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**Abstract**

In this research, it was aimed to analyse the labour market in Azerbaijan from the viewpoint of the corporatism theory and to determine whether the corporatist model is valid or not with Labour Unions relations in Azerbaijan.

In spite of the fact that the corporatist practices had first showed up in the term between two world wars, the term of fascist regimes, could likewise be seen in the democratic countries after Second World War.

The corporatist practices are for the most part conveyed to the motivation in the economic-social crises and change periods. Through this model, it is desired to reduce the conflicting characteristics of working relations. Corporatist model, tries to regulate labour relations through Labour Unions. Therefore, Labour Unions may help to reduce conflicts between employers and employees.

In Azerbaijan there is a good fundamental legal basis for corporatist view of labour market. These fundamentals are regulated through Labour Code, Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan about trade unions and Constitution. In addition, we determine how active is Labour Unions in protection of employee rights. However, in the last section when we analyse the current labour relations with Labour Unions, we can see that, current Azerbaijan labour market regulations is far away from corporatist view. Thus, in practice we can see that the work of Labour Unions is not that much effective, which fail corporatist view of labour relations.

**Introduction**

The corporatism is an important and actual issue in terms of labour market regulations. In corporatism, labour market mainly regulated through Labour Unions or in other call Trade Unions.

Liberal approaches are based on the individuals. These individuals express their interests through interest groups and political parties. The means of transforming these interests into central political decisions is the parliament, which is based on a regional basis. According to this conception, the oppression groups, which are competing with each other, are defending their own interests. The state does not play an active role in liberal understanding. State intervention in the interests of the civil society, the expression of these interests, the choice between interests and similar issues is seen as negative, disrupting the natural balance.

In the Marxist approach, the subject of the political process is not individuals, but classes. History consists of class struggles. The state is the most competent organization of the ruling class, as well as being passive and impartial in class struggles. In the Marxist approach, the state is nothing more than a mechanism that defends the interests of the bourgeoisie in the case of capitalism. According to another type of assessment, which can be called a functionalist, the state is ultimately an instrument of the ruling class, but as a collective capitalist it has a relatively autonomous structure from individual capitalists. Rather than being a simple tool for defending the interests of individual capitalists, if necessary the state conflicts with the interests of individual capitalists. In general, it is a more efficient and autonomous structure defending the interests of the capitalist system.

The evaluations workers-employers-state relations are generally discussed in three main theoretical-methodological frameworks. It is observed that the issue is generally discussed on the basis of liberal, Marxist and corporatist models remaining among them. As a society and economic model, corporatism considers the society as a whole that is mutually dependent and functionally complementary to each other.

According to this understanding, even though there are conflicts of interest between various classes, status and professions, these conflicts of interest can be reconciled with mutual concessions by creating permanent central institution on the state-worker-employer relations.

In this research, we will try to determine how close is the labour regulation in Azerbaijan, to the corporatist view of labour relations. We will look at legal basis of Azerbaijan and determine the proximity to the corporate labor market regulations. Then, in case of Azerbaijan has fundamental conditions for corporatist labour market regulations, we will analyse how current labour relations are managed with Labour Unions.

**1. Corporatism and labour market**

**1.1 Introduction to corporatism**

The word of corporatism, derived from the word "corpus" in English which means "unity."

As a society and economy model, corporatism sees society as an organic and internally harmonious whole that is mutually dependent and functionally complementary to each other (Belge:2006; Parla,1993:7). By definition it is anti-socialist and anti-pluralist. At the same time, it is anti-liberal because it emphasizes the public space, not the individual.

In the historical course, it is observed that the concept is used more frequently in economic terms than in the post-transition period from agricultural society to industrial society (Rose, 2005:3). As a political approach, corporatism can be defined as in the context of ”common principles“ and ”social cohesion“ to handle the activities of all segments of society on the basis of solidarity and common interests. (Göker, 2001: 229). The corporatist understanding in which a social partnership and social division of labour come to the fore, the individuals pursues their own interests and freedom and as an entrepreneur, it emerged as a reaction to the liberalism approach in which the individual should be free. In corporatist understanding, individuals who act jointly in the face of events and who have a common will, property, are like part of an organism or a social body. (Panitch, 2000: 98 and Durmaz, 2011: 58-61).

The concept of corporatism, which is one of the basic components of social organization, has emerged as an extension of the concepts of Liberalism and Marxism, which emerged as an alternative to each other. This concept focuses on public policies, social changes, social welfare policies, labour relations, labour peace, trade unions, government policies, social security and social policy practices created in industrialized societies where both Liberalism and Marxism policies are insufficient to explain. The corporatist approach therefore offers new approaches and methods for researchers to the function of the state, formal cooperation of interest groups in decision-making processes, and new social, political and economic phenomena such as new aspects of public policy making. The corporatist approach offers many perspectives on the rationalization, social bureaucratization, changing work and industrial relations of many researchers in modern societies. (Wiarda, 1997: 3,4).

In contrast to liberalism, society is not the sum of individuals, but more than that. Therefore, corporatist understanding imposes limitations on individual interests, in the name of public interest, which is seen as a higher interest (Parla,1993:8). In the liberal understanding, the basic unit of political activity is individual. Individuals express their interests through interest groups and political parties. These interests become central political decisions by means of parliamentary institution on a regional basis. On the other hand, by the corporatist view, the basis of political activity and organization are occupational groups. The representation and expression of interests take place through corporatist organizations. The central political decision-making mechanism is the structures that bring corporations and the state together. These administrative structures are organized on the basis of professional representation, not by region. These structures consist of corporate councils organized in parliament or pyramid form. (Parla, 1993:95).

Durkheim explored professional organization in the civilization of the post-industrial revolution, taking into account the enormous, complex and widespread economic life associated with a centralized bureaucracy. Instead of giving up completely from the idea of an effective social order as the orthodox economists did, Durkheim preferred to rely on the function of professional organizations as a new formation that would provide social solidarity (Hayward, 1960:32). In this respect, Durkheim considered corporatism as an integral element for all post-agricultural societies. He tried to show that democratic corporatism was the principle of social order in accordance with modern, complex societies. (F. Hearn, 1985:164).

As it is known, fascism has an approach that ignores the contradictions between classes. According to the concept of fascist social organization, all social classes and segments will be put into national harmony with the corporate organizations to be established under the leadership of the state. The fact that corporatist practices were first seen in the classical fascist countries of Europe during the two world war was another important factor that facilitated this association.

The ideology itself was emerged as a result of the mobilization of large masses in Italy. The basic philosophy of this concept, supported by capitalist forces, has constituted the understanding of differentiating people according to their races (Trotsky, 2005: 17, 18).

Fascism adopts the notion of individual development if the nation develops. The most basic feature that separates it from its contemporaries is to give a violent appearance (Lawson, 1993: 81). The Italian leader Benito Mussolini was adopted as the official ideology in Italy. Then it was implemented in Nazi Germany. Nazi Germany, with its ultra-nationalist, authoritarian, anti-democratic and anti-communist practices, has been adopted and has put racist discourses on the foreground (Kornblum, 2008: 295 and Johnson, 1971: 103).

According to Parla, corporatism is anti-socialist and anti-Marxist system of thought. And also from the perspective of politics and economics corporatism is ”anti-liberal“ but not “anti-capitalist”. Parla emphasises that there are two sub-types of corporatism, solidarist corporatism and fascist corporatism or fascism. For him, solidarism includes some elements of political-cultural liberality, as mentioned above. However it opposes liberalism as an economic, social and political organization. Solidarism and fascism is not an alternative third way between capitalism and socialism or the integration of these two. The word solidarism means solidarity. As a sub-genre of corporatism, it refers to a pluralist and moderate management structure against the authoritarian, fascist approach that prioritizes public interests (Neocleous, 1997:8). The corporatism is a derivative of capitalism with its solidarist and fascist practices. (Parla, 1993: 53) Parla refers to corporatism in three levels: “First, it is a philosophy and ideology about a certain society and economy model. Second, a series of economic and class policies and actual processes for the representation of interests. Third, it is a form of political institutionalization and authoritarian decision-making” (Parla, 1993: 53,54).

However, the most important reason for the revival of corporatism is the historical practice that has revealed the existence of other types of corporatist practices, except fascism.

When the debates have been held in 1970s, the claim that a new kind of corporatist model emerged in the industrialized Western countries in the period following the Second World War, except for the pluralist market model began to be widely expressed (Akkaya,1996:7). There is no equal competition between workers and employers' organizations in this model. The place of the passive state has been replaced by an effective-interventionist state, and under these conditions, the most fundamental condition of the pluralist market model, which was based on the basic logic, was to obtain the rights of the organizations that compete against each other with equal power and with each other (Cizre,1987:69).

The difference between two forms of corporatism is mainly due to the diverse approaches of the individual, society and state relations. Both types of corporatism reject "individualist liberalism" and "classist Marxism", at which point they are partners. But in fascism, the state is everything. The role of corporations is to represent the state in society and to be the extensions of the state in society. However, professional organizations in neo-corporatism maintain their autonomy even partially, and represent their professional interests against the state at the level of government, in proportion to their autonomy (Parla,1993:92-93).

