



LA LETTRE DU GERPISA

RESEAU INTERNATIONAL
INTERNATIONAL NETWORK

N° 172

Novembre 2003

Editorial
Yannick Lung

ELARGIR LES DEBATS SUR LA GRILLE D'ANALYSE DE LA VARIETE DES MODELES PRODUCTIFS

Au cours de la précédente année universitaire, le GERPISA a privilégié la mise en discussion de la grille d'analyse de la diversité de modèles productifs proposée par Robert Boyer et Michel Freyssenet à l'occasion des contributions des jeunes chercheurs aux Journées d'étude et de la 11^{ème} rencontre internationale du GERPISA en juin 2003.

Le dernier *Forum de la régulation* qui s'est tenu à Paris en octobre dernier a montré que la communauté scientifique commençait à prendre en compte cette grille comme élément de réflexion. Ces débats vont se poursuivre dans le cadre de rencontres et de projets scientifiques associant le GERPISA et d'autres réseaux, notamment ceux qui sont proches des "régulationnistes". Cette confrontation passe par la réflexion sur l'analyse des modèles productifs dans d'autres secteurs que l'industrie automobile pour enrichir et dépasser les outils conceptuels mobilisés, en développant une approche comparative.

Le projet ESEMK permettra une telle démarche qu'initie la discussion sur la rencontre possible des agendas de recherche du GERPISA et du groupe Régulation-Secteur-Territoire (RST) lors de la journée d'étude du 7 novembre 2003.

TO WIDEN THE DEBATES ON THE DIVERSITY OF PRODUCTIVE MODELS

Last year, GERPISA privileged the discussion on the analytical grid proposed by Robert Boyer and Michel Freyssenet on the diversity of productive models. Papers presented by young researchers at the *Journées d'étude* and at the 11th international colloquium in June 2003 contributed to this discussion.

The last *Forum de la régulation*, which was held in Paris last October showed that the academic community started to take into account this grid as a reference for such an analysis. These debates will continue within joint scientific meetings and projects that the GERPISA will develop with other networks, especially those associated to the "regulationist" approach. This supposes to discuss the analysis of the productive models in other sectors that the car industry to enrich and exceed the mobilized conceptual tools within a systematic comparative approach.

The ESEMK project will allow such an approach. The discussion on the possible confluences of the GERPISA and Regulation-Sector-Territory (RST) group's research programmes will set the agenda.

Nouvelles du programme - News Programme

THE EUROPEAN SOCIO-ECONOMIC MODELS OF A KNOWLEDGE-BASED SOCIETY: THE OBJECTIVES OF THE ESEMK PROJECT

Bruno Amable (CEPREMAP) and Yannick Lung (GERPISA)

This presentation of the ESEMK project is available on the 11th GERPISA colloquium CD ROM and can be download on the GERPISA website.

- Part 2 -

The ESEMK research agenda

Our project aims to present new analytical tools for the investigation of the issues related to the possible convergence towards a single socio-economic model of knowledge-based society and the persistence of diversity of productive models and institutional forms, combining the micro/meso and the macro/societal levels of analysis.

Studies concerning the European socio-economic model(s) will build upon progress made during recent work on Social Systems of Innovation and Production. The project will fine-tune typologies of socio-productive models and offer new findings related to how these models have developed. In this way we will be doing more than merely characterising the different models.

In English: Editorial (p.1): To Widen the Debates on the Diversity of Productive Models. News Programme (p.1): The European Socio-Economic Models of a Knowledge-Based Society: the Objectives of the ESEMK Project. News Firm (p.5): Ford Genk and Renault Vivoorde Fell Through The Meshes of Their Own Net (Work).

This will help us to move towards a theory of the political economy of diversity and models' development (Amable [2003]).

The diversity of socio-economic models

At the macro/societal level, our project will improve the state-of-the-art by proposing a theoretical analysis of the diversity of socio-economic models based on a political economy approach of institutions and coupled with an analysis of the diversity of productive models within a given socio-economic model. We will define the characteristics of a European socio-economic model in terms of specific institutions in the areas of product market regulation, employment relationship, financial relationship and social protection, and analyse the institutional complementarities that ensure the coherency of this model: between product markets regulation and labour market characteristics (Amable and Gatti [2002]), labour market and the financial system (Amable Ernst and Palombarini [2002]), product market regulation, the financial system and industrial specialisation (Bassanini and Ernst [2002]), social protection and labour markets and so on (Amable [2003]).

We will then compare this model with existing institutional configurations. We will identify the forces that affect the dynamics of the European socio-economic model, in terms of political sustainability, social cohesion and economic performance particularly with respect to the knowledge-based economy and we will be able to answer the following questions:

Is there one or are there several sustainable socio-economic models within Europe?

Is the 'European socio-economic model' defined as the 'lowest common denominator' of the institutional characteristics of European Union member States or is it possible to identify some fundamental characteristics of a European model distinct for instance from the market-based model?

Can we define the institutional characteristics of the European model in terms of product markets regulation, labour market and employment relationship characteristics, financial system and corporate governance and social protection?

Are some or all of the European countries converging towards this European model, are they all diverging, or is there a pattern of differentiated convergence, some of them belonging to a core European model and others drifting apart?

What are the socio-political equilibriums associated with the emergence and stability of this 'European socio-economic model'? Are they stable?

Is the European socio-economic model competitive with respect to the other most advanced knowledge-based societies in the world?

Our approach presents significant innovations compared to the economic literature on the development of modern economies. The scholars of the variety of capitalism give predictions on the development of modern societies that are clearly far from the idea of a general convergence towards a dominant model of socio-economic development.

However, they have in common with the proponents of institutional convergence a more or less implicit hypothesis that economic efficiency is, at least in the medium/long run, the determinant of the dynamics and viability of a society. For the 'variety of capitalism' approach (e.g. Hall and Soskice [2001]), there are several sources of competitiveness and thus different models can coexist. The conditions for the emergence and stability of a model are its capacity to stay competitive and lead to economic growth.

From our point of view, this position is correct but incomplete. We certainly concur that the institutional architecture of a society has a major influence on economic performance. However, this does not imply that a selection process should necessarily lead to a breakdown of institutions that impede growth and competitiveness. The design of optimal institutions would be facilitated if agents had a common objective, i.e. if they all agreed on what performance indicator should be taken into account to measure the efficiency of institutions; they might then agree on an efficient institutional design, conditional on their rationality. However, agents usually disagree on what this indicator could be because they often have different and even conflicting interests.¹

Institutions are likely to affect the interest structure and hence the preference that agents may express towards a certain pattern of institutional change. Rather than optimal solutions to a given problem, institutions represent a compromise in the social conflict originating in the heterogeneity of interests among agents. What we consider as different economic 'models' are therefore based on specific social compromises over institutions. The question of models' stability and institutional change is basically a question of political economy.

