compliance in Jordan’s Apparel Sector: Actions to date and next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Union-Info Union (unknown), You are not alone: Worker Leaflet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Union-2018 Union (2018), Worker statistics 01/2016 -30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Chamber-2018 Amman Chamber of Industry (2018), Directory of Jordanian Exporters 2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>BWJ-Evaluation-2013 Al Jidara (2013), Final Independent Evaluation of Better Work Jordan – Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>BWJ-Plan-2013 Al Jidara (2013), Sustainability Plan for the Better Work Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 BWJ-Study-2012</td>
<td>BWJ (2012), Employment of Jordanians in the Garment Industry: Challenges and Prospects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 BWJ-Study-2013</td>
<td>BW (2013), The Collective Bargaining Agreement in Jordan’s Garment Industry: Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 BWJ-Study-2014</td>
<td>BWJ (2014), Addressing Sexual Harassment in Jordan’s Garment Industry: Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 BWJ-Study-2014</td>
<td>BWJ (2014), Addressing Sexual Harassment in Jordan’s Garment Industry: Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 BW-Study-2013</td>
<td>BWJ (2013), Garment Industry Baseline Report: worker perspectives from the factory and beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 BW-Study-2014</td>
<td>BW (2014), Addressing Sexual Harassment in Jordan’s garment industry: Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 BWJ-Survey-2019</td>
<td>BWJ (2019), Worker Voice Survey Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 BWJ-Guide-2012</td>
<td>BWJ (2012), Good Practices: Apparel – Better working conditions, better business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>BWJ (2016), Better Work Jordan 8th Annual Buyers’ Forum: Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>BWJ (2016), Better Work Public Reporting: Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>BWJ (2019), Celebrating a ten-year journey in Jordan: Highlights and achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>BW (2016), Public Reporting: Frequently Asked Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Business and Human Rights Resource Centre (2018), Jordan’s Garment Sector: How are brands combating worker exploitation and abuse?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Clean Clothes Campaign (2009), False Promises: Migrant workers in the Global Garment Industry, Discussion Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>EU (2014), Strategic Plan of the Garment Manufacture Sector in Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>FIAS (2008), Competitiveness and Corporate Social Responsibility in the Jordanian Apparel Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Institute for Global Labour and Human Rights (2011), Sexual predators and serial rapist run wild at Wal-Mart supplier in Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Institute for Global Labour and Human Rights (2011), Another crisis in Jordan: Workers strike the IBGM Factory over illegal sweatshop conditions, strikers beaten and threatened with forcible deportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Institute for Global Labour and Human Rights (2012), Ten years into the U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement: Brutal sweatshop conditions endure at the Taiwanese-owned Rich Pine Factory with gruelling mandatory seven-day 96-hour work weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Institute for Global Labour and Human Rights (2013), President Obama may very well clean up the U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>National Labor Committee (2006), U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement Descends into Human Trafficking &amp; Involuntary Servitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Jordan Times (23 October 2014), Culture of shame, low salaries driving Jordanians away from industry sector jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Jordan Times (05 April 2015), Jordan’s garment sector offers more benefits to guest workers — report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Jordan Times (16 May 2015), Int’l survey highlights strong impact of refugee influx on employment among Jordanians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Jordan Times (13 July 2015), Garment factory workers strike to demand higher salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Jordan Times (18 August 2016), Violations at garment factories ‘minor’ — Labour Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Jordan Times (10 November 2016), Officials, activists act swiftly to rescue ‘abused foreign labourers’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Jordan Times (22 November 2016), Syrians’ reluctance to work in industrial sector threatens future of ‘rules-of-origin’ deal with EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>News-2017-02, Jordan Times (25 February 2017), Minister orders factory closure after alleged abuse of guest workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>News-2017-07, Jordan Times (24 July 2017), Only two Jordanian companies benefiting from EU relaxed rules of origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>News-2018-02, Jordan Times (22 February 2018), Minimum wages need to be increased to cope with price, tax hikes — experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>News-2018-08, Jordan Times (04 August 2018), Stakeholders join forces for effective partnerships in garment sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 18. Category system of the analysis (chapter 3)

#### Category System Part A. Enablers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Cat.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Global-level developments</td>
<td>1.1 Public actors</td>
<td>1.1.1 Countries importing from Jordan: Pressure to improve decent work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.2 Countries importing from Jordan: Technical and financial support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.3 Int’l organisations: Pressure/support to implement labour standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Business actors</td>
<td>1.2.1 Global buyers: Pressure to implement private labour standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.2 Global buyers: Private audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Labour (social) actors</td>
<td>1.3.1 Global unions: Technical and financial support of local actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3.2 Global NGOs: Reports on decent work realities in Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Local-industry-level developments</td>
<td>2.1 Public actors</td>
<td>2.1.1 Legal institutions: Development of national labour laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2 Labour inspectorate: Development of factory audit capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.3 Labour initiatives: Technical support and training centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Business actors</td>
<td>2.2.1 Employer organisations: Decent work sensitivity and capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.2 Employer organisations: Pressure to improve decent work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Labour (social) actors</td>
<td>2.3.1 Union: Development of decent work sensitivity and capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.2 Union: Increase of resources to lobby for decent work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.3 Union: Increase of resources to represent all workers, incl. migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.4 Local NGOs: Reports on decent work realities in Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Stakeholder collaboration</td>