In addition, these corporatist practices exclude Marxism and liberalism as a holistic model, but contain some values and principles of these currents. While neo-corporatism is a pluralist and moderate statist, fascist corporatism has singularist and totalitarian characteristics.

It is important to emphasize the distinction between fascist corporatism and neo-corporatism. It should be noted that neo-corporatism is not uniform in itself.

On the basis of similarities, neo-corporatist practices can be divided into two sub-groups as social corporatism and authoritarian corporatism. (Akkaya,1996:49).

The concept of corporatism was rediscovered by the western societal scientists in the wake of the 1974 oil crisis, the most widespread use period of the 1920s. Researchers like Shmitter claimed that the 20th century is the age of corporatism (Cizre, 1992a:37).

It is observed that the corporatist practices are brought to the agenda during the periods of economic-social crisis, usually during socio-economic periods. As a matter of fact, all corporatist practices are accompanied by stability and structural adjustment programs.

Social unity and harmony and other discourses are introduced through the use of corporatist practices to restore social stability and harmony. The recovery of the national economy from the crisis and a more advantageous position of the country in international competition are among the most important reasons behind the introduction of corporatist practices. Through this practice, the conflicting nature of working relations is tried to be avoided, strikes and other methods are avoided.

Furthermore, the aim is to ensure an increase in the rate of profit. One of the most distinctive features of the corporatist practices is the setting of a ceiling limit in order to guarantee an increase in wage rise. In other words, the increase in the demand for wage growth. (Arslan,1997:9).

If incentives are put into force in that country, these incentives have three important dimensions. Ensuring an increase in profit rates means that the relative income distribution is constantly deteriorated against the workers. The consent of the working class to this situation was possible by offering them a steady increase in their absolute income and a stability under employment conditions (Akkaya,1996:41-46).

Workers 'organizations have the right to be represented in institutions that make decisions on economic and social issues, and workers' organizations have been able to participate in decision-making processes, especially those that concern them directly.

Organizational incentives for corporatist practices are also favoured, and preferably the most powerful workers' organizations. A number of legal and de facto advantages are offered to the organization in the organizational and financial areas, and this organization is given the right to monopolistic representation in a number of institutions. (Cizre,1987:34).

Thus, workers and employers organizations are engaged in a corporate relationship with each other and with the state in the process of forming and implementing economic and social public policies. Economic Social Councils are the main institutional tools of this relationship.

Until the middle of the 1980s, the debates on corporatism were held at the macro level, and from the mid-1980s onwards, the distinctions such as "mezzo corporatism" or "sectoral corporatism" and "micro corporatism" were discussed (Makal,1996:723).

The state takes a bargaining attitude not only by recognizing the interests of the organizations of interest, but also by donating the monopolistic representation rights, by choosing the leader and by controlling the structuring of the content and the form of expression of the interests. Since bureaucracy and major interest organizations are internalized, the representation of interests loses its traditional meaning, and it is replaced by a high level of cooperation by both state and interest groups (Cizre,1987:43).

When the situation in terms of macro corporatism is evaluated, it should be remembered that all these should be realized at national level, not at sectoral levels.

It is observed that the researches on corporatism began to shift from the macro level to the lower levels especially in the 1980s.

Mezzo corporatism is the relationship between national central organizations and individual firms or individuals (Cizre,1987:47).

For this reason, mezzo corporatism involves a more limited process in terms of application area and content from macro corporatism. While the interventions in macro corporatism are very comprehensive and general, this intervention is limited to certain sectors in mezzo corporatism.

Macro regulations include many organizations, while mezzo regulations include a single organization, which is privileged by the state (Akkaya,1996:75-76).

Mezzo corporatism does not always involve workers' organizations. Class basis is less prominent. Even in this sense, mezzo corporatism can be regarded as a means of dividing the working class. In Mezzo corporatism, a single trade union and trade organization may be included in the negotiations, but this inclusion may be limited only by the capital or employer. For this reason, mezzo corporatism may not always require the tripartite participation in macro corporatism.

While investigating the existence and development of corporatism in some countries with the concept of Mezzo corporatism, it is thought that it should not be considered only national references. For instance, while it is argued that there is no corporatism in the USA because it is not included in the creation of economic policies and there are no formal sanctions to be used by interest groups, it is accepted that there is mezzo corporatism in the USA after this approach.

According to the researchers who have concentrated their studies on mezzo corporatism in recent years, sub-national corporatism is observed at mezzo level in USA, UK and France. Since the intervention can be differentiated at the sectoral level, so the idea of being differentiated at the level of individual firms is the source of a micro-corporatist view.

Since the intervention can be differentiated at the sectoral level, so the idea of being differentiated at the level of individual firms is the source of a micro-corporatist view. The area where the intervention is located is the firm (Akkaya,1996:78).

Micro-corporatism appears to be an alternative in cases where the Mezzo regulations cannot be found in effective interventions.

Where professional organizations are weak or attempted to be weakened, the state prefers to be directly involved with firms.

The presence of interests in participation in policy-making and in the implementation of the policy is defined as the common characteristic of macro and micro corporatism. (Akkaya,1996:80).

One of the essential features of corporatism is reconciliation. According to this approach, workers 'organizations are marginalized at factory or firm level rather than integrating workers' organizations effectively in micro corporatism (Cizre, 1987:48).

**1.2. Corporatist thoughts**

According to Gerthard Lehmbruch, one of the researchers contributing to the conceptualization of corporatism, corporatism involves more than the representation and reconciliation of interests. According to him, "corporatism is the organization of great interest organizations in cooperation with each other and the state in the formulation and implementation of public policies" (Akkaya,1996:8).

He thinks that, this cooperation has different dimensions and features in practice, not in the same way everywhere. According to Lehmbruck, at a certain stage of capitalism, there is a need for corporatism in order to reconcile classes. The reason why corporatism is needed is that in this way the workers and employers organizations should be removed from being an interest group and they should be partnered with the formation and implementation of government policies by gaining public status.

The attempt to redefine corporatism was started in 1974 by Philippe C. Schimetter. Schmitter puts the reasons for the emergence of corporatism on a class basis and argues that it corresponds to a certain stage of capitalism. According to him, corporatisation arises from the need for capitalism to produce and provide more capital accumulation (Akkaya,1996:18).

According to Schmitter, since pluralism is collapsing, corporatism is formed. He states that corporatism makes important contributions to the functioning of democracy in a more effective and stable way and that these practices provide manageability in society.

According to Leo Panitch, by means of this practice, the state, by limiting the autonomy of workers 'and employers' organizations, mobilizes them in line with the state policies and uses them as a management tool. According to Panitch, it cannot be claimed that corporatist-quality social agreements are made on equal terms, since the state is not in an impartial position. Because the state is in favor of capital (Akkaya,1996:23-24).

Bob Jessop describes corporatism as a form of state. According to him, in the so-called "hybrid system", interest organizations are both political representation and a means of state intervention (Akkaya,1996:24).

Charles S. Maier, on the other hand, defines corporatism as the application of decentralization in the formation of public policies. This is due to the need to dissolve the government's increasing and centralized functions by including interest organizations in decision-making processes and alleviating its burden (Akkaya,1996:24-25).

**1.3 Social Corporatism and practices**

It is possible to mention the three important factors that constitute social corporatism. A working class with a strong, independent struggle and organization tradition is developed socio-economic structure and the application of Keynesian economic policies.

As a matter of fact, unions in the USA and Japan are not accepted as a party in the implementation of public policies at national level. Particularly in the USA, we can talk about mezzo corporatism and in Japan, micro-corporatism applications. The practices in these countries are based on the precondition that workers' organizations should be outside of political processes, and therefore they are not interested in this study.

For the emergence of social corporatism, the fact that the working class has a special weight in domestic equilibria has a very important necessity. As a natural consequence of this particular weight of the working class, even though Marxism has been rejected holistically in social corporatist practices, the principles and values of socialism have a more important place than liberalism. In social corporatist practices, liberalism is generally rejected because it disrupts social cohesion and in particular leads to the brutal exploitation of labour. In social corporatist practices, classes and class struggle are considered to be a reality, but it is argued that class interests can be reconciled with mutual concessions.

Although there are some similar examples and initiatives before 1945, the history of social corporatist practices should be started with the post-World War II period. Social corporatist practices have become widespread after this date and have reached today by gaining a continuity.

As it is known, there was a very strong labour movement in Western European countries. Almost all of them experienced threats of collapse by workers' uprisings during the First and Second World Wars.

These countries, which experienced a serious threat of revolution during the First World War, were able to survive this threat as a result of the division of the socialist movement in two. Again, almost in all the Western European countries, the reformist parties of the working class have been included in the governments.

Thus, the capitalist system saved its future, but the working class had to make serious concessions, albeit internally (Talas,1990:65). The period after the First World War was a period of instfability, and this instability became much deeper after the 1929 crisis. For this reason, corporatist practices did not gain institutionalization during this period.

However, at this stage of history, the combination of the factors we tried to rank above also had an effect on the formation of the ILO (Starting from ILO will be referred to International Labour Organization) in a triple structure. The corporatist models, which would become increasingly widespread in the twentieth century, were thus first found alive in the ILO and internationally. As the process progressed, similar corporatist practices would have established at national levels and would have become increasingly widespread.