Institutions are the product of political processes governed by a logic which is distinct from that of wealth accumulation. They perpetuate political compromises related to specific conflicts. Once existing, they are perceived as 'rules of the game', i.e. rules that organise social exchange: both economic exchange and socio-political conflicts. One may then imagine that any process of institutional reform involves costs. On the one hand, it reopens a certain number of specific conflicts that had been settled by an agreement on 'institutionalised compromises'; on the other hand, it implies a questioning of the rules of the game that permit to structure still unsettled conflicts. If institutional change is not impossible, it takes place in specific configurations, those where the socio-economic trajectory contradicts the fundamental socio-political compromises. This happens with greater probability within a socio-economic model exhibiting poor economic performance, if only because the economic resources necessary to the maintenance of political compromises become scarcer.

¹. One may argue that the knowledge-based society may exacerbate some conflicts of interest: among firms as a consequence of increased competition, between firms and workers and among workers high-skilled vs. low skilled, mobile versus immobile... (Amable and Askenazy [2002]). It is bound to create new divides, with political consequences that are yet to be analysed, which may lead to institutional change.

But one cannot exclude the hypothesis of institutional change in a society enjoying a fast growth (growth may not be sufficient to guarantee the reproduction of political compromises) or that of the persistence of an institutional architecture leading to a modest economic performance (which may not systematically induce a break-down of the fundamental political compromises). Instances of the latter case are numerous; the post war Golden Age (1945-1973) on the other hand is an example of a period of important institutional changes and socio-political conflicts (for some countries at least) taking place in a fast growth environment.

The relation between economic evolution and institutional change are thus much more complex than a direct link between the emergence or the persistence of a socio-economic model and its economic performance. On the one hand, institutions and public policies shape the growth regime, income distribution and income volatility. On the other hand, the growth regime both conditions the formation of socio-political interests that demand a certain political mediation and determine the resources that the political mediation can mobilise to appease social conflict.

The evolution of socio-economic interests is also conditioned by the mode of management of corporations and the compromises established at the firm-level. It is therefore important to consider the modality by which firms' strategies fit into their macroeconomic and macro-institutional environments, since this also determines the productive model's tenor and reliability. After all, the income distribution, growth modalities and balance of power that drive a model not only shape the outlets by means of which profit strategies will actually materialise but also affect the capacities firms build up in their attempts to invest, innovate and distribute income to their various stakeholders. The rules that firms apply in these areas are both forced upon them by their environment and interpreted in a specific way by each firm. As such, identifying the contours and developments that affect these actions is undeniably one way of improving our understanding of the various socio-economic models present in a knowledge-based economy.

One can then have two sources of institutional change: as a result of a political action when the existing rules of the game reveal to be unsuited to the building of a stable social compromise; or as a result of local arrangements (at the firm-level for instance), when profit strategies compatible with the existing growth regime lead actors (wage-earners, firm-owners and management for instance) to establish a corporate governance arrangement founding new rules for social exchange. It is therefore important to establish connections between the macro and the micro/meso levels since 'local' micro compromises may in the medium/long run affect the stability and sustainability of the global socio-economic model whilst political action at the 'macro' level may threaten some 'micro' profit strategies.

We will apply this theoretical matrix to the transformations affecting European countries in the context of the emergence of a knowledge-based society and analyse the political impact of the changes that took place since the 1990s in order to assess the likely consequences for the different socio-economic models. An analysis of each model will be carried out at five different levels, each of which has a reciprocal effect on all the others.

1. The predominant paradigm for innovation and production;
2. The way in which interests are structured and political demands shaped;
3. Social institutions, to be understood here as "institutionalised compromises" between interests that are heterogeneous and (at least in part) conflicting;
4. Public policies, notably economic policy, construed here as responses that are supposed to arbitrate between divergent political demands;
5. An economy's mode of growth.

The diversity of productive models

At the *micro/meso* level, the project aims at improving the analytical matrix of the diversity of firms' productive models developed by the GERPISA in its previous research programmes to improve our understanding of certain recent developments and also include new dimensions. This has notably involved contextualising a matrix that had been built to reflect the 20th century history of the automobile industry. *The aim now is to focus on issues associated with the production and management of knowledge at the dawn of the 21st century.* Characterised by a long period of technological maturity² the new context, marked by a permanent innovation regime (Hatchuel, Le Masson and Weil [2002]), has changed the circumstances that shape today's competitive interactions, thus inferring new organisational modes, i.e. those that are capable of coordinated knowledge production and management (Lung [2001], [2002]). New profit strategies and new productive configurations are therefore likely to emerge, as witnessed by recent carmaker developments.

A second new characteristic to be integrated relates to the phenomenon of financialisation (Williams [2002]) and to the rise of corporate governance (Lazonick, O'Sullivan [2001]). It would be important to check for a possible change of trends in the financialisation of the car companies: the 1990s were about equity value and the prevaricating company to demands for value. Recent evolutions raise issues about (a) credit stability (especially for the European car companies who have moved into finance) (b) underfunded pension schemes and (c) the interaction between growing product market pressures and capital market constraints (d) the implications for the stable stakeholder compromises of the 1990s and the market for corporate control.

A third new characteristic relates to the effects of the many merger-acquisition and alliance operations that have taken place in recent years. Such operations, whether intra-European (France-Germany) or extra-European (notably with North American or Japanese partners) in nature, have raised questions about previous governance compromises and offer us a special opportunity to investigate firms' European growth strategies as well as State authorities' attempts to impact market structure via monopoly controls, measures negotiated directly with firms and regulations (including European sectorial policies). Linking different national institutional environments together, we find discussions on the postulate that convergence has actually taken place.

². This being the basis of Abernathy's [1978] analysis.

This hypothesis is re-situated in a concrete, observable and measurable dynamics, and the strengths and impacts of its different potential convergence factors are assessed.

These considerations will lead us to work on *the analytical matrix previously developed with GERPISA in order to include recent developments in the automobile industry*. One must also consider the recent transformations in the automobile market, and in demand for this product. For firms, such a demand infers their getting involved in a learning process that will allow them to apprehend, interpret and modify ongoing trends in a way that is beneficial to them. Much as we have been able to demonstrate that firms' shared technological environment has caused them to devise highly differentiated production processes and products stemming from their own design and learning activities, our research should also show how organisations incorporate this issue and how the mediating links between income distribution, the demand that a total sector faces and the demand that firms in this sector face ultimately crop up at the end of an adaptation and innovation effort that appears to be an essential dimension of corporate strategy in a knowledge society.