<td>2.4.1 Business-Labour: Collective bargaining process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.2 Business-Labour: Ad-hoc dialogue on conflicts and opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.3 Public-Business-Labour: Dialogue in BWJ PAC meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Factory-level developments</td>
<td>3.1 Employers</td>
<td>3.1.1 Development of decent work sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.2 Development of decent work capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.3 Development/ existence of financial and organisational resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Workers</td>
<td>3.2.1 Development of worker bargaining power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.2 Development of decent work sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Dialogue</td>
<td>3.3.1 Development of formal dialogue channels on factory level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.2 Improvement of day-to-day communication on factory floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Better Work Jordan</td>
<td>4.1 Consulting &amp; Capacity Building</td>
<td>4.1.1 Business stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.2 Labour stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.3 Public stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Monitoring &amp; Factory Assessment</td>
<td>4.2.1 Business stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.2 Labour stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.3 Public stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Facilitation &amp; coordination</td>
<td>4.3.1 Transparency across stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.2 Dialogue between stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.3 Problem-solving with stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 Success factors</td>
<td>4.4.1 (Legal) obligation to participate in BWJ program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4.2 Acceptance and respect of BWJ across stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Sub-Category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Competitiveness of the Jordanian export industry</td>
<td>1.1 Buyer price and procurement pressure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 High labour costs in Jordan compared to global competition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 High risks of investment due to frequent local institutional changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Especially weak bargaining position of subcontractors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Institutional environment in Jordan</td>
<td>2.1 Intense bureaucracy and frequent changes in regulatory demands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Cooperation difficulties between public and business actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Mismatch between national strategy for garment industry and business (exporters) needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Limits of social auditing</td>
<td>3.1 Plurality of factory audits (BWJ audits, buyer audits, local audits)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Room for deceit and blind spots in factory audits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Limited scope of BWJ audits (focus on local laws, labour standards)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 Limited reach of auditors (focus on factory floor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Worker vulnerability</td>
<td>4.1 Vulnerability of migrant labour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Vulnerability of local labour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 19. Excerpt of the coding frame (chapter 3)

**Main category:** 4. Enablers: Better Work Jordan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory 1</th>
<th>Subcategory 2</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sample Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Consulting &amp; Capacity Building</td>
<td>4.1.1 Business stakeholders</td>
<td>Statements highlighting that BWJ consults, trains, or coaches business stakeholders</td>
<td>Better Work teach us 90% from what auditors need. [J08F05]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.2 Labour stakeholders</td>
<td>Statements highlighting that BWJ consults, trains, or coaches labour stakeholders</td>
<td>BWJ also expanded its training services through the piloting of innovative sexual harassment prevention training for managers, supervisors, and workers. [BWJ-Report-2013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.3 Public stakeholders</td>
<td>Statements highlighting that BWJ consults, trains, or coaches public stakeholders</td>
<td>BWJ is training labour inspectors […]. Training topics include […] the Better Work model and compliance tool and investigating and addressing sexual harassment. [BWJ-Report-2018]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Monitoring &amp; Factory Assessment</td>
<td>4.2.1 Business stakeholders</td>
<td>Statements highlighting that BWJ monitors or assesses activities of business stakeholders.</td>
<td>Better Work is watching you. That is good, Better Work, it is good that we have them. […] One needs someone, an external buddy, who says, this is right, this is wrong [J02E01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.2 Labour stakeholders</td>
<td>Statements highlighting that BWJ monitors or assesses activities of labour stakeholders.</td>
<td>Given the single trade union structure prescribed by national law, all factories continue to be non-compliant under Freedom to Associate. [BWJ-Report-2018]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.3 Public stakeholders</td>
<td>Statements highlighting that BWJ monitors or assesses activities of publics stakeholders.</td>
<td>[Discrimination in pay increased to] 83% of factories assessed more than once. This is due to the fact that the minimum wage increase that went into effect February 2012 differed for migrant workers as compared to Jordanian workers. [BWJ-Report-2013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Facilitation &amp; Coordination</td>
<td>4.3.1 Transparency across stakeholders</td>
<td>Statements highlighting that BWJ contributes to establishing transparency concerning labour issues across stakeholder groups.</td>
<td>BWJ has 29 key assessment questions which they publish openly on the internet: “Transparency Portal” [J04E03]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.2 Dialogue between stakeholders</td>
<td>Statements highlighting that BWJ contributes to establishing dialogue on labour issues between stakeholder groups.</td>
<td>[PICCs existed] since long time with the labour union. They’ve got more organized with BWJ, when BWJ started. BWJ started in 2009. That’s when it got official, more documented” [J07F04]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.3 Problem-solving with stakeholders</td>
<td>Statements highlighting that BWJ contributes to solve (arising) problems between stakeholder groups.</td>
<td>BWJ is perceived by current buyers […] as a problem solver […]. For example, when it came to recruitment fees, BWJ was able to bring together the MoL, relevant embassies, employers, employer associations, which resulted in significantly reducing or eliminating recruitment fees from some countries [BWJ-Evaluation-2013]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Annex 20. Labour standards on working hours in Egypt and Jordan (2017 - 2018)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regular Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>Regular Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>Regular Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>Regular Hours</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ max. 6 d workweek</td>