In spite of this, these developments at the beginning of the century will play a decisive role in the emergence of an international institution which can be regarded as corporatist. This institution is the International Labour Organisation. In fact, the establishment of the ILO was also sought by the capitalist countries of developed countries in order to serve the international standards of labour standards. First of all, this was necessary for equality in competition in world markets. However, there was a tendency towards the participation of state representatives. There was no idea that representatives of the workers' organizations would have a say in the determination of labor standards in a tripartite structure and to participate in decision-making mechanisms (Ateşoğulları, 1997:37).

But this development would have to wait a while. The 1929 crisis and the subsequent World War II prevented these practices from happening. But the results of the war have further accelerated the formation of social corporatist practices. After World War II, the number of countries that called themselves socialist increased and the Western European countries faced serious workers revolts once again. These rebellions were not successful, but after the Second World War, the social-democrat and communist parties had strengthened their influence on the political regime, in many countries alone or as a coalition partner in the governments.

Within the extremely poor economic conditions of the post-war period, the social-democratic initiatives of social-democratic governments failed once again. Social democratic parties, the architects of these policies, began to lose power. Soon the sought-after saviour and Keynesian economic policies provided a highly appropriate economic and social basis for social corporatist practices.

The economies of the crisis, as a result of the Keynesian economic policies put into practice, have survived the crisis and have entered into a high and stable growth process. Keynesian economic policies have contributed to the increase of the purchasing power of the wage earners, and the increase in purchasing power has had a positive effect on investments and economic growth. This growth process, based on the development of domestic demand, has constituted the material basis of the social state in general and social corporatist practices in particular.

A general outline of the process in Western Europe and the Scandinavian countries, where social corporatist practices have found living spaces, has been presented so far. Social, political and economic conditions which are the source of social corporatism are tried to be determined.

We believe that if we summarize what happened in the USA and Japan in the same historical period, what we mean will be made clearer. Although there was a similar period of growth and relative prosperity during the same period in the USA and Japan, social corporatist practices of the European and Scandinavian countries did not come into question in these countries.

Unlike in Europe, the unionization rate is low, trade union organizations are dispersed, and the workers' movement is highly divided. Collective labour agreements are made on the basis of the workplace, rather than on the basis of industry. American workers are far from defending their interests in the political arena through a powerful political party, and the political activities of the trade unions consist of playing the role of pressure group against political parties with no significant differences. US workers are extremely weak in terms of class consciousness. The dominant consciousness is a kind of "wage and profession" consciousness. For this reason, despite the fact that Roosevelt introduced the New Deal policies in the 1930s with the Keynesian nature of these policies, there was never any Western European type of social corporatism in the United States. Workers' organizations in America have never been accepted by the US government as a party to public policy intervention (Işıklı,1995:247-269).

In Japan in the 1920s, after hard-hitching attempts of unionization, Nationalist Industrial Associations were established under the conditions of the First World War, and the unions were dissolved in this organization. Japanese business life as a "family-like company" understanding was placed through such applications. The Japanese ruling circles did not allow independent trade union organizations for a long time, they blocked the initiatives in this direction. In November 1987, the RENGO Confederation, a representative of a moderate trade unionism, was created under the initiative of the state. Workers and civil servants in public workplaces in this country have the right to organize, but they do not have the right to strike. Collective agreements are made at the workplace level and not at the country or business level. Therefore, micro-corporatism is dominant in Japan.

The homeland of social corporatism practices is Western Europe and Scandinavian countries. The practice seems to be largely limited to these countries. It is not coincidental that this is a product of a very specific historical - political process and a very specific economic conjuncture. The historical process that we are trying to convey implies that social corporatism can only be possible if certain conditions come together.

As it is known, there was a strong labour movement in these countries. This movement had a strong and challenging union tradition, but was also massively organized under the umbrella of social democratic parties that had a social revolution program at that time (Işıklı,1994:27). Almost all of these countries had experienced the threat of collapse by workers' uprisings during the First and Second World Wars.

What is described reveals that the existence of social corporatism necessitates the existence of a strong labour movement. In the United States, where Keynesian economic policies were also implemented for a while, the most important reason why social corporatist practices did not come up was that there was no emergence of working class mobility with strong and independent organizations in this country.

As it is known, the core of Keynesian policies is to increase investments by increasing domestic demand, to expand employment by increasing investments, to stabilize employment, to stabilize an adequate demand, and to restrain the overproduction through all these. Thus, the possibilities of satisfying the expectations of full employment and stable income growth, which constitute the basic framework of the practices of social corporatism for trade unions, have emerged.

The Keynesian economy, with its structure focusing on the domestic market and domestic demand, enabled not only to be seen as a cost element but also as a demanding factor, thus enabling the state and its employers to be more flexible in the demands of trade unions for wage increase (Koç,1979:68-72).

Within this framework, since a stable employment and wage growth demand matched the objectives of the state and the employers' sectors, a social consensus on this ground and the fact that trade unions were involved in the process of creating public policies did not bother the employers and the state. That is, the fact that Keynesian economic policies and social corporatism do not contradict each other, but on the contrary feed each other greatly simplifies the existence of this practice.

Although implementation of Keynesian policies is an important factor, it must also be realized on a strong economic structure. Otherwise, the system cannot implement satisfactory economic incentives that will enable the voluntary consent of workers' organizations to this corporatist practice, resulting in the collapse of social corporatism practices.

These countries, which have imperialist features, are the most powerful economies of the capitalist world. In the post-World War II period, these countries have entered into a high and very stable growth process.

These mutual commitments constitute the essence of social agreements and incomes policy, the most important instrument of social corporatism.

It is evident that such a commitment requires a relatively strong and stable economic structure.

From the point of view of the above-mentioned criteria of social corporatism practices, it is understood that in some countries these practices are more successful, while in some others this practice can have a much more unstable structure.

The centralization of the trade union movement in Austria seems to be extremely strong. In Austria, the central trade union organization has a very strong authority on sub-organizations and members. For example, this union is one of the most powerful trade union structures in Europe in terms of having a say in the appointment of the leaders of the trade unions. This union controls all strikes. Only the union has the authority to sign a treaty on wage contracts. Because of these characteristics, Austria is considered to be a country where corporatism is purely applied (Akkaya, 1996: 97-106).

In Sweden, a strong economy, strong centralized trade unionism, and a strong party relations led to much earlier Keynesian practices. The combination of such positive factors has made social corporatist practices more effective and successful.

In Denmark, where the system is very well established in terms of institutionalization, the fact that the economic structure is not sufficiently strong and stable has been a source of problems in terms of the functioning of the system and the corporatist practice has also been unstable. In terms of the number of working days lost, Denmark had a significantly higher rate than in other countries (Akkaya,1996:106-114).

In Germany, which is among the countries where the corporatist practices are moderately strong, many factors were suitable for this application. However, the fact that this country has turned to Keynesian economic policies at a later date but after 1966 prevented it from settling on solid ground in its corporatist practices.

The two countries with the highest failure of corporatism in Europe are Britain and France, respectively. Looking at these two countries in terms of the factors underlying the social corporatist practices, it is seen that these two countries have a very deficient and problematic structure. In the UK, the centralization of the Trade Union Congress is weak and cannot supervise its sub-organizations.

As a traditional feature in this country, there is a structure that gives autonomy to workplace-level union representatives. Due to this autonomy, the power and pressure of the base are increasing with the workplace representatives. Due to this autonomy, the power and pressure of the base are increasing with the workplace representatives. The union center has a hard time setting up activities on the base (Işıklı,1995:154-158).

Moreover, the low rate of unionization in the UK is an important obstacle for the effectiveness of corporatist practices. But the most important reason why British corporatism is weak and unstable is the structural weakness of the British economy. The slow economic growth rate, the weakness of the competitive feature, the balance of payments difficulties, and the continuity of structural weaknesses of the British economy throughout the process. It is for this reason that British corporatism can give little to the working class, but much sacrifice has been asked from the working class which destabilizes the application (Akkaya,1996:124-138).

A very stable economy in terms of corporatist institutionalization, the implementation of keynesian economic policies and other factors create a strong corporatist structure in France.

**1.4 Criticism on Corporate applications and the crisis of Social Corporatism**

In particular, based on the achievements of social-corporatist practices, it is widely argued that neo-corporatism is an extremely superior practice. The advocates of this view have a very democratic essence because it provides an effective representation right for neo-corporatism. They also state that this practice is also a very effective means of guaranteeing a peaceful solution to the problems that create conflicts in the field of working relations and a stable economic growth (Akkaya,1996:12).

In addition to this kind of appraisal of neo-corporatism based on social corporatism, there are also some critical evaluations that are critical to corporatist practices in general and social corporatism, which is the most advanced form of these practices in particular.

In the academic literature, Panitch, Cronch Jessop, and other authors claim that these practices have some serious structural defects, even in the most successful cases, and that therefore corporatism is doomed to instability, imbalance and temporality (Akkaya, 1996:24-26). As a matter of fact, we are witnessing this shock. On the other hand, for the same reason, the chance of social corporatism being implemented in countries that do not have these conditions is extremely weak. Therefore, this situation shows the difficulties in the generalization of social corporatism and shows that this practice cannot be permanent and stable and in this respect it is not capable of being an alternative model. This situation is one of the main criticisms of social corporatism.