We will then test the *analytical matrix with other sectors than the automobile*, since the specificities of this business could hamper the validity of the findings we obtain. The application of this approach to other sectors will confirm its analytical and strategic usefulness, as demonstrated in a recent communication by J.L. Beffa, CEO of Saint-Gobain (Beffa [2002]). Whether in reference to studies by K. Pavitt [1984] for example, or to more recent ones by Franco Malerba and Luigi Orsenigo [1997], the economic literature has mainly highlighted the diversity of sectorial configurations, both in terms of their knowledge bases and innovation dynamics and as regards the varying architectures used in their products and in the organisations that drive their various knowledge coordination modes (Fujimoto [2001]).

This latter approach focuses on the opposition between a modular structure and an integrated one. Although modular production offers a certain number of features that can help actors to cope with increased product diversity (due to greater competition), and even though it enhances incremental innovation, we should nevertheless avoid falling prey to visions like that of the network-firm, an entity supposedly geared towards the type of cooperation that some analysts (Langlois [2001]) believe to have historically succeeded the large multidivisional enterprise as an optimal mode of organisation – a configuration whose emergence and diffusion has been discussed by Chandler [1990]. The multidivisional firm has not led to the disappearance of any of the other organisational forms that were reproduced and renewed all throughout the 20th century. This is because the diffusion of mass production did not cause any of the other forms of production to disappear (Piore and Sabel [1984]). Modular production should be viewed as one of the issues to be considered in this diversity approach. On one hand, modular product architecture cannot be generalised due to the constraints affecting certain products, like the automobile. On the other, modular organisation is more than a mere transcription of technical constraints, as it involves strategic issues that are of an entirely different nature and involve 'macro-level' institutional characteristics and socio-political equilibriums.

The sectors chosen for the study are meant to deepen our explorations of modularisation issues (Sako [2002]; Volpato [2002]) in connection with institutional change at the societal level (labour markets, social protection...). Another manufacturing sector with characteristics similar to the automobile industry (but where we can identify other actors' strategies and different technical and institutional constraints) is the aerospace industry. This will be the topic of a comparative study. Alongside these two traditional manufacturing sectors, the study will focus on industries that play a key role in the dynamics of the 'new economy' – in other words, on ICT sectors. These are likely to manifest configurations that contrast greatly in terms of their profit strategies, the presence of institutional investors or their employment relationships. We are specifically referring to the sectors associated with information and communications technologies, whether in the hardware (telecommunications equipments) or the software business. The software industry will give us an opportunity to apprehend the configurations that are likely to arise in the field of service activities. Two other sectors would be selected to make comparative studies regarding the impact of public regulation and the interactions with the final demand: energy (Public utilities) and agro-food industries.

On the basis of these six sectors (automotive industry, aerospace, telecommunications equipment, software, energy and agro-food sector) and by referring to the structural changes that have been identified in the automobile industry, a comparative study of the main actors' trajectories over 1975-2005 will allow us to test our analytical matrix, renewing and generalising its incipient conceptual framework to help it encompass the various strategies and models that are to be found in the various sectors. Our investigations will focus on four areas in particular:

- ✓ the relationship with the end-user market – thereby accounting for the product-service bundle that causes actors to adopt new strategic behaviours;
- ✓ company governance compromise dynamics - with emphasis on firms' equity structures; institutional investors' strategies towards the firms in question; and employment relationship characteristics (work organisation, qualification, flexibility, pay systems, role of labour unions);
- ✓ the productive organisation – the point here being to apprehend the redistribution of activities all along the value chain and to ascertain the impact thereof on inter-firms relationships, in the light of the current debate on modular production and diffusion of ICT;
- ✓ state intervention: via environmental regulation, competition policy, and the protection of intellectual property right that influence actors' behaviour and the dynamics of the sector in question.

References

- Amable B. [2003] *The Diversity of Modern Capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press forthcoming.
- Amable Ernst and Palombarini [2002] Comment les marchés financiers peuvent-ils affecter les relations industrielles ? Une approche par la complémentarité institutionnelle. *L'Année de la Régulation*, n° 6 (2002-2003).

- Amable and Gatti [2002] Macroeconomic effects of product market competition in a dynamic efficiency wage model. *Economics Letters*. (75)1 pp. 39-46.
- Bassanini A. and E. Ernst [2002] Labour Market Regulation, Industrial Relations, and Technological Regimes: A Tale of Comparative Advantage, *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 2002, 11/2
- Beffa J.L. [2002] La construction d'une stratégie de profit. Le cas du groupe Saint-Gobain, Paper presented to the Saint-Gobain Centre for Economic Research 5th Conference *Organizational Innovation within Firms*, Paris, 7-8 November 2002.
- Chandler Alfred D., Jr [1990] *Scale and Scope. The Dynamics of Industrial Capitalism*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Fujimoto T. [2001] La diversité de l'organisation des firmes : une analyse, in R. Boyer et P.F. Souyri, *Mondialisation et régulations. Europe et Japon face à la singularité américaine*. Paris : Editions La Découverte. pp.131-38.
- Hall P.A. et Soskice D. (eds.) [2001] *Varieties of Capitalism. The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Hatchuel A., P. Le Masson and B. Weil [2002] From knowledge management to design-oriented organisations, *International Social Science Journal*, Special issue n *The Knowledge Society*, n°171, UNESCO, pp.25-37
- Langlois R.N. [2001] The Vanishing Hand: The Changing Dynamics of Industrial Capitalism, *Working paper*, University of Connecticut
- Lazonick W. and M. O'Sullivan [2001] *Corporate Governance, Innovation, and Economic Performance in the European Union*, TSER supported by the European Commission, 4th Framework Programme (SOE1-CT98-1114), Final Report.
- Lung Y. [2001] Coordinating competencies and knowledge: A critical issue for regional automotive systems, *International Journal of Automotive Technology and Management*, 2001, Vo.1, no.1, pp.108-127
- Lung Y. [2002] *Coordinating Competencies and Knowledge in the European Automobile System*, COCKEAS final report for the European Commission, 5th Framework Programme, Thematic network (HPSE-CT-1999-00022), Two volumes, October 2002.
- Malerba F. and L.Orsenigo [1997] Technological Regimes and Sectoral Patterns of Innovative Activities *Industrial and Corporate Change*, vol. 6 (1), pp. 83-117.
- OECD [2000] *A New Economy ? The changing role of innovation and information technology in growth*. Paris: OECD.
- Piore M. and C.F. Sabel [1984] *The Second Industrial Divide: Possibilities for Prosperity*, New York; Basic Books.
- Sako M. [2002] Modularity and Outsourcing: The Nature of co-evolution of product architecture and organisation architecture in the global automotive industry, in A. Prencipe, A. Davies and M. Hobday, *The Business of Systems Integration* Oxford: Oxford University Press (forthcoming).
- Volpato G. [2002] The OEM-FTS Relationship, Workpackage One Final Report in *Coordinating Competencies and Knowledge in the European Automobile System*, Annexes Volume to the CoCKEAS final report for the European Commission, 5th Framework Programme, Thematic network (HPSE-CT-1999-00022), October 2002, pp.19-51.
- Williams K. [2002] New agendas for auto research: financialisation, motoring and present day capitalism, Workpackage Three Final Report in *Coordinating Competencies and Knowledge in the European Automobile System*, Annexes Volume to the CoCKEAS final report for the European Commission, 5th Framework Programme, Thematic network (HPSE-CT-1999-00022), October 2002, pp.76-94.