<td>▪ max. 6 d workweek</td>
<td>▪ max. 6 d workweek</td>
<td>▪ max. 6 d workweek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ max. 48 h/w</td>
<td>▪ max. 48 h/w, ~ 8 h/d</td>
<td>▪ max. 48 h/w, ~ 8 h/d</td>
<td>▪ max. 48 h/w, ~ 8 h/d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ 40 h/w recommended</td>
<td>▪ max. 11 h/d</td>
<td>▪ max. 11 h/d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overtime (OT) (max. 12 OT-hours/w) allowed if:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Overtime (OT) (max. 12 OT-hours/w) allowed if:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Overtime (OT) (max. 12 OT-hours/w) allowed if:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Overtime (OT) (max. 12 OT-hours/w) allowed if:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ voluntary</td>
<td>▪ voluntary</td>
<td>▪ voluntary</td>
<td>▪ voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ temporary</td>
<td>▪ temporary</td>
<td>▪ temporary</td>
<td>▪ temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ paid with premium</td>
<td>▪ paid with premium</td>
<td>▪ paid with premium</td>
<td>▪ paid with premium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ no harm to workers</td>
<td>▪ no harm to workers</td>
<td>▪ no harm to workers</td>
<td>▪ no harm to workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excessive OT (&gt; 60 h/w)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Excessive OT (&gt; 60 h/w)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Excessive OT (&gt; 60 h/w)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Excessive OT (&gt; 60 h/w)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ mostly prohibited with exceptions</td>
<td>▪ according to local law</td>
<td>▪ not prohibited</td>
<td>▪ prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breaks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Breaks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Breaks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Breaks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ according to local law</td>
<td>▪ according to local law</td>
<td>▪ mandatory</td>
<td>▪ min. 60 m breaktime in regular hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ duration not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Local specifics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Reduced hours during Ramadan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Women prohibited to work at night</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Local specifics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Firms decide on Ramadan regulations in the private sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Women prohibited to work at night</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 21. Profiles of interviewed factory owners-managers (chapter 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Role(s)</th>
<th>Local/ Migrant</th>
<th>Factory location</th>
<th>Approx. no. of workers</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E01F01 General, Manager, IT Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>EG RMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>E07F04 General Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>EG RMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>E11F08 HR Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>EG RMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E12F09 General Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>EG RMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E17F12 General Manager, HR Manager, Compliance Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>EG RMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>E21F16 General Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>EG RMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>E24F19 Export Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>EG RMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>E25F20 Owners</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>EG RMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>E27F22 Owner, General Manager, HR Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>EG RMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>E28F23 Owners</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>EG RMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>E30F24 Owners</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>EG RMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>E06F03 General Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>EG TEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>E10F07 HR Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>EG TEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>E13F10 Owner, HR Managers</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>EG TEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>E23F18 Technical Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>EG TEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>E31F25 General Manager, HR Manager, Export Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>EG TEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>E05F02 Owner</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>EG RMG-TEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>E16F11 HR Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>EG RMG-TEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>E19F14 Owner</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>EG RMG-TEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>E20F15 Owner</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>EG RMG-TEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>J05F02 HR &amp; Compliance</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>JO tier-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>J07F04 General Manager</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>JO tier-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>J08F05 HR Manager</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>JO tier-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>J09F06 COO</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>JO tier-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>J16F11 Factory Manager</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>JO tier-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>J18F12 General Manager</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>JO tier-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>J19F13 HR &amp; Compliance</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>JO tier-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>J06F03 Owner</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>JO tier-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>J12F08 Owner</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>JO tier-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>J13F09 Owner</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>JO tier-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 22. Profiles of interviewed experts (chapter 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type of expert</th>
<th>Type of organisation</th>
<th>Local/ International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E02E01 Labour expert</td>
<td>Development organisation</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>E03E02 Industry expert</td>
<td>Development organisation</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>E04E03 Industry &amp; labour expert</td>
<td>Development organisation</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E14E04 Industry expert</td>
<td>Chamber</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E15E05 Labour expert</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>E29E06 Industry expert</td>