In social corporatist practices, wage increase ceilings are determined to guarantee an increase in profit rates, although an increase in the incomes of employees is assumed in terms of absolute values. For this reason, the relative income distribution systematically deteriorates against the employees. One of the most obvious aspects of social corporatism's criticism is the suppression of wage increases to ensure an increase in profit rates (Arslan,1997:4).

As emphasized above, one of the main features of social corporatist practices is to convince a trade union, especially by giving certain privileges to this trade union's management apparatus, and to cooperate more easily with the privileges provided. These privileges deepen the horizontal and vertical division of trade union organizations (Makal,1996:725).

According to this critique, the division in the trade unions is deepening, as the union-management apparatus makes more use of these privileges, and through these privileges a more autonomous, more alienated position emerges from the union base. Thus, the independence of the trade unions as a whole is undermined, and the state can be guided by the aims and activities of the trade unions, their managers, their members and others. On the other hand, union managers are removed from the union base with the privileges provided and brought closer to the state apparatus. Thus, the decisions taken by the managers are not much related to the current interests and preferences of the base, but they are provided to be more easily channeled to the task of adopting their own base. All this leads to significant erosion of the labor unions as a labor organization.

Another criticism in this area was that social corporatism deepened the horizontal division of trade unions. It is stated that one of the trade unions is to be favored by the state, the exclusion of other trade union organizations leads to a division of workers and their organizations within themselves, rather than a solidarity rather than a solidarity. It is claimed that this practice would neutralize the union organizations, which are obliged to defend the common interests of all employees, for this purpose.

This discriminatory practice of social corporatism among the labor organizations is also criticized for the purpose of reducing the self-confrontational relations of social corporatism, and it is stated that this practice serves to promote competition among the trade unions and to accelerate the conflict (Arslan,1997:4).

Social corporatist practices have also been criticized on the grounds that the working class has become an extension of its state and employers by imprisoning workers' organizations within national boundaries, and undermines the international solidarity consciousness of the working class. In these circumstances, it is stated that even if the international workers' organizations have not disappeared, they have begun to gain shape.

In today's world, where capital is internationalized, it is stated that the fact that workers' organizations are locked into national shells with social corporatist practices has harmed workers movement and organization (Akkaya,1996:25).

Economic growth after the Second World War was the material basis of social corporatism, which was the growth of income, high employment, social reconciliation policies and its corporate expression. With the economic pause that started in the mid-1970s, the ground of such a social consensus began to disappear. In these dates, satisfaction in the domestic market, stagnation in the foreign market and increasing competition have dragged advanced capitalist countries into a deep crisis.

The social welfare countries, which find it difficult to find new markets for increased production and thus face a decline in profit rates, have found a way to prevent the decline in profit rates under these conditions, at least in the liquidation of the social state.

These developments have brought along the discussions of whether social corporatism has been completed or not. Concrete data indicate that time is early to assert that social corporatism is over. It is seen that there is not much change in Austria and Germany in terms of maintaining the existence of centralized strong trade unionism and the participation of trade unions in the process of wages and public policies (Akkaya, 1998).

However, in spite of all these, social corporatist practices are facing serious problems compared to today and there is a significant crisis in these practices.

In Austria, after the 80s, governments have turned to balanced budget and stability-based policies and began to undermine the foundations on which reconciliation was built.

The practice, which has not been established on a firm basis in Germany, has been shaken since 1977 when the German Trade Union Confederation did not attend the meetings. After 1982, Kohl's government was more functional with its neo-liberal policies. After this date, conflicting relations increased in Germany and the number of lost workdays reached the highest level of recent years.

In the UK, the Teatcher Government limited wages in the public sector, rejected the principle of full employment, and eroded the foundation of social corporatism with its policy of privatization. With the two separate employment laws, it aimed to break the power of trade unions (Işıklı,1995:28- 32). In the UK, it is observed that the process is moving away from social corporatism.

After this process, Euro-Scandinavian social corporatism has entered into a crisis. This crisis is seen in a dual form.

First of all, corporatist practices have begun to be challenging by changing qualifications and corporatist practices have been fulfilling the function of imposing capital's anti-crisis policies on trade unions instead of sharing the pie and expanding the cake on the basis of this sharing. Secondly, workers' organizations are increasingly excluded from the mechanisms of public policy formation.

It seems that the main pillars of volunteerism are eliminated as a result of economic growth, full employment, inflation and wage stability.

**1.5 Labour Unions with monopoly and Authoritarian corporatism**

Another important factor affecting the success of corporatism is the presence of labour unions with strong central monopoly representation. The less fragmented the union structure in a country, the higher the rate of unionization and the more unified union they have, the greater the chances of success of corporatist practices in that country if they have a strong weight and control over their sub-organizations and members (Cizre;1992b:46). Or vice versa, the more centrifugal forces in the sense of union organization in a country, the stronger the ground of social reconciliation. Under these conditions, trade unions will be less likely to fulfill their commitment to adopt corporate decisions and practices to the worker base, and thus the chances of success for corporatist practices will be weakened.

In countries where the corporatist practices are raised, political authorities attach special importance to the strengthening of the trade unions with respect to representation and financial strength, which are the most appropriate in terms of corporatist policy, by law or in practice (Akkaya,1996:59).

One of the most distinctive features of corporatist practices are to favor one of the trade unions according to others and try to strengthen the union by giving it the monopolistic representation.

As a rule, unions are not spontaneously formed by mass initiative in authoritarian corporatism. The state does not tolerate the existence of independent unions. The autonomy of the trade unions is extremely limited, and the nature and scope of the interests that the trade unions will defend is predominantly determined and restricted by the state. Unlike social corporatism, it is difficult to come to the forefront instead of voluntary participation in authoritarian corporatism, rather than economic social concessions (Makal, 1996:732).

However, these are general features and, depending on the differences in social conditions, the rigidity or flexibility of these conditions also change, and even authoritarian corporatism can be combined with practices that evoke social corporatism in some circumstances.

As a matter of fact, there are also those who divide authoritarian corporatism into two sub-groups as internal and external (Akkaya,1996: 49).

Indeed, it is not possible to address authoritarian corporatism from the landscape of capitalism in that social context and from the distribution of social and political power that accompanies this landscape independently of the traditions in that country. It is natural that these different conditions create differences in the application of authoritarian corporatism.

Authoritarian corporatist practices are, as a rule, exclusionary. For example, in almost all Middle Eastern and Asian countries where authoritarian corporatist practices are concerned, it is seen that corporative organizations are a social control tool. In these regimes it is seen that corporatist practices aim to weaken pluralism and create a uniform union structure and have very oppressive characteristics.

In terms of exclusive authoritarian corporatism practices, Egypt and South Korea are two good examples.

The corporatist structuring of the workers' movement in Egypt was carried out by the state, by the state, by the election of the union leaders. In the period from 1959 to 1964, the only trade union principle was sanctioned with non-competitive, hierarchical organization structure and the right to represent a single confederation at national level. With the application of corporatism, while the trade union movement has been suppressed as a rule, the only concession has been to increase the organizational and financial opportunities of the trade union bureaucracy (Akkaya, 1996:160-164).

In South Korea, the General Council of the Korean Trade Unions, which was in the hands of the Communists, was closed down, and instead the 1946 Federation of Koreans Union was established under the special effectiveness of the US-led support and intelligence organizations. The directors of these federations were elected with the approval of the government.

However, it is the authoritarian corporatist practices that concern us more under this heading. To find an answer to the question whether these practices can be considered as a permanent and universal model. For this purpose, it will be tried to examine which historical, political conditions emerged.

The working class or the trade unions played an important role in the anti-colonial movements in the African and Latin American countries. In these countries, the working class was relatively weak, but the most dynamic part of society. The power of domestic capital was not in such a way as to lead the anti-colonial struggle because of the domination of foreign capital in these countries. In these circumstances, the working class had a special and predominant role in national liberation struggles within the intelligentsia, the working class and the indigenous capital alliance.

In Africa, the working class and especially the industrial workers were few. But the fact that national liberation movements were concentrated in the cities that were the engines of the state increased their strategic importance (Munck,1995:184).

This historical development has been decisive in the relations between the union and the state in postcolonial societies and corporatism has found widespread application in these countries. This relationship can be said to be two-dimensional. On the one hand, the state is controlled by the state under the cover of legitimacy created by nationalism, but on the other hand the working class in the new nationalist regimes has an irrefutable influence on the power. Which of these two-dimensional relations is gaining weight differs in different countries depending on the level of dependency relationship between the trade unions and the nature of the trade unions and other factors.

Behind the common nature of corporatism in these countries, there is also the burning importance of the national liberation problem. For this reason, the nationalist ideology had a weight that covered all classes.

As a matter of fact, after such a process, trade unions in Tunisia developed partnership relations with the state after independence.

After gaining independence, the government of India implemented and implemented an industrial democracy project based on labor participation projects.

In Togo, the leaders of the national liberation war proposed a constructive partnership to the trade unions and said that they wanted to act together with the trade unions supporting the national war while building the national economy.