Nouvelles des firmes – News Firm

FORD GENK AND RENAULT VILVOORDE FELL THROUGH THE MESHES OF THEIR OWN NET (WORK)

Bart Kamp

Belgium has been a major car producing country within the EU, despite not having its own national brand (that is, since the Belgian car manufacturer "Minerva" ceased to exist in mid-1900s). In fact, for a long time the country boasted some of the most impressive output per capita rates in the global car assembly industry.

In fact, throughout most of 1990s the automobile factories located on Belgian ground assembled annually more than 1 car for each 10 inhabitants of Belgium.

Belgium has also been a country whose car industry has been hit hard in recent times. Most politicians and sector analysts have been quick to point at the relatively high labour costs in the Belgian automotive industry and at the dependency of Belgian branch locations on decisions being made in foreign head quarters.

This article calls this explanation into question and instead presents an alternative explanation that approaches the most radical reorganizations the Belgian car industry went through in recent times from a network theory point of view. We argue that, with regard to the closing of Renault Vilvoorde (in 1997) and the substantial downsizing of Ford Genk (autumn 2003), a reduced market success of the models produced by the two factories or the fact that they did not produce a strong product within a context of production overcapacity, weakened the power base of these branch locations vis-à-vis their corporate structures. With regard to the overcapacity of production, this is a sector-wide phenomenon that emerged and grew over the last decade as a consequence of European integration and a shift in the production for the Western European market by, for instance, Ford and Renault towards Eastern Europe and Turkey.

Multinationals as business networks with their own intra-firm dynamics

The argument of this article is based on the proposition that the recent reorganizations by Ford Europe and the earlier ones by Renault can be best understood by looking at such multinationals as “business networks”. Inside such networks individual branch locations compete for investments, other resources and competences to assure their continuity and if possible to grow. The assignment and allocation of such resources and competences to a large extent correlates and coincides with branch locations that manufacture a strong product or that maintain privileged relationships with (a bundle of) advanced suppliers that are also of value to other parts of the mother company.

As such the assignment of resources and competences, on the one hand, and the occupation of a strong position within the business network of the own multinational enterprise, on the other hand, to a certain extent represent a self-reinforcing process. Nevertheless, such an intra-organizational network position can also erode with time. And this is what happened at Renault Vilvoorde and Ford Genk. They were both branch locations that saw their competitive positions within their respective business networks deteriorate.

From the mid-1980s onwards outsourcing became an increasingly important in the automobile industry. This meant that having competent suppliers within the company network became a major competitive advantage. As indicated above, at the level of multinationals competition can also take place between “sister locations”. Therefore, branch locations working with the most competent suppliers are more likely to be assigned all kinds of R&D, design and engineering tasks. In this respect it appears that neither Renault Vilvoorde nor Ford Genk managed to develop a solid (local) supplier base at a time when it was essential to their survival.

Whereas at Renault Vilvoorde supply lines were strongly embedded in Renault France’s supplier base, those of Ford Genk were strongly interwoven with the outsourcing complex of the Ford locations in Germany. On top of that, Ford Genk proved a slow learner in terms of outsourcing, being, for instance, one of the last plants to outsource its car seat production. One can ask oneself to what extent Renault Vilvoorde and Ford Genk were in a position to influence this state of affairs, or whether it was imposed on them from above. What is clear is that it helped neither of them in developing a strong position within the mother company on the basis of (excellent and) privileged supplier relationships.

The manufacturing of a successful product, preferably in exclusivity within the mother company, is another important prerequisite for having substantial resources allocated to a branch location. In this respect Renault Vilvoorde and Ford Genk had the same bad luck over time. In its last years, Renault Vilvoorde produced relatively small production batches of several models, without producing the lion’s share of either of those models. On the contrary, its role was a supplementary one (especially with regard to the Renault factory in Douai –for the R-19 and the Mégane- and the one in Flins –for the R-5 and the Clio).

Especially after the Spanish Renault factories started to approach their production capacity and began producing cars for the entire European market and the company also started production in Slovenia and Turkey, it became clear that the Renault group as a whole faced significant overcapacity, which meant the production apparatus of the group had to be rationalized, at the cost of those plants that did not have their own strong product, for instance Renault Vilvoorde.

For a long time, Ford Genk did produce a strong product, which it built in (quasi) exclusivity at the level of Ford Europe: the Ford Sierra. However, with the introduction of its successor, the Ford Mondeo, the tide began to turn. For a number of reasons the Mondeo turned out to be far less popular than its predecessor, and as a result annual production did not live up to expectations. Thus, despite the fact that Ford Genk had its “own” product during the Mondeo era, it was no longer a truly “strong” product. As a consequence, its intra-organizational network position started to erode.

The situation was made worse by an emerging overcapacity at company level, which made it increasingly less likely that Ford Europe would assign additional resources to Ford Genk. In addition, Ford’s Spanish and Turkish factories had begun producing for a Europe-wide market, which meant that the company’s European production apparatus was simply too big. From that perspective the possible transferring of (part of the) production of the Focus from Saarlouis to Ford Genk would merely be a transferring of the problem of overcapacity or of insufficient demand.

The validity of the labour cost argument

In a way, referring to the labour cost as the reason why car production is moved to countries with low wages is incorrect, as automobile assemblers compensate for wage differences by regulating the degree of automation and mechanization of their factories. For instance, the degree of mechanization of the Renault factories in France that manufacture the Clio and the Mégane is higher than that of the Spanish Renault factories producing the same models. Similarly, the production of the Golf and the Polo in the VW factory in Bratislava is more labour-intensive than the VW factories in Vorst (where the Golf is also assembled) and Pamplona (where the Polo is also assembled). Furthermore, of the total cost of developing and producing cars, labour costs as compared to assembly costs only represent a fraction.

Moreover, it is generally the more “low-end” models (type Ford Fiesta, Opel Corsa, Citroën C-3, ...) that are produced in countries with lower wages, the reason being that the total production costs of these models should not run up too high. At the same time, as a rule the more “high-end” and “Exclusive” models are produced in countries and regions with higher labour costs. From this perspective, the production of the Mondeo in Ford Genk makes perfect sense. Based on these observations, one could question, on the other hand, whether VW Vorst is the most optimal site for producing the VW Lupo or Opel Antwerpen for the Opel Astra ...