<td>Federation</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>J02E01 Industry expert</td>
<td>Employer organisation</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>J03E02 Industry expert</td>
<td>Employer organisation</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>J04E03 Labour expert</td>
<td>Development organisation</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>J11E04 Labour expert</td>
<td>Training organisation</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>J15E05 Industry expert</td>
<td>Employer organisation</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>J17E06 Labour expert</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>J21E07 Labour expert</td>
<td>Development organisation</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annex 23. Profiles of interviewed workers (chapter 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Local/ Migrant</th>
<th>Stage/ node of supply chain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E32W01 Male</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>EG TEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>E32W02 Male</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>EG TEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>E33W03 Female</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>EG RMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E33W04 Male</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>EG RMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E34W05 Male</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>EG RMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>E34W06 Female</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>EG RMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>E34W07 Female</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>EG RMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>J20W01 mixed, approx. 60% female</td>
<td>18-35</td>
<td>95% Migrant, 5% Jordanian</td>
<td>JO tier-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(250)
Annex 24. Final pattern matching frame (chapter 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Theor. indicated patterns</th>
<th>Empirically observed patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JO tier-1 Mig</td>
<td>JO tier-2 Jor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Working Time Designs</td>
<td>1. Regular hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Days/ week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hours/ shift</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Overtime hours (OT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1. Hours/shift</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2. Frequency of OT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3. Voluntariness of OT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4. OT premium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Excessive hours (ET)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1. Hours/shift</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2. Frequency of ET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3. Voluntariness of ET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4. ET premium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Beaks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1. Break time/ shift</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2. Extra break/ OT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Working Time Rationales</td>
<td>1. Global drivers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1. Buyer power: procurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2. Buyer power: labour standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3. Buyer power: conflicts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4. International headquarter power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Local drivers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1. National laws and regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2. National education system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3. Local culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Firm resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1. Human resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2. Intellectual resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3. Physical resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4. Financial resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Cross-level drivers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1. Multi-stakeholder initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2. Capacity-building opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 25. Overview of working hours practices in each research case (chapter 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working times arrangements</th>
<th>JO tier-1 Jordanians</th>
<th>JO tier-1 Migrants</th>
<th>JO tier-2 Migrants</th>
<th>EG RMG tier-1</th>
<th>EG TEX 3-shifts</th>
<th>EG TEX 2-shifts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Regular hours (as defined by respondent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Working days per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 d</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 d</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Hours per shift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 h, incl. break</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 h, incl. break</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 h, excl. break</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5 h, incl. break</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Overtime (OT) hours (as defined by respondent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 OT hours per shift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no OT</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 h</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 h</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 h</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Frequency of OT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rare</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Voluntariness of OT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voluntary</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limited OT is the regular thing to do</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limited OT demanded for business needs</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limited OT occurred with loyalty bonus</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forced</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Excessive OT hours (as defined by respondent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Excessive OT per shift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no excessive OT</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 2 h</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 3 h</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8 h</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 extra shift</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 24 h</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Frequency of excessive OT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rare</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regular</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Breaks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Break time per shift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 m</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 m</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 m</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 60 m</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: The size of the bubble illustrates how many respondents reported their firm to implement a certain practice.