The establishment of workers' committees in Tanzania has been one of the main practices of the post-independence political regime. Tanzania also created workers' committees, which were established in state-owned companies and public enterprises, with the trade unions and the top representatives of the state bureaucracy.

After the national revolution in 1952, when the working class played a decisive role in Bolivia, the workers' control system was introduced in the vital mining sector.

In Algeria, in the summer of 1962, when national liberation was approaching, workers in cities and agricultural holdings began to take over the means of production abandoned by French immigrants who fled. And they re-started production by creating self-management committees.

A similar development is seen in Singapore, where workers play a key role in the struggle for independence. But in Singapore, just like in Togo, it is a feasible supporter of the new regime expected from the unions after independence (Munck,1995:219).

After the independence, the main aim of the government was to take the unions under close control, to channel the workers' protest to the institutions controlled by the state and to create a framework of labor laws that would make wage conflicts easier to handle (Oran, 1997:269).

Another important factor in the formation of authoritarian corporatism was the struggle for internal conflict and hegemony within the ruling power bloc. For example, the authoritarian regimes, who faced the strong territorial oligarchy of the 1930s as an adversary, followed by an introverted, external world strategy of industrialization, deemed it necessary to include the broad-based city coalition formed by the working-class organizations and to provide economic and social concessions to integrate with the regime. Thus, they created an example of authoritarian corporatism with a kind of social corporatist colour (Cizre, 1992b:51).

In 1968, when the generals of Peru came to power, it is possible to evaluate the implementation of a reformist program, which includes an ambitious labor participation plan known as industrial committees. In Peru, the same power has established Public Property Enterprises based on workers' self-management as well as industrial committees. The model was taken from Yugoslavia. In 1979, there were 52 enterprises employing a total of 7,000 workers at the Public Property Enterprises. The National Community Mobility Supervisory Organization, which is called SINAMOS, the state agency responsible for promoting participation, can in fact be seen as an integrative tool rather than mobilizing workers (Munck,1995:245-247).

A similar picture took place in Bolivia following the 1971 military coup, and the new regime formed a popular assembly. The People's Assembly was composed of delegates elected by direct vote in the workplace assemblies, and a large democracy prevailed in this parliament. The military government, which did not have a solid social base, was trying to increase the support it received from trade unions with such practices (Munck, 1995:258).

What we have referred to here should give an idea of the background of authoritarian corporatism practices in the Third World. The weakness of classrooms imposes a state-specific role in regulating industrial contradiction in the entire Third World. In this general table, according to the class power balances in that country, the state realized this role either by direct and strict control of the labor movement or by recognizing a certain area of responsibility, initiative and movement to these segments. This second option, which concerns us more in this article, is the relatively more flexible, more participatory practice of corporatism in the Third World. In these countries, whose economic opportunities are limited and the working class is relatively weak, it is the question of how such a flexible form can arise in state - union relations. We tried to find the answer to this question. And we have focused on three important factors:

a) The specific and sometimes decisive role played by the working class in the anti-colonial struggle,

b) the struggle for hegemony in the power bloc,

c) the less stable growth conditions within the introverted development model.

Therefore, it cannot be said that an application that arises due to these conditions is based on a stable, stable and stable basis. Although these practices have survived for many years, it does not seem possible to argue that this relative continuity shows that corporatist practices can be a permanent model. These practices have so far involved many conflicts, and the process has reversed, and there are many new cases in the Third World that show that these types of corporatist models suffer from serious shocks. According to the ILO reports, in the recent period, especially in South Asia, although there are still some trilateral agreements between an increasing number of government-worker-employer sectors, the main characteristics of them are not being signed by the workers' slavery, but rather because of helplessness, disagreement and other reasons. They are unilateral and imposed (Munck., 1995:223).

In the post-colonial regimes, the crisis of the system, the strengthening of the capital power, the distance from inward-oriented industrialization, and the union-state relationship, depending on other factors, change from a more flexible model to a more rigid and oppressive model. Under the conditions where the trade unions are silent, workers at the bottom react to this trend by blaming and overcoming the union administrations.

Perhaps the first important example of this was the workers' actions in Ghana in 1961 at an early date. In 1961, the first serious strike against post-colonial rule was held under the leadership of Sekondi - Takaradı's railway and port workers. Sekondi - Takaradi workers, who were among the most prominent supporters of Nukrumah's nationalist line in time, started to think that they were betrayed. As a result of the events, the leaders of the strike were arrested. The control over the union was intensified and finally one-party administration was established (Munck,1995:224 ve Oran,1997:282-284).

Military coups shook Brazil in 1964, Argentina in 1966 and again in 1976, Chile and Uruguay in 1973. In any case, urban workers and their trade unions and political parties became the main victims of political pressure and economic stabilization programs. In all of these four countries in the southern hemisphere, military dictatorships initiated a regular inaction against workers' organizations. Strikes were banned in all cases and trade union activities were either suspended or severely restricted. The corporatism and docile union management were seen as an important guarantee for these practices. However, the strikes after 1978 revealed that this was not true (Munck,1995:286).

Towards the end of 1983, Nigerian troops once again took control of the state and took a planned action against the unions. The official labor movement was not the only target. National Student Union was distributed. Squatters were demolished by bulldozers.

Martial law in the Philippines was announced in 1972 by President Markos. As a result, they reacted to these pressures and corporatist practices, and the Mayo Uno unions were founded and turned to radical actions.

In Algeria, anti-democratic tendencies began to dominate in 1965, and councils began to lose their radical potential. Committees, once fighting bodies, were now tools for preventing the base from opposing the new state and factory bureaucracy. The decision on self-government, which was announced in Charte d'Alger, started to become dysfunctional before it was dry (Munck, 1995: 269).

Brazil is a prime example of a corporative control system on workers. The detailed structure of the labour laws enacted in the 1930s envisaged making the trade unions a representative of the government. The system applied in workers' control led to the development of a trade union movement that was separated from its members and dependent on the state. When workers moved in key sectors after 1978, one of the main demands was reform of union structures (Munck, 1995:220).

What has been described so far has demonstrated the important role that authoritarian corporatism, the working class or the unions play in national liberation wars. It has shown that it can be transformed into more flexible applications depending on such factors as the crack, inward development model within the ruling power bloc and such factors. But in parallel with the change in these factors, these practices are becoming increasingly more oppressive and difficult, and in this case, the working class or the unions have become more radical and independent from the state.

**1.6 Neo-corporatism**

In the 19th century and in the first quarter of the 20th century, the state in the capital and capital axis against the escalation of the working class struggle, resisted the unions. However, the fact that the working class in Russia took power in 1917 and the developing countries in the countries where the Bolshevik Revolution took place, the establishment of the International Labor Organization in 1919 led the bourgeoisie and the state to reconsider these developments. The attempt to implement socialism that rivals capitalism and prescribes working-class sovereignty has frightened the bourgeoisie and the state. Rather than ignoring the working class and its organization, the unions, or fighting against unions, led them to act together. Thus, the timid, non-systematic steps taken towards cooperation with the trade unions before the Second World War began to be more voluntary and encouraging after World War II, especially after the Soviet Union gained great respect. After World War II, the steps taken by the state and trade unions to cooperate with each other began to become systematic in line with the policies of welfare state.

The concept of corporatism has been redefined and conceptualized since the 1970s in order to explain the relations between the state and the interest groups after the Second World War. Thus, the term corporatism has been used with qualitative concepts such as neo, liberal, social, pluralist, bargaining and authoritarian in order to indicate the difference between the corporatist practices in the post-World War II period and the fascist practices during the interwar period.

With the new corporatism model which is tried to be developed, it has been tried to solve the relations between the society and the state in a broad sense and the relations between the workers and employers organizations in the narrow sense. Thus, in some Scandinavian countries, corporate agreements and practices that have been in place since the beginning of the 20th century have become widespread due to the debates in the theoretical field in the 1970s.

Since the mid-1970s, corporatism has been discussed under the name of new corporatism. According to Akkaya, in the industrialized Western countries, according after the Second World War, new formations have occurred outside the pluralist model in the state society relations. As a result of the increasing intervention of the state to the economy, it has been suggested that new relations between the interests of workers and employers organizations are formed in a broad sense. After World War II, the new form of interest organizations' relations with each other and with the state makes the explanations of the pluralist theory inadequate. The new corporatism model has been opened to argue that all the changes occur better than the pluralist model.