L'actualité du produit

Ugo Puliese

LE PORSCHE CAYENNE

La fin brutale et cruelle de Matra Automobile (même si son bureau d'études est préservé) fait contraste avec le brillant parcours de Porsche. Il est vrai que, si les deux entreprises ont un certain nombre de points en commun (activité à la fois de production et de développement, capacité à exploiter les créneaux du moment), il existe néanmoins des particularités qui ont fait toute la différence en faveur de la société allemande : autonomie commerciale (Porsche utilise sa propre marque et dispose de son réseau de commercialisation), autonomie technique (Porsche dispose de ses propres moteurs), large gamme (alors que Matra a été victime de sa monoculture) et positionnement en très haut de gamme.

C'est en 2002 que la firme de Zuffenhausen (près de Stuttgart, c'est-à-dire à quelques encablures de Mercedes et de Bosch, deux fleurons de l'industrie automobile mondiale) a opéré un virage important en ajoutant un troisième modèle à sa gamme, et pas n'importe lequel. En effet, aux 911, Boxster et Carrera GT (cette dernière, récente et marginale fait que l'on considère souvent que l'offre sportive se limite à deux modèles) est venu s'ajouter en 2002 un tout terrain, le Cayenne, dont il était difficile d'imaginer au départ qu'il puisse s'intégrer harmonieusement à la gamme et surtout à l'esprit de la marque.

En fait, le choix d'un tout terrain s'explique par un constat simple : Porsche est fortement dépendant à la fois du marché américain et d'une clientèle huppée. Or, quel est le créneau de luxe qui se développe largement aux Etats-Unis ? Celui des 4x4, ou pour reprendre une expression plus branchée, celui des « sport utility vehicle » (SUV). Ces véhicules offrent en effet à la fois les caractéristiques d'une voiture de haut de gamme et celles inhérentes à un utilitaire (sensation de sécurité et de puissance). En outre, en raison de droits de douanes élevés à l'importation des utilitaires légers, le marché américain des 4x4 a longtemps été protégé de la concurrence japonaise. On a donc vu un grand nombre de marques européennes s'engouffrer dans ce créneau afin de parer à la stagnation du marché des voitures de haut de gamme (déjà attaqué par les Lexus, Acura et autre Infiniti). Mercedes a d'abord lancé en 1997 sa Classe M produite en Alabama, suivi par BMW et son X5 fabriqué à Spartanburg (Caroline du Sud). Le X5 a d'ailleurs ouvert la voie aux caractéristiques d'un grand nombre de « sport utility vehicle » : il est en effet conçu comme un break (la version break de la Série 5 en l'occurrence), surélevé (pour lui offrir des capacités de franchissement) et doté d'une transmission intégrale. C'est la même recette qui est appliquée cette année au X3, dérivé de la Série 3.

On verra par la suite Volvo emboîter le pas à BMW (avec les XC70, version 4x4 du break V70, et surtout le XC90, un 4x4 plus authentique). Mais Audi s'y est également mis (l'Allroad Quattro, version 4x4 du break A6 en attendant les Steppenwolf et Pikes Peak) et d'autres marques européennes de haut de gamme sont également à l'affût, comme Alfa ou Saab (ce dernier reprend en fait un modèle Subaru). Enfin, Ford n'est pas resté indifférent puisqu'il a récupéré Land Rover pour sa division Premier Automotive Group.

Mais quand on parle de marque européenne de luxe, on voit l'ombre du Docteur Piëch, l'ancien patron de Volkswagen, planer sur le marché. C'est ainsi que Volkswagen s'est mis, comme les autres, à viser le marché américain du haut de gamme aussi bien du côté des berlines (la Phaeton) que de celui des tout terrain. Afin de réduire les investissements (le marché européen des 4x4 est insuffisant pour les amortir), Volkswagen a trouvé un partenaire idéal en Porsche qui lui apportait en outre une caution « haut de gamme ». Mais assez curieusement, chacun des partenaires a choisi un site industriel différent, Volkswagen fabriquant le Touareg à Bratislava, capitale de la Slovaquie, et Porsche construisant une usine toute neuve à Leipzig, dans l'est de l'Allemagne les pièces de carrosserie venant néanmoins de Bratislava.

Est-ce à dire que l'avenir de Porsche est écrit à l'encre rose ? Pas vraiment, car ce qui fait la force de Porsche (une clientèle huppée et souvent américaine) fait aussi sa faiblesse : le petit constructeur est à la merci, comme il l'a d'ailleurs vécu au début des années quatre-vingt-dix (15 000 voiture produites au cours de l'exercice fiscal 1992/1993 à comparer aux 75 000 attendus en 2003/2004), d'une récession économique aux Etats-Unis (les Golden Boys constituent une bonne partie de sa clientèle) et de la parité entre l'euro et le dollar. Un autre élément menace également l'avenir de Porsche : l'arrivée progressive de la concurrence sur son terrain de chasse privilégié, celui des voitures très sportives.

Audi a déjà fait son entrée sur ce marché avec le TT alors que plus globalement, le groupe Volkswagen relance Lamborghini, Bentley voire Bugatti ; Mercedes s'appuie sur McLaren, Ferrari transfigure Maserati et Ford entend promouvoir Aston Martin sans oublier les Jaguar sportives. Le Cayenne lui même, qui tire la croissance de Porsche, est menacé par l'existence du Volkswagen Touareg, aussi bon que lui mais surtout moins cher. Il n'est d'ailleurs pas inutile de rappeler au passage que Volkswagen a souvent rêvé de s'emparer de Porsche et le Docteur Piëch, ancien président de Volkswagen et membre de la famille Porsche, a espéré rattacher le petit constructeur à son groupe et de lui adjoindre Bentley et Bugatti qui bénéficieraient ainsi du réseau Porsche. Par prudence, Porsche a lancé à l'automne 2003 une version d'entrée de gamme du Cayenne, doté d'un moteur V6 emprunté au Touareg (un moteur d'origine Audi) mais qui enlève en fait toute exclusivité au Cayenne puisque jusqu'alors il était doté de moteurs uniques (Porsche essence V8 et V10) et plus puissants que ceux du Touareg.