Note 2: The terms “regular hours”, “overtime hours”, and “excessive hours” are used in this graphic as implied by respondents, e.g. Textiles owners-managers characterized 8 h/d plus 4 OT h/d as their regular hours and the use of an extra shift as exceptional or excessive. For the pattern matching procedure and in the description of results, they were adjusted to the definitions used in global labour standards to make them comparable.
Annex 26. Profiles of interviewed factory owners-managers (chapter 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factory Code</th>
<th>Factory location</th>
<th>Factory type</th>
<th>Approx. no. of workers</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Local/Migrant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 E01F01</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>tier-1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>IT Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 E07F04</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>tier-1</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 E08F05</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>tier-2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 E11F08</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>tier-1</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 E12F09</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>tier-1</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 E17F12</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>tier-1</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 E21F16</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>tier-1</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 E22F17</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>tier-2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner 1</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Owner 2</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 E24F19</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>tier-1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Export Manager</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 E25F20</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>tier-1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner 1</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Owner 2</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 E26F21</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>tier-2</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 E28F23</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>tier-1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner 1</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Owner 2</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 E30F24</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>tier-1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 J05F02</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>tier-1</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>HR &amp; Compliance</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 J06F03</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>tier-2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 J07F04</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>tier-1</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 J08F05</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>tier-1</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 J09F06</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>tier-1</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>COO</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 J12F08</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>tier-2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 J13F09</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>tier-2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 J16F11</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>tier-1</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Factory Manager</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 J18F12</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>tier-1</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>HR &amp; Compliance</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 J19F13</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>tier-1</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>HR &amp; Compliance</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 27. Global, organising, and basic themes (chapter 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global theme</th>
<th>Organising theme</th>
<th>Basic theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (Paternalistic) family responsibility</td>
<td>1.1 Image</td>
<td>1.1.1 (Paternalistic) family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.2 Home away from home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.3 Collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Objective</td>
<td>1.2.1 Ensure well-being of worker in all areas of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.2 Educate and discipline workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Employer-worker relationship</td>
<td>1.3.1 Employer-workers are close/ one unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3.2 Employer as parent/ caretaker; worker as child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3.3 Relationship values: honesty, respect, loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Typical practices (top 9)</td>
<td>1.4.1 Support of personal (especially financial) problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4.2 Direct communication with top management (open door)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4.3 Work-life balance support (nursery, shortened working hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4.4 Decent salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4.5 Factory in residential area (short commute)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4.6 Offer of leisure time activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4.7 Homely work environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4.8 Fair and respectful treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4.9 Safe work environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Business responsibility</td>
<td>2.1 Image</td>
<td>2.1.1 Win-Win</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2 Give and take / Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.3 Battle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Objective</td>
<td>2.2.1 Worker benefit: Provide work opportunities/ income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.2 Business benefit: Ensure business survival/ profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.3 Worker benefit: Ensure worker satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.4 Business benefit: Keep and build committed, productive workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Employer-worker relationship</td>
<td>2.3.1 Constructive: Balancing of employer-worker needs and demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.2 Destructive: Clash between employer-worker needs and demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Typical practices (top 9)</td>
<td>2.4.1 Decent salaries and overtime opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.2 Social and medical insurance, indoor clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.3 Transportation to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.4 (Tasty) daily meals at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.5 Comfortable facilities, including accommodation for migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.6 Offer of leisure time activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.7 Fair and respectful treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.8 Communication channels for workers to communicate their needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.9 Work-life balance support (nursery, shortened working hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Regulatory responsibility</td>
<td>2.1 Objective</td>