According to the pluralist conception, there are a large number of interest groups or organizations competing with each other in the society and equally powerful. These groups or organizations can put pressure on the state they are presuming to be neutral and passive in the process of formation of policies in economic, social and political fields, and ensure that these policies to be implemented are in line with their own interests. However, after the Second World War, the state started to intervene in the economy effectively by getting out of the passive position, away from being the night watchman state of classical liberalism. In order to achieve the success of the policies it pursues, the state has replaced the centralized and powerful groups open to cooperation with it, rather than a large number of equal and competitive interests. It has empowered the organizations which are open to cooperation by strengthening them in various ways. An institutionalized cooperation has been established in the process of creation and implementation of economic and social policies with these interest groups, which are empowered by both structurally and functionally, equipped with the right to monopolistic representation, and are further mechanized. This form of a collaborative relationship, which is increasingly operating in the economic sphere, namely corporatist practices, stems from the need to protect a stable bourgeois-dominated regime. Indeed, the bourgeois-dominated regime continues to prevail, unless social policy practices, welfare state policies are in place, or the policies pursued in favour of the working classes are abandoned. Welfare state policies have also been the new rational way of stable development and expansion of capitalism after World War II. In this context, as stated by Akkaya, corporatist practices are considered as an attempt to solve the problems faced by the interventionist welfare state policies based on mixed economy. Because, in line with welfare state policies, it is necessary to ensure full employment and economic growth and to keep inflation at low levels. To achieve these goals, it is argued that workers and employers' organizations should support corporatist policies. Thus, by integrating workers and employers organizations into corporatist policies and practices, it has been argued that the class demands can be taken to an acceptable level, wages and profits can be kept under better control, and that the unions that have to think about each other's interests will be open to cooperation and reconciliation.

The new corporatist practices, which began to weaken towards the end of the 1980s, have not always been applied in the same quality within the specified period of time. As Cizre points out, the new corporatism was the product of good days and then bad days in the first phase of the oil crisis. The new corporatism, from the positive expectations of the welfare state in the first phase up to the oil crisis, such as full employment, price stability, and social welfare gains that require high government spending; In the second period after the crisis, it was due to the need for solidarity and reconciliation required by the worsening social and economic environment. In the second phase of the oil crisis, new corporatist practices aimed at ensuring inter-class cohesion in the first phase have begun to change their qualifications, become challenging and lose their effectiveness as a public policy-making tool.

In the 1980s, in many countries, the social democratic parties had to leave the power to the right-wing parties. In the economic and political transformations the right-wing parties plan to implement, corporatism was not needed as a public policy-making process. Right parties tend to exclude interest groups, particularly workers' organizations, from political processes and public policy making. These initiatives have disabled logistical compromise. Thus, the bargaining power has come to the forefront rather than compromise in the protection of interests. Starting in the 1980s, interest groups have turned to bargaining methods that lead to conflicts and fluctuations, rather than corporatist practices, with the aim of increasing their incomes, by increasing their productivity and economic growth, and by trying to achieve this goal through consensus rather than conflict.

**2. Corporatist view to Azerbaijan’s labour market regulations**

**2.1 The value of labour in Azerbaijan Law**

In this section, we will look at how closely the labor market in Azerbaijan is legally close to corporate ideas. The main source of state power in the Republic of Azerbaijan is the Azerbaijan nation. It is the sovereign right of the Azerbaijani people to freely and independently solve their problems and determine their form of administration. There are some basic legal bases that protect workers' rights in the labor market. In Azerbaijan, The Labor Code, the Labour Unions Act and Constitution, forms this basic legal basis.

There are some articles in Azerbaijan which can be considered that could support corporative ideas. Certain articles in the Constitution of the Republic of Azerbaijan define workers' rights in the labor market.

Firstly, in the Labor law it is noted that labor is the basis of personal and social welfare. Everyone has the right to choose their occupation and place of employment on the basis of their ability to work. Employee has freedom on selection of job speciality and conditions under contract framework. And no one can be forced to work. Furthermore, labor contracts are freely closed. No one may be compelled to conclude a labor contract. It is an exception to involve the compulsory labor stipulated by the law on the terms and conditions of the court decision. As well as during the military situation, citizens are allowed to perform the required work. Same is applied during emergency cases. (Constitution; article 35)

Employees' working conditions is important either. Everyone has the right to work in a safe and healthy environment, without any discrimination, to receive at least a minimum wage, which is determined by the state for his or her work. However if citizen do not work he has a rights about unemployment. The unemployed have the right to receive social benefits from the state. The state uses all opportunities to eliminate unemployment. The State employment center supports unemployed people and tires to ensure unemployed person with a job.

Everybody has the privilege to strike alone or with others. The right to strike on the basis of an employment contract can only be restricted in the cases provided for by law. Military servicemen and civilians serving in the Armed Forces of the Republic of Azerbaijan and other armed units can not strike. Furthermore, individual and collective labour disputes are resolved in accordance with the law.

According to right to rest article, everyone has the right to rest. Employees of the employment contract are provided with a paid leave of not less than 8 hours a day, weekends and holidays. Employee should have vacation of not less than 21 calendar days in a year.

Everyone has the right to obtain social security if he / she has reached the statutory age limit or have a sickness, disability, loss of working capacity, loss of family head, unemployment and other personal circumstances provided or by law.

Work relations will be set up upon the execution of a composed work contract. An understanding for preparing in another calling and claim to fame might be closed based on common assent of business and representative straightforwardly when a work contract is marked or during the time spent work relations. The terms, methods and span of representatives preparing in another calling or strength and the gatherings commitments will be administered by a fitting understanding or work contract marked compliant with the assent got.

Workers do have some essential rights identifying with labour understandings. In the first place, to pick work at a position of work as per his calling, strength, and calling. He can request that the business alter the terms of the work contract or to end it (Labour code; article 9).

Worker has a privilege to work under conditions which meet security and wellbeing prerequisites and to practice the privilege to request such conditions. They can take part in movement for pay amid working hours which isn't disallowed by law and to not obstruct satisfaction of the commitments of gatherings to a work contract.

Representative has rights on remuneration no not exactly the base set up by law and to get or request additional compensation for extra time. Also, to reject to perform work or administrations excluded part of the expected set of responsibilities characterized by the work contract and to request extra pay proper for such work.

Employee has the basic obligations related to employment contracts. To conscientiously play out the activity obligations indicated in the work contract and to keep up work discipline and inside big business discipline. They have to meet word related security prerequisites. To be liable for material harm to the business. Moreover, to keep state privileged insights and the businesses exchange insider facts classified under the guidelines and terms built up by law. Employee should support interests and the labour rights of his co-workers.

Employer also has Basic obligations and responsibilities. An employer have the following basic obligations with respect to labour relations. One of the main obligations is to comply with the terms and obligations stated in employment contracts. At that point to fire work contracts on the grounds and compliant with the standards built up thus. To conform to the terms and states of aggregate understandings and contracts and the commitments anticipated in that. Employer have to think about worker applications and complaints inside the term and in the way settled by Legislation. To make fundamental strides as per the endeavour ordinances or aggregate contract to improve the working, material, and living states of representatives.

At the period of hiring or a change in or end of work no separation among representatives will be allowed based on citizenship, sex, race, nationality, language, spot of habitation, monetary standing, social birthplace, age, family conditions, religion, political perspectives, alliance with worker's organizations or other open affiliations, proficient standing, convictions, or different elements inconsequential to the expert capabilities, work execution, or expert aptitudes of the workers, nor will it be allowed to build up benefits and benefits or legitimately or by implication limit rights based on these components.

Employees, employers, labor collectives and trade unions have the right to engage in individual or collective labor disputes to protect their rights and legitimate interests. Implementation of this right may be restricted only in the cases and in the manner prescribed by law.

The settlement of individual and collective labor disputes arising from the application of labor legislation between the employer and the labor collective is regulated by the relevant law.

Employers can combine their economic, financial interests, interests in entrepreneurial activity, and voluntarily establish an organization to engage in social partnerships with trade unions.

Together with worker's guilds associations, other open self-government organizations and businesses delegate offices built up under the predefined methodology may give movement as by their laws.The proprietor or administrator of an endeavour will give the proper conditions as stipulated in aggregate contracts.

*Collective contracts*

There are some basic principles for the preparation, closure and implementation of the collective agreement and agreement. First of all, the parties should have a legal equality. The independence and volunteerism of the parties in the discussion of the collective agreement and the content of the agreement should be protected. It is unacceptable to include conditions that can not be satisfied for objective reasons into the collective agreement and the content of the agreement. The collective agreement must ensure the fulfillment of its obligations, and compliance with the requirements of the legislation. It is responsible for monitoring and non-execution of collective commitments.

Intervention in their implementation during the conclusion of a collective agreement and agreement is inadmissible. The terms of the collective agreement and agreement concluded in the manner prescribed are obligatory for the parties and the places where these terms apply. The terms of the collective agreement and agreement that worsen the employee's situation compared to social and economic norms are invalid. Collective bargaining agreements and arrangements for the preparation, conclusion and amendment of the collective bargaining agreement shall be undertaken by trade unions organizations, labor collectives, employers, relevant executive authorities and employers' representative bodies within their competence.

If the organization does not have a trade union organization, the labor collective creates a competent commission to negotiate.

If there are several trade unions within the enterprise, a commission consisting of representatives of relevant employees' union membership is formed to conduct collective bargaining.

One of the collective agreements is the employer and the other is the trade union organization. In the absence of a trade union organization, the second part of the collective agreement is the labor collective.

A trade union organization can be established on the basis of purely voluntary principles, without the prior written consent of the employer, without distinction of workers. Employees may enter into relevant trade unions to protect labor, social, economic rights and legitimate interests, and engage in trade union activities. The rights, duties and powers of trade unions are defined by the Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan on trade unions and their charters.

**2.2 Why establishment of labour union is important**

With the commencement of the industrial revolution in the 18th century, especially in Europe, particularly in England, France and Germany, the aid chambers established by workers against the inhuman working conditions began to be used.