Pour ceux qui douteraient de son avenir et de sa capacité à croître, Porsche rappelle ironiquement que, en terme de véhicules produits (environ 70 000 en 2003), il n'est déjà pas très loin du niveau atteint par BMW au début de l'ère von Kuenheim (100 000 par an). On sait d'ailleurs que Porsche réfléchit à un nouvel ajout à son offre, ne serait-ce que pour rentabiliser son usine de Leipzig : il pourrait s'agir

d'un coupé sportif d'entrée de gamme, afin d'attirer une clientèle plus jeune et moins huppée et de la fidéliser par la suite, ou d'un coupé 2+2 ou d'un coupé-break 4x4, dans tous les cas le nouveau modèle reprendrait la plate-forme du Cayenne. Mais à plus court terme, Porsche doit se soucier du remplacement des 911 (en 2004) et Boxster (en 2005). Enfin, et on voit là combien le destin peut parfois s'avérer cruel,

Porsche dispose d'un petit degré de flexibilité dans la sous-traitance de la fabrication du Boxster à la société finlandaise Valmet. En cas de nécessité, Porsche pourrait rapatrier cette fabrication en Allemagne et Valmet, qui a déjà perdu le marché de sous-traitance des cabriolets Saab au profit de l'autrichien Magna Steyr, connaîtrait alors le destin de Matra...

Une année d'un constructeur

Kémal Bécirspahic dit Bécir

AVTOVAZ

(réalisé grâce à la Revue quotidienne de presse du CCFA)

En août 2002, *Die Welt* écrit qu'Avtovaz a présenté au Salon de Moscou la Lada Eurokopeke ; elle sera lancée en 2006 à un prix voisin de 4 000 dollars et produite au rythme de 220 000 unités par an, notamment pour le marché européen. - Fin septembre, la presse mondiale annonce que General Motors a lancé le 23 septembre sa société conjointe avec Avtovaz à Togliatti dédiée à la fabrication du tout terrain Chevy Niva. La production devrait porter sur 450 unités cette année, s'élever à 35 000 unités en 2003 et atteindre 75 000 unités par an à l'horizon 2005. General Motors a apporté des améliorations à l'actuelle Niva, mais il a conservé son moteur et sa transmission (russes) afin de commercialiser le modèle à un prix voisin de 8 000 dollars. *The Herald Tribune* signale par ailleurs que le gouvernement russe a décidé récemment de relever les droits de douane sur les voitures d'occasion étrangères de plus de sept ans, qui concurrencent les voitures neuves produites dans le pays, afin de soutenir l'industrie locale.

Le *Handelsblatt* du 25 septembre 2002 écrit que les autorités russes prévoient un fort accroissement de la production automobile d'ici à 2010, ce qui suppose d'importants investissements et l'implantation de constructeurs étrangers (BMW, Ford, Renault), ainsi que de fournisseurs. La Chevrolet Niva doit sortir Avtovaz du marasme actuel (les stocks de Lada invendues s'élèvent à 50 000 unités).

Le nouveau modèle sera exporté ultérieurement vers l'Europe occidentale et le Mexique. Avtovaz et General Motors envisagent de mettre en fabrication l'Opel Astra en 2003 dans le cadre de la société conjointe avec la BERD. La Calina, qui évoque l'Opel Corsa, sera mise en fabrication en 2004 dans l'ancienne usine Lada. Les experts doutent que les ventes atteignent alors l'objectif de ventes de 950 000 unités, contre un volume effectif de 767 300 unités en 2001, soit les trois-quarts de la production russe.

General Motors et Avtovaz, après avoir lancé la production du Chevrolet Niva à Togliatti, envisagent d'implanter une usine de moteurs, écrit en octobre le *Financial Times*. Le projet porte sur la production de 200 000 moteurs par an pour le tout terrain et les voitures d'Avtovaz, et pourrait, selon les analystes, engendrer un investissement de 1 milliard de dollars. M. Mylonnas, directeur de la société conjointe, a indiqué que le projet était à l'étude et qu'une décision serait prise en 2003. L'entreprise compte par ailleurs commencer à exporter le Niva vers l'Europe centrale et orientale à la fin de 2003. General Motors compte sur le Niva pour augmenter ses ventes en Russie. Le prix du modèle ne dépassera pas 8 000 dollars.

Le marché automobile russe constitue un enjeu important pour les constructeurs. D'après J.D. Power-LMC, il devrait croître de 37 %, à 1,56 million d'unités d'ici à 2007.

Alors que Avtovaz et Gaz (Volga) parviennent à survivre, c'est la débâcle financière qui guette Moskvitch, Ijmach et Oka, note *Automobil Revue* du 5 décembre 2002 qui passe en revue les projets des constructeurs russes. Oka pourrait se redresser avec le lancement (à une date inconnue) de la petite voiture Carat que l'on aperçoit régulièrement dans les salons et qui sera dotée d'un moteur de 749 cm³.

Avtovaz a entrepris la production d'un monospace compact baptisé Nadeschda dont 2 000 exemplaires ont déjà été produits en 2001. Le modèle est doté de moteurs 1,7 l ou 2 l et, fait assez rare en Russie, est disponible en version automatique. Le constructeur élargit également son offre de pick-ups, chacun de ses modèles de voitures étant désormais décliné dans ce type de carrosserie, à commencer par la Lada 2345 dérivée de l'antique Fiat 124 et dotée d'un moteur diesel de 1774 cm³.

Les quatre premiers constructeurs russes - Avtovaz, Gaz, Kamaz et UAZ - ont décidé d'unir leurs efforts pour améliorer la compétitivité de l'industrie automobile locale et les investissements dans ce secteur. Ils ont formé l'Union des constructeurs d'automobiles russes, qui a pour but d'assurer une liaison avec les autorités locales et les organisations internationales et de promouvoir les véhicules russes à l'étranger. L'Union veillera également à la qualité des véhicules locaux, qui est jugée insuffisante et en partie responsable du recul des ventes.

En mars, le *Handelsblatt* écrit que la Russie, dont le marché automobile devrait croître fortement dans les prochaines années, attire un nombre croissant de constructeurs occidentaux. Le premier constructeur local, Avtovaz, a annoncé qu'il produirait des Opel Astra dans sa société conjointe avec General Motors, et qu'il créerait une société conjointe avec la filiale Ferrostaal de MAN pour établir un parc de fournisseurs à Togliatti.

BMW assemble des voitures à Kaliningrad et Ford près de St-Petersbourg. Renault produira une nouvelle voiture au nom de code X90 dans l'usine d'Avtoframos à une cadence de 60 000 unités par an. Volvo a commencé à produire des camions conjointement avec le groupe russe AFK Sistema près de Moscou, et Scania a indiqué qu'il allait accroître sa production d'autobus.

La branche automobile du groupe sidérurgique russe Severstal compte conclure sous peu des négociations en cours avec un constructeur occidental en vue de la production d'un tout terrain. Volkswagen souhaiterait également produire des voitures dans le pays.

En 2002, les constructeurs occidentaux ont produit 10 208 voitures en Russie (sur une production totale de 985 292 unités, en baisse de 3,6 %) et ils en ont vendu 111 552 (+ 40,7 %). Les importations de voitures d'occasion occidentales ont en outre bondi à 826 800 unités...

Séminaire – Colloque

Table ronde de l'ISTM

Jean-Marc Pointet nous envoie l'invitation à une table ronde consacrée aux "Nouveaux enjeux de la veille technologique", ISTM, mardi 9 décembre de 17h00 à 19h00.