<td>3.1.1 Comply with local laws and regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.2 Comply with global standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Typical practices</td>
<td>3.2.1 Food and accommodation according to Collective Bargaining Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.2 Overtime regulations according to global standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.3 Salary according to national legal regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.4 Non-discrimination according to national legal regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global theme</td>
<td>Organising theme</td>
<td>Basic theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social responsibility</td>
<td>4.1 Objective</td>
<td>4.1.1 Support development of workers (human/social/economic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.2 Support development of local community (human/social/economic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.3 Support development of country (human/social/economic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Typical practices</td>
<td>4.2.1 Decent salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.2 Support of personal (especially financial) problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.3 In-house training or technical education opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.4 Temporary jobs for students during holidays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.5 Job opportunities for poor/marginalised community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.6 Reading and writing classes, English language classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.7 Secure workspaces for women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Human responsibility</td>
<td>5.1 Objective</td>
<td>5.1.1 Honouring human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1.2 Supporting basic human needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Typical practices</td>
<td>5.2.1 Financial support in case of need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2.2 Rest periods / limited overtime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2.3 Additional earning opportunities / extended overtime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2.4 Punctual, correct payment of salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2.5 Physical integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2.6 Non-discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Religious (Islamic) responsibility</td>
<td>6.1 Objective</td>
<td>6.1.1 Honouring local religious (Islamic) work ethics and traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1.2 Honouring religious (Islamic) duties of workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2 Typical practices</td>
<td>6.2.1 Zakat (alms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2.2 Ramadan provisions (shortened hours, food packages, money)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2.3 In-house celebration of local religious holidays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2.4 In-house celebration of workers’ religious holidays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2.5 Respectful communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Overarching claims about decent work</td>
<td>7.1 DW is multidimensional</td>
<td>7.1.1 Decent work includes a plurality of work issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2 DW is not fully feasible - limited resources</td>
<td>7.2.1 Limited financial resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2.2 Limited temporal resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2.3 Limited human resources (hard and soft skills)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2.4 Limited physical resources (especially space)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2.5 Respectful communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3 DW is not fully feasible - normative contradictions</td>
<td>7.3.1 Local laws contradict global labour standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3.2 Worker interests contradict local/global regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3.3 Own normative judgements contradict local/global regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3 DW has universalistic and particularistic aspects</td>
<td>7.4.1 Different groups of workers have different needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4.2 Different cultures have different needs/priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4.3 Different organisations and jobs have different needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4.4 All humans have rights and basic needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Annex 28. Excerpt of the coding frame (chapter 5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of theme</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sample Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>1. (Paternalistic) family responsibility</td>
<td>Owners-managers frame decent work as a (paternalistic) family responsibility. They talk about decent work and their workers as if they are a (paternalistic) parent who takes care of their children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising</td>
<td>1.1 Image</td>
<td>Theme includes all basic themes that describe the image that an owner-manager has of the work environment or the work relationships within the factory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>1.1.1 (Paternalistic) family</td>
<td>Statements describing the work environment or the work relationships as family-like</td>
<td>In [factory J06], we are trying to have the family concept system. [J09F06, R1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>1.1.2 Home away from home</td>
<td>Statements describing the work environment or the work relationships as home away from home (for migrant workers)</td>
<td>We create a home away from home for all our employees wherever they are [J07F04, R1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>1.1.3 Collective</td>
<td>Statements describing the work environment or relationships as a collective or community</td>
<td>The factory is a small community [E08F05, R1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising</td>
<td>1.2. Objective</td>
<td>Theme includes all basic themes that provide information on the intention that an owner-manager associates with decent work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>1.2.1 Ensure well-being of worker in all areas of life</td>
<td>Statements implying the intention to ensure the workers’ well-being during working hours and after work</td>
<td>They [workers] live better, they should learn better. They should have a better authority of life. […] There are many more things we can do, […] we can have libraries. […] [J18F12, R1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>1.2.2 Educate and discipline workers</td>
<td>Statements implying the intention to educate and discipline workers (like children)</td>
<td>I: What are the most crucial issues you teach them […]? R1: How to live in a dormitory with others, on the soft skills. They’ve been with their parents or most of them are young, between the age of 20 and 30. […] This is your cover, this is your bed. You have to take care of your bed, organise everything. You are not living alone. [J07F04, R1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising</td>
<td>1.3 Employer-worker relationship</td>
<td>Theme includes all basic themes that provide information on the owners-managers’ perception of employer-worker relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>1.3.1 Employer-workers are close/one unity</td>
<td>Statements describing employers and workers to have a very close relationship, including a personal relationship.</td>
<td>A week doesn’t go by without an engagement, birthday, or wedding celebration going on. A birthday or wedding, everyone has to attend. So, our relationship with each other [is close]. [E08F05, R1]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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