Union is defined as the alliance established by the laws between workers in order to protect their interests in terms of work, earnings, social and cultural issues, to provide new rights and to develop them further. In other words, the union is a group of workers who come together to maintain and improve the conditions of employment.

A typical feature of a union is its efforts to help its members to improve the quality of public services and collective bargaining for better wages and conditions for all employees for political campaigns and industrial actions.

Workers have the right to belong to a labour union in accordance with the European Convention on Human Rights. Participation in a union helps to balance the power that employers have on individual employees.

If a labour union is recognized by an employer, then the employer agrees that the union represents the employees in that company and it will discuss the relevant issues with the union.

Labour unions play a critical role in improving working conditions, job security and wages. However, some governments and employers are abusing the rights of workers to join existing trade unions or to establish new ones. In this case, there are many reasons for being a member of a union.

The first reason is economic. The individual employee has very little bargaining power as compared to their employer. If they are not satisfied with the wage and other working conditions, they can quit the job. However, it is not useful for an employee to resign continuously. This means a huge financial and emotional burden on the worker. Participating in a union that can take joint action against the employer is a powerful tool that will cause the employer to accept the demands of workers for better employment conditions. The second reason is a sense of security. Employees can join trade unions because they can provide adequate protection from accidents, injuries, sickness, unemployment and similar dangers and income insecurity. The union can force the management to increase the level of welfare of. Thirdly, it minimizes the discrimination. Wages, workload, mobility, promotions, and similar decisions are inherently very subjective, which creates room for nepotism and discrimination. A union can force the management to regulate personnel policies, thus pressing workers for equal treatment. All labour decisions of the administration are under close monitoring of the union, which has the effect of minimizing nepotism and discrimination.

Another reason is the feeling of belonging. Some workers join the union under the influence of their colleagues and not joining may be seen as undesirable. On the other hand, people who are members of a union are viewed with respect by their colleagues.

The need to express yourself can be considered as another reason. The desire to express yourself is a fundamental human need. We all want to share our feelings, thoughts, and opinions with others. Similarly, workers want the administration to listen to them. A union provides an environment where workers can discuss their feelings and ideas. It also communicates the feelings, opinions, and complaints of employees to the management. Management gives the necessary importance to these ideas, complaints and opinions when making decisions.

Another reason for the workers participating in the labour unions is that the trade unions help solve the problems peacefully and improve the relations between management and workers.

Thus, participating in the labour unions is significantly beneficial for employee.

**2.3 Labour Unions in Azerbaijan as corporatist syndicate**

The basis of the trade unions' activities is their respective statutory acts, as well as their respective legal acts. Requirements for the structure of trade unions and the main sections that should be considered are reflected in article 4 of the Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan "About trade unions", which came into force on 24 February 1994.

Each emerging trade union organization may freely determine its structure, the organization's governance rules, subject to the requirements of law. Below is an example of a trade union charter. This charter was prepared by the Azerbaijan Trade Unions Confederation. An example of this is primarily for trade unions, which are primarily related to co-financing. However, it can be used as a template for any trade union by partial modifications to this exemplary charter. The proposed model is officially approved by the Decision of the Executive Committee of the Azerbaijan Trade Unions Confederation.

The Trade Union is created and operates to protect the rights and interests of other workers, as well as the right of representation to the members of the Union, represent them on the basis of a defined rule.

The Trade Union has key responsibilities to achieve the Charter requirements. It develops and improves the life of the field workers. Participates in the development of socio-economic policy, development of draft laws and other legal acts on social and labor issues. It represents employees' interests in social partnership, conducts collective bargaining, implements collective agreements and contracts, and monitors their implementation. Participates in the development of the employment program, offers measures on the social protection of workers who have been released as a result of the establishment, annulment and staffing of organizations.

Trade Union participates in the regulation of corporate labor disputes including strikes. Organizes mass actions of the Trade Union, including meetings, rallies, demonstrations, rallies, pickets and other co-operative actions. Creates legal and technical inspectorate of trade union labor. Furthermore, Oversees the performance of employers and their representatives with respect to labor law and other regulatory legal acts. Creates legal and technical inspectorate of trade union labor. Unification oversees the performance of employers and their representatives with respect to labor law and other regulatory legal acts. Participates in the development of the field program on occupational safety and environmental protection. Contributes in the development of nourishing and other preparations that promote the protection of pancreatic illnesses and the pathogenic safety. The legally binding labor protection agrees with legal acts.

Socially oriented enterprises are also involved in overseeing compliance with state and municipal property, laws on privatization and other regulatory acts. Employees representing public and municipal property privatization boards represent employees.

They create legal services and advocacy for the defense of the interests of labor union and other citizenship rights of trade union members. Organizes cultural, mass and health events between members of the Trade Union and their families.

Participates in the organization and development of curative treatment, child health recreation, organization of cultural institutions, additional education, recreation, tourism, physical training and sports.

It implements the preparation, training, education and training of trade union activists, and trade union members and carries out a purposeful personnel policy. Moreover the union manages solidarity, holidays, insurance, cultural - educational, training and preparation of personnel and other funds, manage the trade union budget. To achieve its statutory objectives, it implements financial and other types of activities in accordance with law. The Trade Union helps logistical, legal, financial and other types of assistance to its members and trade union organizations.

They implement their publishing activities. Carry out information campaigns to ensure the transparency of the activities of the Trade Union and its affiliates. It creates and uses its own mass information tools.

It also carries out other activities that are not prohibited by existing law-making, which derive from the goals and objectives of the Trade Union.

Furthermore we will discuss Principles of Trade Union activity. The Trade Union regulates its activities on freedom, independence, justice, solidarity, voluntarism, democratization and self-government, equality, legality, law and obligations.

The Trade Union is not dependent on the executive authority, the self-governing body, the employers, their associations, political parties and other public associations in their activities, and is not subject to their control. Participates in the development of the employment program, offers measures on the social protection of workers who have been released as a result of the establishment, annulment and staffing of organizations. Members of the Trade Union have equal rights and equal responsibilities. However, the member does not have the right to be a member of another trade union in the enterprise.

In addition members in trade union have rights. First, member has the right to use the trade union assistance to protect its labor rights and interests. Second, is a right to make proposals for the organization about research and development plan on the social and economic policy issues. There is also a right to participate in trade union activities and take part in the events organized by its organizations. A Member may criticize its Trade Union affiliates, their leaders, each member of the Union of Trade Unions, and express and defend their views. It can propose initiatives within the framework of its goals and objectives and make proposals to the Trade Union organs. A Member may take part in the meeting of the Trade Union Body, which has its own application, complaint and proposal. Under certain rules, it may also use the trade union property. There is also the right to receive professional assistance and support from the Trade Union. The member also has the right to receive unpaid legal advice on labor issues.

**3. Empirical Research**

**3.1 Sampling and descriptive statistics**

In this section we will discover how respondents in Azerbaijan react on questions about labour market. Data is collected from my own survey.

Firstly, the majority of people who have participated in my survey were male participants whereas female participants’ number was less in comparison to men.Percentage of males were 60.3% (302 people) whereas the percentage of women contains 39.7% (199 people)

Participants ages vary from 17 to 67 in our survey and we will have a quick glance at certain numbers related to various aged people. Starting from the lowest respondents who aged between 17-18 consists 8 people in survey. Morever age group between 19-22 included 40 people itself which is 5 folds more than previous age group. People that aged between 23-30 contains the big part of our survey by being 135. As ages go up, the number of participants increase at the same time. 31-40 age group people encompasses 139 people during survey. However when we go to elder ages number decreases hence it is not surprising to see the amount of people between 41-50 ages to be 72 and furthermore 51-60 age group contains 48 participants and last but not least people over 60 years old to 67 contains 23 people and is the second least number after 17-18 age criteria.

It is very intriguing to see people’s marital status and notice the comparison among them. We listed 4 criterias here which are:

a)Married b)Single c)Engaged d)and Widow

As we see in our pie chart, the amount of married people is the highest by being 318 who involved in our survey and answered our questions and this is 64% of all individuals. Then the second biggest number belongs to Single persons as it is roughly the half of married criteria by being 151 people which is 30.4% . Only 20 people that is 4% belongs to widow criteria and the least number is for engaged individuals which are 8 people – 1.6%

*Level of Education*

Here we classified 5 options for the degree of individuals.

They are: High school graduate; Sub Bachelor graduate; Undergraduate degree; Postgraduate degree; PhD degree

The vast majority of people have Bachelor degree which is 52.2% that makes 261 persons. Following undergraduate students, the second highest number is Master degree which is 20% and precisely 100 people.Sub bachelor students who were involved in survey is 13,2% by being 66 folks. Surprisingly high school graduates are less compared to other degrees and it is kind of good news for us, so they are 9% which are 45 people and lastly Phd students consist the least part in our pie chart that is 5.6% - 28 people.