"Qu'il s'agisse de développer un produit nouveau, de moderniser l'outil de production ou d'accéder à un marché étranger, l'information est devenu un passage obligé. Pour prendre les bonnes décisions stratégiques et saisir les opportunités qui se présentent, il faut connaître le plus tôt possible tous les événements susceptibles d'influer sur l'activité de l'entreprise" (extrait du site www.innovation128.fr). Comment évoluent les stratégies et dispositifs de veille pour l'innovation technologique ? Comment guetter, surveiller, acquérir, trier, diffuser et traiter les informations susceptibles d'être utiles à la préparation de l'avenir des entreprises technologiquement innovantes ? Comment maîtriser l'information pertinente et utile au management de l'innovation technologique ?

Le prochain "rendez-vous de la recherche" de l'Institut Supérieur de Technologie et Management (Ecole de management des technologies de la CCIP) du mardi 9 décembre de 17h00 à 19h00 (amphi M. Dassault) portera sur ce thème des nouveaux enjeux de la "veille technologique".

A cette occasion, trois experts participeront à une table ronde : Bertrand Bellon, professeur d'économie à l'Université de Paris-Sud où il dirige le centre de recherche ADIS, spécialisé dans l'innovation, l'information et les réseaux ; Marc-Henri Ménard, Directeur Général Délégué d'Innovation 128 ; Anne Renaud-Villeneuve, responsable veille et marketing de Scient'X, entreprise du domaine biomédical.

IREC Conference 2004

(Utrechtse School voor Bestuurs- en Organisatiewetenschap - Universiteit Utrecht) Governance issues in shifting industrial and employment relations Industrial Relations in Europe Conference (IREC) 26 - 28 August 2004.

Venue: Utrecht School of Governance, Utrecht University Bijlhouwerstraat 6, 35 11 ZC Utrecht, The Netherlands

Conference organisers

Peter Leisink (Utrecht School of Governance, Utrecht University), Huub Ruël (Utrecht School of Governance, Utrecht University), Ulke Veersma (University of Nijmegen/University of Western Sydney), Bas de Wit (Utrecht School of Governance), Conference Secretariat (B.deWit@usg.uu.nl).

Call for papers addressing the themes and issues of the following workshops:

1. The eastward Europeanisation of industrial relations? European policy making affects ever deeply systems and outcomes of national systems of IR.

Multi-level governance or 'subsidiarity' is said to be the main principle behind European policies, but the new accession countries are given no choice but to go through a highly demanding process of change and adaptation. This workshop aims to explore EU-level regulation and the Europeanisation of industrial relations in both the existing EU-member states and new accession countries. Papers are especially welcomed that address the transition process, and the effects of the adoption of European regulations and practices of IR at various levels of policy making.

2. Potential and limits of national level socio-economic governance. Much emphasis has been laid upon internationalisation and convergence as the main directions of European policies. At the national level, trade unions, employers and governments continue to seek to direct the national economy. Although the basis for such policies seems to be eroded by European integration and internationalisation of businesses, new forms of governance develop at the national level. Social pacts are an example of attempts to make use of the (limited) space of policy making. This workshop aims to explore the national institutions, the role of the actors involved and their potential for new forms of socio-economic governance within the context of Europeanisation of industrial relations.
3. Management of diversity in labour markets and employment relations. Western, (post-)industrialised societies are ever more characterised by diversity of the workforce. Immigrants from former colonies and African countries change the picture of the workforce. Labour participation of women has significantly increased. The 'greying' of the workforce is another aspect of diversity which becomes increasingly important. This workshop deals with issues of diversity, including the impact on demand and supply on the labour market and the accommodation of diversity in the regulation of employment relations. Changing preferences of employees induce new work patterns with increasing flexibility of employment relationships. To what extent is flexibility used for the removal of certainties for labour and/or the facilitation of more worker autonomy? and what are the effects of a policy of 'flexicurity'?
4. Public sector reform and the reform of employment relationships. From the 1980s onwards the public sector has been the scene of ongoing reforms in all European states. Privatization, the creation of quangos, new public management and forms of competition and performance management have been introduced. the effects of these reforms on public sector employment relationships?

What meaning does 'public service' have for 'new public managers', employees and unions in terms of quality of service and quality of work?

5. e-HRM/e-IR: a new approach to managing and regulating employment relationships? Collective agreements are stored in databases, workers can arrange their own menu of employment conditions by selecting a la carte from framework agreements, managers and workers can assess their own competences and get advice on further training and career development, unions can consult and counsel their members online. Is this rethoric or reality? Are electronic means of information and communication just another medium? Or do they go along with the emancipation of the worker or the ultimate surveillance and control over the worker? What are the implications, the opportunities and threats of ICT for workers and unions?
6. IR and HRM: a critical assessment of ideological and theoretical rifts and/or shifts. Is there a 'us' and 'them' in the theoretical field of studies of industrial and employment relations? How can the differentiation of (sub)disciplines be explained? Is there mainly an ideological division, as illustrated by the (implicit) use of such essential concepts as power and ideology in the analysis of the field (confer 'adversarial relationships' and

'class struggle' versus 'social partners' and 'social dialogue', or 'exploitation' versus 'cooperation'). Are such ideological divisions a reflection and/or a part of real socio-economic differences between national (or sectoral) systems and cultures of industrial and employment relations (confer the Rhineland model versus the Anglo-American model)? (What) do new theoretical approaches add to the study of the field of industrial and employment relations?

Important dates

Deadline for submitting abstracts to the Conference Secretariat: 20 February 2004

Confirmation of accepted papers: 15 March 2004 Deadline for submitting papers: 1 July 2004

Further information on the programme, the list of hotels and so on will be provided in due time on the conference website: <http://www.usg.uu.nl/irec>

The conference fee (including conference materials, conference dinner, lunches, tea, coffee and drinks) will be EUR 275 (until 1 May 2004).

Any requests for information can be made to the Conference Secretariat.

Mail to Bas de Wit at B.deWit@usg.uu.nl

Centre documentaire

Danielle Lacroix

Livres reçus

REINGOLD Edwin M., *Toyota. People, Ideas And The Challenge Of The New*, London, Penguin Books LTD, 1999, 208 P.

Toyota Motor Manufacturing France, *Des voitures et des hommes*, Wimille (France), Éditions Punch, 2001, 64 p.

BROCARD Pascal, DONADA Carole, *La chaîne de l'équipement automobile*, Paris, Ministère de l'Économie, des Finances et de l'Industrie, 2003, 204 p.

CASTILLO Juan José y LOPEZ Pablo, *Los obreros del Polo. Una cadena de montaje en el territorio*, Madrid, Editorial Complutense S.A, Marzo de 2003.