We diversified 10 different regions that people might belong to and here are statistics.Tremendous amount of people live in the capital Baku which is 46.2- 230 individuals. The second largest number of them inhabited in Absheron region around 12%-60 people. 8.2% of those live in Ganja-Qazax by being 41 persons and 6.4% is settled in Sheki-Zaqatala which is 32.Furthermore number of people who attended in our survey from Aran is 64 that is 12.9% . In addition to that, Lankaran is on the sixth place: 5.4%-27 people. Then Quba-Khacmaz, Yukhari Garabagh and Daghliq Shirvan are on the list by being respectively 18, 11 and 13 (3.6% , 2.2% and 2.6%)

The individuals who have participated in our survey possess long work experiences and from the least to the highest we see the year between 17 to 46 years of work experience. People who have worked for 17-30 years are 7, whereas 30-40 years of experience consists the biggest amount by being 30 people.To conclude people possessing 40-46 years experience is the least which is 6.

Almost the main part of participatory work with employement-contract which is 80.2% and it is approximately 400 people. Second majority of them are students 6.9%-34 people.Unfortunately the third group that belongs to working without labour contract is 5.9% -29 people.Individuals that have participated in our survey belong to Other criteria are 3.8%-19 persons. Folks that are working under temporary contract are next by being 3.2%-16 respondents.

Almost 70% of participants are working in government organization which are 331 people.Following that the next highest percentage belongs to Private sector by being 24.9% -119 persons. There are slight difference between individuals who are having their own business and farming and agriculture business. People who have their own entrepreneurship are 15 which is 3.1% and who work in farming and agriculture sector is 13 people – 2.7%

The highest number of people is those who work between 30-50 hours a week and they are 226. The amount of respondents that are working 1-30 hours weekly is 182 people which is actually quite high number. Those who have 50-70 hours per week are not much since they are only 39 and only 14 folks work for 70-100 hours per week. We have just 5 people who are working for above 100 hours weekly.

*Net income*

Individuals for their salary diversification reveal facts about how much money our respondents get from their job and by money we mean net salary. People that get 0-400 AZN consists of 213 of our respondents by being in top. The second largest salary group people contains 186 people and their net profit salary is between 400 and 800 AZN. The least number of people get the highest net salary by being 44 folks.

From next section, the data of 393 participants will be analyzed on respondents who work with labour contract.

**3.2 Overall eveluation of labour union**

Most of our participants answered that they do have Labour Union but inactive and they have only heard its name. These people are 61.5% of our respondents and it is 242 people. Unfortunately the respondents that mentioned that they don’t have such Union at their job which are 39 people – 10% . Only 16% people have said they do have a Trade Union and it is actively working. And the last, people who have never heard of it contains 12% which are 47 people.

Figure 3.1: Do you have a labour union in your workplace?

When we asked about satisfaction of respondents’ physical work conditions, 393 answers has been collected. The respondents are generally satisfied with the working conditions. In fact, 73.5% of people either completely agree, agree or partially agree that they are satisfied with their physical work conditions. But only 22.6% of people either completely disagree, disagree or partially agree.

Figure 3.2: Are you satisfied with your physical work conditions?

In next figure we can see that, 70% of people either disagree or completely disagree that their labour union work successful. The majority of participants even completely disagree which is 48%. It can be clearly seen that Labour Unions do not work well, for the people who has a labour contract. The highest level of satisfaction comes from just partially agree category which is only 11.7%.

Figure 3.3: I think that the work of the Labour Union is successful in my workplace.

**3.3 Trust to labour union**

People are less likely to believe that the Labour Union will seriously defend them if their rights are violated at work. From 389 participants on this questionnaire who has a labour contract, 275 of them either disagree or completely disagree that their Labour Union will seriously defend them in case their rights are violated at work. This makes 70,7% of total participants which shows huge distrust that the union will defend employees’ rights.

Figure 3.4: I believe that the Labour Union will seriously defend me if my rights are violated at work.

In this part we see another distrust to Labour Unions. Only 19.5% of individuals completely agree, agree, and partially agree that, first what they will do is appeal to labour union in case of unjustly dismissed from a job. Unfortunately 64% of people disagree and completely disagree with the statement which means huge distrust to labour unions. If we look at figure 3.5 we can easily see how disagree and completely disagree sections’ values are high. This shows that if employer fires employee unfair, employee will not appeal to trade union which should come to help. Employees do not feel comfortable themselves even unfair fire from job.

Figure 3.5: Firstly, I will appeal to Labour Union if I am unjustly dismissed.

Here we see a complete disbelief that in case of the rights of employees violated, the trade union will strike on this unjust. The vast majority of people (77%) either disagree or completely disagree that trade union will strike in such cases. Labour Union have rights to strike, especially in such cases when members’ rights are violated. This gives a huge advantage to employers to dictate terms on employee knowing that no strike will occur by labour union.

Figure 3.6: I believe that if the members' rights are violated, the Labour Union will strike.

Participants are also claim that they have not seen their trade union protects its employees in case of a violation of laws against employee member. 72.5% of people either disagree or completely disagree that they have ever seen such defence by trade union. Around 16% stays neutral.

Figure 3.7: In my workplace, I witnessed the Trade Union strongly defending its employees in case of a violation of a law against a worker

It can be clearly seen that, participants also think that labour union in their workplace is more likely on the side of directory. This is extreme drawback for employees. It means that, employees do not feel safe and comfortable themselves because, trade union as their guard will not protect them, because they think trade union will not be on the side of employees.

Figure 3.8: I think that the Labour Union is mostly on the side of the directory where I work.

When it comes to social protection supporting, the most people completely disagree and their percentage is 38%. Moreover, 23.3% of respondents disagree. Only 15.5% of respondents partially agree that trade union plays an important role in support of the social protection of employee.

Figure 3.9: The Trade Union plays an important role in supporting the social protection of workers (sending them to treatment and leisure, etc.).

**Conclusion**

Although corporatist practices first emerged during the period of fascist regimes between the two world wars, the issue was updated again. This is because history has shown that in the post-World War II period the corporatist model in democratic regimes can find living space.

The writers such as Schmitter have started to use the term neo-corporatism to separate the corporatist model that emerged after World War II from the fascist corporatism. While neo-corporatism is a pluralist and moderate statist, fascist corporatism has singularist and totalitarian characteristics. It is possible to divide the neo-corporatist model into two as social corporatism and authoritarian corporatism. The criteria based on this distinction are the degree of autonomy of the relationship between the state and the professional organizations, the severity between the difficult-pressure factor and the economic-social concession factor, and the degree of effectiveness of the trade unions in the process of creating public policies.

The distinction between social corporatism and authoritarian corporatism has an overall value. These models also show significant differences in class power balances in each country, socio-economic development level of the country, level of unionization and quality.

Authoritarian corporatism is divided into two as authoritarian and corporatist corporatism, which is relatively more oppressive or more participatory. Social corporatism practices are observed in European countries with strong economic structures, where there is a strong labor movement and organization, and keynesian economic policies are implemented.

Another distinction in corporatism is related to scale. Macro-corporatism at national level, mezzo corporatism for sectoral corporatism, micro corporatism for corporatism at workplace-enterprise level, corporatism which is valid at international scale are also called mega corporatism.

It is observed that the corporatist practices are generally brought to the agenda during the economic-social crisis and transformation periods. Saving the national economy from the crisis and making it more advantageous in international competition are among the main reasons why corporatist practices are brought up.

One of the most important objectives to be achieved through this model is to reduce the conflicting characteristics of working relations. Azerbaijan on the legal basis, has very good legal structure regulated with Azerbaijan Republic Constitution, Labour code and law on Labour Unions. In our research we have seen very protective employee rights on the legal basis of labour regulations. Laws valuing employees and gives certain rights. Moreover, Labour Unions also protect their members.

In Azerbaijan one of the most effective protector of employees is Labour Unions or in other words Trade Unions. They regulate conflicts between employers and employees and help come to equilibrium in several cases. In case of members rights’ violated Trade Unions have a right to strike. Moreover, labour unions should defend employees if they will be fired unfairly. Another important case is that labour unions help to come equilibrium on fair wage policy.

However, our research showed that, in practice Labour Unions do not work that much effective. This result came from our data analysis of trust on labour unions. In figure 3.1 we have seen that 62% of respondents actually do have trade unions in their workplace, but they have only the name but not action which means they do not work properly. While 10% do not have labour unions in workplace at all, 12% said that they even do not know if they have labour unions. Only 16% of respondents said they have trade unions and they are actively operating. Then, 73% of individuals said they are satisfied with physical working conditions however, we have seen that 70% of individuals do not agree that labour unions work successfully.

Furthermore, we could see that trust on Labour Unions is also not confident. In figure 3.4, 74% said that they do not believe that the Labour Union will seriously defend them if their rights are violated at work. Same unconfident situation is on cases of unjustly dismissed out of work. In addition, 77% respondents either disagree or completely disagree that trade union will strike in case of rights are violated. And only 10.7% of respondents do not think that Labour Union is commonly on the side of the directory.

From our observations we can see that, employees who work with labour contract, have a lack of confidence on Labour Unions. Labour Unions is not effective as protector of employees.

Laws are supporting labour relations and also in Azerbaijan there are Labour Unions which should defend their members’ rights. However, in practice these unions are not successful.

Thus, legal basis is supportive to corporatist view of labour regulations but there is a lack of confidence on Labour Unions. In fact, Labour Unions fail their effectiveness which means we can accept that there is an institutional gap.
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