Livres acquis

THERET Bruno, *Protection Sociale Et Federalisme. L'europe Dans Le Miroir De L'amerique Du Nord*, Bruxelles, Berlin, New York, P.I.E.-Peter Lang, Presses De L'universite De Montreal, 2002, 495 P.

POTERAT Jacques, *Histoires d'automobilistes*, Toulouse, Éditions Drivers, 2002, 201 p.

GUTH Jean-Pierre, Naulleau Gérard, *La voiture qui a changé l'entreprise*, Paris, Éditions d'Organisation, 2003, 213 p.

MAGEE David, *Comment Carlos Ghosn a sauvé Nissan*, Paris, Dunod, 2003, 260 p.

DOULET Jean-François et FLONNEAU Mathieu, *Paris-Pékin, civiliser l'automobile*, Paris, Descartes & Cie, 2003, 130 p. Préface de Gabriel DUPUY.

Revues reçues

Frontera Norte, n° 27, Vol. 14, Enero-Junio 2002, San Antonio del Mar, El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, 264 p. *Frontera Norte*, n° 29, Vol. 15, Enero-Junio 2003, San Antonio del Mar, El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, 216 p.

Asian Journal of Latin American Studies, n° 1, Vol. 15, 2002, Latin American Studies Association of Korea, 42p.

Cette revue publie un article de Jorge CARRILLO « La industria de los televisores en México : Integración y proveedores locales en Tijuana ».

Comercio Exterior, n° 7, Vol. 53, Julio 2003, México. Cette revue publie un article de Arturo A. LARA et Jorge CARRILLO « Globalización tecnológica y coordinación intraempresarial en el sector automovilístico : el caso de Delphi-México ».

Revues acquises

Frontières, 2003, Besançon, Annales littéraires de l'Université de Franche-Comté, Presses Universitaires Franc-Comtoises, 88 p.

Cette revue publie un article de Nicolas HATZFELD, « L'usine Peugeot-Sochaux : un espace à frontières variables ».

Thèses – mémoires – rapports reçus

BEN AISSA Hazem, *La démarche sociotechnique chez Renault : histoire, diagnostic et logiques d'évolution*, thèse de doctorat en Sciences de Gestion, Université Paris XI, École des Mines de Paris, novembre 2002, 354 p.

AMADEI Andrea, *Progettazione, produzione e subfornitura nell'industria automobilistica francese : il futuro secondo Renault*, thèse de doctorat en Sciences Politiques, Università di Bologna, Facoltà di Scienze Politiche, 2002, 680 p.

SEGRESTIN Blanche, *La gestion des partenariats d'exploration : spécificités, crises et formes de rationalisation*, thèse de doctorat en Sciences de Gestion, École des Mines de Paris, mai 2003, 373 p.

KAMP Bart, *Formation and Evolution of International Business Networks. Kaleidoscopic organization sets*, thèse, Université de Tilburg, mai 2003, 300 p. Publiée à Nijmegen, Wolf Legal Publishers (WLP), 2003.

Les membres publient

Michel Freyssenet, Patrick Fridenson, Bernard Jullien, Yannick Lung, Christian Mory ont participé à l'ouvrage collectif dirigé par Audrey Puig, *L'automobile.Marchés, acteurs, stratégies*, Paris, Elenbi Editeur, 2003.

Adresse de l'éditeur:
8 rue du Faubourg Poissonnière.
75010 Paris. www.ebg.net

Gérard Bordenave, Yves Cohen, Michel Freyssenet, Patrick Fridenson, Nicolas Hatzfeld, Jean-Louis Loubet, Yannick Lung, Steven Tolliday ont participé à l'ouvrage collectif dirigé par Hubert Bonin, Yannick Lung et Steven Tolliday, *Ford, 1903-2003: the European history*, Paris, P.L.A.G.E, 2003.

Prix : 95 Euros.
Adresse de l'éditeur:
29 rue Jean-Jacques Rousseau, 75001 Paris.

CALENDRIER DES REUNIONS DU RESEAU GERPISA 2003-2004

Vendredi, 21 et samedi 22 novembre 2003 (Maison Suger)

Vendredi, 12 décembre 2003 à la MSH (Salle 07)

Vendredi, 09 Janvier 2004 à la MSH (Salle 015)

Vendredi, 06 février 2004 à la MSH (Salle 015)

Vendredi, 05 mars 2004 à la MSH (Salle 015)

Vendredi, 02 avril 2004 à la MSH (Salle 015)

Vendredi, 07 mai 2004 à la MSH (Salle 015)

Douzième Rencontre Internationale du GERPISA

9, 10 et 11 Juin 2004, Ministère de la Recherche, Paris. à confirmer

vendredi 21 et samedi 22 novembre 2003

réunion du Comité de pilotage

Journée du 12 décembre 2003

09h30-12h30, Secrétariat des membres du bureau

14h00-17h00, Journée d'étude animée par Bruno Amable sur ESEMK

LA LETTRE DU GERPISA

Sommaire du n° 172

- P.1. Éditorial : Elargir les débats sur la grille d'analyse de la variété des modèles productifs.
Yannick Lung
- P.1 Nouvelles du programme : The European Socio-Economic Models of a Knowledge-Based Society : The Objectives of the ESEMK Project
Bruno Amable, Yannick Lung
- P.5 Nouvelles des firmes : Ford Genk and Renault Vivoorde Fell Through The Meshes of Their Own Net (Work).
- P.7 L'actualité du produit : Le Porsche Cayenne
Ugo Puliese
- P.8 Une année d'un constructeur : Avtovaz
Kémal Bécirspahic dit Bécir
- p.9 Séminaire - Colloque
- p.10 Centre documentaire :
Danielle Lacroix
- p.11 Les membres publient
- P.11 Calendrier du réseau 2003-2004
- P.12 Sommaire.

E-mail des auteurs

Bruno Amable : bruno.amable@pythie.cepremap.ens.fr
Yannick Lung : yannick.lung@gerpisa.univ-evry.fr
Bart Kamp : bka@resource.be
Ugo Puliese : upul@wanadoo.fr
Kémal Bécirspahic dit Bécir : kemal.becirspahic@gerpisa.univ-evry.fr
Danielle Lacroix : D.Lacroix@gerpisa.univ-evry.fr

Supplément : bibliographie

Direction : Yannick Lung

Rédaction : Kémal Bécirspahic dit Bécir

Collaboration : Bruno Amable, Kémal Bécirspahic dit Bécir,
 Patrick Fridenson, Bart Kamp, Danielle Lacroix,
Ugo Puliese, Yannick Lung,

Mise en page : Carole Assellaou

Mise en page sur Internet : Carole Assellaou

Les manuscrits sont à envoyer avant le 20 du mois
 The manuscripts have to be sent before the 20th of the month